

**CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA**

Table of Contents

I. CAEP Accountability Measure 1: Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 Learning and Development (Impact Measure)..... 3

    Completer Impact Research ..... 3

        Principal Survey of Impact on Learning..... 3

        Graduate Self Evaluation of Impact on Student Learning..... 5

        Pretest-Posttest Assessments of Student Learning ..... 6

II. CAEP Accountability Measure 2: Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Impact Measure)..... 10

    IDOE Supervisor Performance Observation Evaluations of Completer Effectiveness..... 10

    Saint Mary’s Principal Survey ..... 11

    Partners in Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement) ..... 12

    Teacher Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement) ..... 16

    General Meeting Fall 2023 ..... 17

III. CAEP Accountability Measure 3: Candidate competency at program completion (Outcome Measure)..... 21

    Elementary Education Licensure Examinations..... 21

    Secondary Education Licensure Examinations ..... 23

    Art/Music Education Licensure Examinations..... 24

    Student-Teaching Rubric..... 24

    Student-Teaching Dispositions Rubric ..... 25

    Social and Emotional Learning ..... 27

    Assurance that Candidates Understand the Expectations of the Profession..... 30

    Assurance of Content Knowledge and Teaching Effectiveness Prior to Recommendation for Licensure ..... 31

    Completer Satisfaction Survey ..... 31

IV. CAEP Accountability Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared (Outcome Measure)..... 33

    Completer/Graduation Rate ..... 33

    Completer/Licensure Rate ..... 33

Alumnae Employment Survey ..... 34

Student Loan Default Rate for Saint Mary’s College ..... 34

V. Discussion..... 34

Impact Measures:..... 34

    Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1) ..... 34

    Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Components R4.2, R5.3)..... 35

Outcome Measures: ..... 35

    Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3) ..... 35

    Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared ..... 36

**I. CAEP Accountability Measure 1: Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 Learning and Development (Impact Measure)**

Completer Impact Research

In accordance with the CAEP’s 2021 guidelines on assessing impact measures (*2021 EPP Annual Accreditation Report [Annual Report] Technical Guide*, we will no longer be using the *Indiana Supervisor Report* (See Section II. CAEP Accountability Measure 2: Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement) as a measure of Graduates’ Impact on P-12 Learning. As of 2020 IDOE regulations make optional student achievement (i.e., teacher impact) as a measure in the *Indiana Supervisor Report* (<https://www.in.gov/doe/files/hea-1002-guidance.pdf>).

Our EPP has developed three separate measures of our graduates’ impact on P-12 learning: (1) Pretest-Posttest Assessments of Student Learning (2) Principal Survey of Impact on Student Learning, and (3) Graduate Self Evaluation of Impact on Student Learning.

Principal Survey of Impact on Learning:

Beginning in the Spring 2023 semester, Saint Mary’s modified our Principal Survey. Two items were added to the survey. The first asked principals to evaluate his/her Saint Mary’s graduate’s impact on student learning using the following rating scale:

Please indicate your Saint Mary’s Teacher Education Graduate’s Impact on students’ learning			
1	2	3	4
This graduate has little to no impact students’ learning	This graduate has some impact on students’ learning; on most lessons/days, students don’t show improvement	This graduate regularly impacts students’ learning; on the majority of lessons/days, students show improvement	This graduate greatly impacts students’ learning; students consistently show improvement with each lesson/day of instruction

The second question builds off the preceding question and asked principals to identify the information they used to make their evaluation of impact on student learning.

What data are basing your answer to the previous question on? (Please check all that apply)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Students' standardized test scores	Students' performance on our schools'/districts' developed or adopted objective tests and essays	Students' performance on this graduate's teacher-made objective tests and essays	Students' performance on individual and/or group projects	Students' performance on in-class assignments and homework	Students' performance during classroom activities/instruction	Feedback from the graduate's fellow faculty, mentors, and/or team leaders.	Other (please describe)

During the spring of 2023 we received 1 response (2018) on the learning impact question. On a scale of 1-4 with four being high, the response to the impact on learning impact question was 3.00. Data sources identified by the principal were district assessments, classroom assignments, classroom activities and feedback from fellow faculty, mentors and/or team leaders.

Graduate Self Evaluation of Impact on Student Learning

Beginning in the Spring 2023 semester, Saint Mary’s modified our Alumnae Survey. Two items were added to the survey. The first asked graduates to evaluate their impact on student learning using the following rating scale:

Please indicate your impact on your students’ learning			
1	2	3	4
I have little to no impact on my students’ learning	I have some impact on my students’ learning; on most lessons/days, students don’t show improvement	I have regular impact on my students’ learning; with the majority of lessons/days, students show improvement	I have significant impact on my students’ learning; students consistently show improvement with each lesson/day of my instruction

The second question builds off the preceding question and asked graduates to identify the information they used to make their evaluation of impact on student learning.

What data are you basing your answer to the previous question on? (Please check all that apply)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Students’ standardized test scores	Students’ performance on our schools’/districts’ developed or adopted objective tests and essays	Students’ performance on my teacher-made objective tests and essays	Students’ performance on individual and/or group projects	Students’ performance on in-class assignments and homework	Students’ performance during classroom activities/instruction	Feedback from fellow faculty, mentors, and/or team leaders.	Other (please describe)

During the spring of 2023 we received 3 responses from the class of 2018 and 11 from the class of 2022. On a scale of 1-4 with four being high, the average combined response to the impact on learning question was 3.36. All seven of the possible data sources were chosen by graduates as those that graduates based their responses on.

Pretest-Posttest Assessments of Student Learning

<p><b>Impact on P-12 student learning/development: Pilot Study</b></p>	<p>Research designed to measure our Graduates' Impact on P-12 Learning is currently ongoing: <i>SMC EDU Measurement of Graduates' Impact on P-12 Learning Initiative</i>. This initiative for a research paradigm is presented in Appendix A of this document.</p> <p>We piloted the pretest-posttest research methodology during the 2021-2-22 year with candidates in our elementary and secondary programs to identify any difficulties with the methodology as well as any logistical challenges.</p>	<p>Candidates were undergraduates enrolled in the course <i>Literacy Strategies and Classroom Management in Middle/High School</i>. All candidates completed a six-item quiz on classroom management. Five items were two-choice (true/false) and one was an open-ended short answer question on Active Supervision. Each item was worth two points to allow for partial credit on the short answer item. Maximum total score was 12. The same quiz was completed electronically prior to and following instruction (N=12) using Google Forms. The delay between Test 1 (pretest) and Test 2 (posttest) was one week. The impact of instruction was determined by growth in scores from Test 1 to Test 2. Percentage correct were as follows:</p> <p>Test 1: Average=6.27, Percent Correct=52.27                  Test 2: Average=10.27, Percent Correct=85.61                  Percentage Growth from Test 1 to Test 2=68.85</p> <p>All candidates showed growth from Test 1 to Test 2; no candidates demonstrated decline between Test 1 and Test 2.</p> <p>Candidates had no difficulty using the platform Google Forms. Nor were there other logistical challenges identified in terms of research design and execution.</p> <p>The research methodology we have selected appears sound in terms of viability and results. The next phase will be to conduct a pilot study in P-12 schools to identify any challenges specific to those settings. The pilot study will inform the actual research in P-12 schools. Both the pilot and actual research are planned for the 2022-2023 academic year.</p>
--	---	--

<p><b>Impact on P-12 student learning/development</b></p>	<p>Coordinating with graduates working in P-12 schools during the 2022-23 academic year. We collected data with appropriate content that used measures consistent with those used in the pilot study. We were able to obtain four samples from classrooms where initial and follow-up assessments were administered. The assessments, as well as the intervening instruction between the two administrations, were part of planned, routine academic activities for those classes. This avoided any research-related biases or expectations. Because this research is conducted in a natural setting with no experimental control by our department, as a measure of quality control we have developed a rubric to evaluate each project individually. For the research to be considered informative and included in reporting, each of the rubric criteria must earn a score of 3 or higher. The research evaluation rubric is provided in Appendix A.</p>	<p><b>Fourth Grade Math.</b> Students solved real-world problems involving addition and subtraction of multi-digit whole numbers (e.g., by using drawings and equations with a symbol for the unknown number to represent the problem). There were six instruction sessions over a two-week period between assessment 1 and 2.</p> <p><b>Fourth Grade Music Performance.</b> Students' individual vocal performances were assessed using the same rubric. Instruction occurred 1-2 times per week for a six-week period between the two assessments.</p> <p><b>Sixth Grade Literacy with Central Ideas Remediation.</b> Students needing remediation on understanding central ideas were identified using a pretest. There were five days of instruction between assessment 1 and 2.</p> <p><b>Seventh Grade Music Projects with Terminology.</b> Students completed two music projects: (1) create a playlist of songs and describe them using musical terminology and (2) use <i>Garage Band</i> to create sounds consistent with musical terminology. 1 month of classwork occurred between submission of the two projects. Similar rubrics were used to evaluate each project.</p>
---	---	--

Positive growth was demonstrated by each of the graduates’ students. Percentage increases are shown in the table below.

<b>Saint Mary’s College Graduate Impact Pretest-Posttest Research Data Spring 2023</b>						
<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Assessment Type</b>	<b>Interval Between Assessment</b>	<b>Average Percentage Change from Pretest to Posttest</b>	<b>Percentage Change Range</b>	<b>Number of Students Demonstrating Growth</b>
Fourth (N=15)	Math	Objective Test	2 weeks	5%	-29% to 57%	10
Fourth (N=14)	Music Performance	Rubric	6 Weeks	6%	-40% to 80%	9
Sixth (N=6)	Literacy Central Ideas Remediation	Objective Test	5 days	10%	-21% to 21%	5
Seventh (N=15)	Music Projects with Terminology	Rubric	4 Weeks	8%	-24% to 81%	9

All measures of graduate impact demonstrated positive results. Our principal and alumnae surveys indicate that our graduates positively impact student learning with means for both groups falling between three and four on a four-point scale. We believe these conclusions are substantiated by having respondents indicate the data sources on which they have based their decisions.

Our graduate impact pilot study demonstrated that our research design was sound in terms of candidates' being able to complete empirical research using a pretest-posttest design. This carried over to our graduate impact research. We should note that this research design closely aligns to our senior capstone project, the *Assessment Cycle*, where candidates collect pretest and posttest data during the student-teaching semester, and offer intervening instruction based on pretest data and other formative assessments. As such, candidates receive training on this methodology during and prior to the student-teaching semester, including as part of assignments in select professional education courses. We believe this has had a positive influence and has facilitated our graduates demonstrating positive impact on the learning of their students, as shown by the Graduate Impact Pretest-Posttest Research Data (while some students did show a negative change from pretest to posttest, overall, 33 of 50 demonstrated positive growth).

The nature of the data collection for each of these three measure, given that one of the target groups is the prior year's graduating class, is there is a one year lag in data collection. While this is true for all data collected for the annual report, collecting data on first-year graduates presents a particular challenge: to allow for maximal growth and development of these first-year teachers, we attempt to collect data as late in the school year as possible. With the P-12 school year extending beyond that of higher education and reporting deadlines for Title II and CAEP falling in April



and May, our most current data available for the preparation of the 2024 CAEP Annual Report is from the 2022-2023 academic year. At the time of the preparation of this year's report, we have distributed and have begun receiving responses to our Alumnae Survey, are preparing the distribution of our principal survey, and have been in contact with graduates to solicit involvement in our graduate impact pretest-posttest research efforts. We plan to include the collected data from each in our next year's report.

**II. CAEP Accountability Measure 2: Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Impact Measure)**

IDOE Supervisor Performance Observation Evaluations of Completer Effectiveness

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) requires all school corporations to conduct annual performance evaluations for teachers and report the results of those evaluations disaggregated by Educator Preparation Provider (<https://www.in.gov/doi/educators/educator-evaluations/>). These data must include supervisor observations of performance but are not required to be based on student performance. Data can be retrieved at <https://www.in.gov/doi/files/December-2023-ER-Report-for-IDOE.xlsx>, see the institution tab of the spreadsheet.

<p><b>Observations of teaching effectiveness: Indiana Supervisor Report</b></p>	<p>Review of IDOE Teacher Evaluations</p> <p>A <b>Highly Effective</b> teacher consistently exceeds expectations. This is a teacher who has demonstrated excellence, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Aggregate principal/supervisor evaluation scores for St. Mary’s first through third year teachers:</p> <p>2022-2023 (N=26)                  76% Highly Effective                  21% Effective                  3% Needs Improvement</p>
	<p>An <b>Effective</b> teacher consistently meets expectations. This is a teacher who has consistently met expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes.</p> <p>A teacher who is rated as <b>Improvement Necessary</b> requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations. This is a teacher who an evaluator has determined to require improvement in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>2021-2022 (N=146)*                  72% Highly Effective                  28% Effective</p> <p>2020-2021 (N=146)*                  72% Highly Effective                  28% Effective</p> <p>2019-2020 (N=143)                  70% Highly Effective                  30% Effective</p>
	<p>An <b>Ineffective</b> teacher consistently fails to meet expectations. This is a teacher who has failed to meet expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes (Indiana Teacher Evaluation: Public Law 90).</p>	
<p>*Numbers were identical in two different reports. Other institutions listed in the same reports did not have the same numbers reported. For instance, University of Southern Indiana’s report totals were 1947 evaluatees in the 2020-2021 report and 1954 in 2021-2022 report.</p>		

Saint Mary’s Principal Survey

Saint Mary’s administers Employer (Principal) Satisfaction Surveys annually. These instruments are administered electronically and are completed one year and five years after candidate program completion. This survey based directly on the 10 InTASC standards. ([https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC\\_Model\\_Core\\_Teaching\\_Standards\\_2011.pdf](https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf)). To allow candidates the maximum development time possible during their first year of teaching, these surveys are administered at the end of the academic year, thus creating a one-year reporting delay. Recent numbers for Learner & Learning, Content Knowledge, and Instructional Practice may have been affected by the COVID 19 Pandemic, the effects of which were at full impact during these candidates’ professional training.

Impact Measure	Source	Elementary and Secondary Combined				
		Year (Cohort)	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
Employer satisfaction and completer persistence	Mean scores from the four InTASC Categories from the most recent cycle of Employer (Principal) Satisfaction Surveys. (Elementary and Secondary Combined). These results are based on a four-point scale: Below Expectation (1), Developing (2), Meets Expectations (3), Exceeds Expectations (4). Data collected Spring 2023 on class of 2022 (1 year) and 2018 (5- year) completers. We received no responses from principals of the 2017 (5- year) cohort so we have included 2015(5-year).	2022(1)	3.50	3.50	3.33	4.00
		2021(1)	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
		2020(1)	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
		2018(5)	2.75	3.00	3.16	3.00
		2016(5)	3.78	4.00	3.83	3.83
		2015(5)	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

InTASC Standards Grouping for Surveys:

*The Learner & Learning*

- Standard 1: Learner development
- Standard 2: Learning differences
- Standard 3: Learning environments

*Content*

- Standard 4: Content knowledge
- Standard 5: Application of content

*Instructional Practice*

Standard 6: Assessment

Standard 7: Planning for instruction

Standard 8: Instructional strategies

*Professional Responsibility*

Standard 9: Professional learning and ethical practice

Standard 10: Leadership and collaboration

Partners in Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement)

## Partners in Education Council

Our Partners in Education Council is made up of Saint Mary's Education Faculty and teachers and administrators from local school corporations. The overall purpose of the council is to maintain a productive dialog among participants that facilitates the continuous pursuit of high-quality teacher preparation programs at Saint Mary's College. Emphases include the following:

- ◆ Increase communication and cooperation between the public and private schools in the Michiana area and the Saint Mary's College Teacher Education Programs;
- ◆ Offer the administration and faculty of the public and private schools in the Michiana area more opportunity for input into the Teacher Education Program and the field experience sequence at Saint Mary's College;
- ◆ Offer the faculty of the Education Department at Saint Mary's College more opportunity for input into the field placements and experiences of students enrolled in professional education courses;
- ◆ Provide a forum for school, community, and college personnel to discuss the meaning and implementation of early and continuing field experiences;
- ◆ Share common concerns of kinds of field experiences needed in the Teacher Education Program and the needs of schools for ancillary teacher aide services.

Administrators from the public and private schools as well as elementary and secondary principals and teachers from the

Michiana area serve on this council with members from Saint Mary's College education faculty. The council meets biannually.

During the fall 2023 semester the council met to be provided with an update on our CAEP Self Study and visit (including potential stakeholder involvement), and to review programmatic assessments in an effort to update validity data. The agenda for the meeting, instructions for the evening's work session, and meeting minutes are presented below.

<b>Agenda</b>
Saint Mary's College Education Department Partners in Education Meeting Agenda Tuesday, October 11, 2023 4:45 pm Madeleva Hall Room 253
1) Welcome/Introductions
2) Lawshe Validity Review of Programmatic Assessments

**Validity Workshop Instructions**

**Saint Mary's College**

**Validity Evaluation of Program Rubrics**

Please evaluate each rubric you are assigned. Each row of the rubric is a criterion.

For each Rubric Criterion, indicated if the item is Essential (E), Important (I), or Not Necessary (N).

*Essential:* rubric would be missing a critical component without the criterion

*Important:* not Essential but contributes to the rubric being an effective assessment instrument

*Not Necessary:* does little or nothing to contribute to the rubric being an effective assessment instrument.

Reviewer Qualifications Sheet:

Stapled to the last page of a rubric.

Indicates your qualifications and helps us justify our conclusions about the rubric(s) you review for us.

If you are reviewing more than one rubric, \*\*\*\*\*complete ONE sheet\*\*\*\*\* and simply put your name on the other(s).

**Thank You!!!**

**Partners in Education Minutes****Partners in Education Meeting Minutes**

October 11, 2023

**In attendance:**

- McKailey Bathurst (Harrison Elementary School; alum)
- Emma Daggy (Twin Branch and Hums Elementary; alum)
- Isabel France (Penn High School; alum)
- Nicole Garcia (Principal of Clay International Academy; alum)
- Shannon Haverty (LaSalle Intermediate Academy; alum)
- Nicole Heritz (Beiger Elementary; part-time faculty; alum)
- Mindy Higginson (Principal of Walt Disney Elementary School)
- Sara Hoover (Beiger Elementary School)
- Angelina Lazovich (Beiger Elementary; part-time faculty; alum)
- Stacy Minegar (Beiger Elementary School)
- Franca Peluso Mulhern (Assistant to the principal of Walt Disney Elementary School; alum)
- Keely Twibell (Prairie Vista Elementary School)
- Jim Lalley (Education Department faculty)
- Steven Mast (Education Department faculty and department chair)
- Greg Harris (Education Department part-time faculty; retired from Clay High School))
- Kathy Higgs-Coulthard (Education Department faculty)
- Diane Nusbaum (Education Department faculty)
- Nancy Turner (Education Department faculty)
- Jeff Greiner (Education Department faculty)
- Terri Suico (Education Department faculty)

**Absent:** Dan Applegate, Brawley Brook, Insook Chung, Genevieve Coleman, Katie Drew Hueni, Mansour Eid, Shannon Haverty, Anna Irons, Liz Konwinski, Courtney Koszyk, Mary Muzzy, Emily Pantelleria, Michelle Sanchez, Kem Schreiber, Laura Scott, Corinne Shaw, Heather Short, Ryan Towner, Amy Troyer

**Introductions**

### **Partners in Education Minutes**

The meeting started at 4:35 pm with a welcome by Director of Field and Student Teaching and Department Chair Steven Mast. Mr. Mast discussed the accreditation process and how the work today will help us with the report that is due this academic year. He then invited the attendees to introduce themselves.

#### **CAEP Update**

Jim Lalley discussed the SPA and CAEP accreditation process, including the feedback cycle with CAEP. The process will culminate with a virtual visit in November of 2024. When the visit happens, some of the people from the Partners in Education Committee might be involved. He noted the value of this committee when it comes to our accreditation process.

#### **Validity Evaluation Work**

Dr. Lalley then discussed the work that needs to be done regarding the validity of our instruments (rubrics). Individuals will be assigned specific rubrics to evaluate using the \_\_\_\_ method. In this method, the participants will be asked to look at each line of criteria, and evaluate these components on whether they are **essential, important (but not essential), or not necessary**. Participants will do these individually, and the individual results will be compared and calculated to determine the validity of each item.

- Along with the rubric evaluations, each participant is asked to complete an information sheet so that we can document this in our report. If a participant has more than one rubric to complete, they only need to complete the information sheet once.

The rubrics were distributed to the participants for evaluation, and the rest of the meeting was spent on individual evaluations of the rubrics. As they completed the evaluations, participants were able to leave.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

#### Teacher Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement)

##### Teacher Education Council

The Teacher Education Council is composed of chairs and faculty of specific disciplinary departments whose input we seek out and value with regards to specific programs; these programs are the content majors approved for secondary licensure (grades 5-12) through coursework at Saint Mary's, including music and art (P-12). The purpose of the Teacher Education Council is to:

- ◆ Collaborate with the EPP regarding curriculum requirements as related to established Specialized Professional Association standards
- ◆ Communicate with the EPP any internal changes in curriculum and/or assessment that is impactful to the content preparation of candidates



- ◆ Offer expertise in regard to content-specific questions from faculty of the EPP
- ◆ Work with the Director of Assessment and Accreditation on Specialized Professional Association matters; this may involve making collaborative plans for data collection and analysis in program-specific content areas.

The members of this council meet on an as-needed basis with the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, the Chair of the Education Department, and faculty members of the Education Department (see sample minutes and council activities below). Meetings and communications among participants varies depending on the topic/program under consideration and the departments affected by any changes and/or initiatives.

This section contains program initiatives, program changes, and other matters that require communication and collaboration among Saint Mary’s academic departments. Further, because of the colloquium agreement among Holy Cross College, Notre Dame University, and Saint Mary’s College that allows students from each institution to earn approved course credit at partner institutions, some Teacher Education Council activities extend beyond the academic departments at Saint Mary’s.

On several occasions, Dr. Terri Suico, one of the EPP’s primary secondary education advisors, met with chairpersons from Saint Mary’s academic departments regarding secondary majors. The foci of those meetings are delineated below:

<b>Targeted Teacher Education Council Meetings</b>
<p><b>Meetings with Department Chairs (Teacher Education Council Members)</b></p> <p>January 10, 2023 - Meeting with Dr. Marwan Gebran and Dr. Terri Suico</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Gebran, associate professor in the Chemistry and Physics Department, and Dr. Suico met to discuss the physics majors and the submission to the IDOE so that the college can license in physics education.</li> <li>• The work discussed and done afterwards was used in the department’s submission to the IDOE in February. The program received full approval for the secondary physics major.</li> </ul> <p>February 22, 2023 – Meeting with Dr. Kristin Kuter and Dr. Terri Suico</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Kuter, chair of the Math Department, and Dr. Suico, the secondary education advisor for math, met to discuss the alignment between the NCTM standards and the required math courses for the math education students.</li> <li>• Dr. Kuter continued to review the document, which would be used for the Education Department’s submission to NCTM.</li> <li>• The department submitted its alignment, with Dr. Kuter’s revisions, on 3/14/2023. The secondary education math program received full recognition from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.</li> </ul>

**General Meeting Fall 2023**

In fall 2023, Drs. Lalley and Suico reconvened the council following a lengthy COVID interruption to update the council on the education department and to learn of any relevant developments in representatives' respective departments. The meeting invitation, agenda and minutes are shown below.

Saint Mary's College  
Teacher Education Council

AGENDA

Date and Time: October 10, 2023

1. Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) process and update.

ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages)

Art

Chemistry and Biology- IDOE

Music

National Council for the Social Studies

National Council for the Teachers of English

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

TESOL- IDOE

2. Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) process, update, and virtual site visit participation.

3. Department of Education Updates/Initiatives.

4. Partner Departments Updates/Initiatives.

5. Trends/Concerns impacting our partnerships and/or students.

**Teacher Education Council Meeting Minutes- October 10, 2023**

**In attendance:** Jennifer Fishovitz (Chemistry), Marwan Gebran (Physics), Nancy Menk (Music), Joel Ralston (Biology), Julie Tourillotte (Art), Chris Wedrychowicz (Math), Julia Weinstein (Music), Ty West (Modern language), Steven Mast (Education Department Chair and Student Teaching, Field, and Licensing Director), Jim Lalley (Education Department Accreditation and Assessment Director), Jeff Greiner (Education Department faculty), Terri Suico (Education Department part-time faculty and CFAI director)

1. Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) process and update – Jim explained how the SPAs relate to our accreditation work as well as the status with recognition from the SPAs and the IDOE.

- ACTFL (foreign language), NCTE (English), and NCTM (Math) recognized their respective programs.
- Chemistry, biology, and English as a second language were all recognized by the IDOE.
- Music is recognized through the Music Department's NASAM's accreditation.
- We have a waiver for art recognition from the state, and we will need to submit the program to the state for the next cycle so that the program can be recognized.
- The only SPA left outstanding is NCSS (social studies), and we will be submitting updates and more data to them in spring of 2024.

2. Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) process, update, and virtual site visit participation – Jim provided an overview of where we are in the process. We have CAEP recognition through June of 2025.

- Our self-study is due in February 2024, and there will be a cycle of feedback and responses to the feedback through the virtual site visit in November of 2024.
- The CAEP team might want to meet with faculty from the content area departments. The focus will likely be on the curriculum (is well-rounded enough to prepare people who will be teaching the content) and the assignments in the required courses.
  - These meetings will be planned in advance, so faculty should have plenty of notice beforehand.

- Chris and several other chairs requested copies of the standards that CAEP and/or the SPAs have regarding content so that they could be prepared to answer questions about the alignment between the standards and the curriculum.

3. Department of Education Updates/Initiatives – Our programs have remained consistent since the last CAEP visit.

- The secondary social studies program has been changed to better align with the NCSS standards and to meet the needs we are seeing in the job market. The changes also resulted in streamlining the requirements.
- Also, Saint Mary's was approved to license in physics education in spring of 2023.

4. Partner Departments Updates/Initiatives.

- Joel posed a question about a possible change to the general education program and how the science with a lab requirement might be removed. While this likely wouldn't affect the secondary education programs, this could have a significant impact on the elementary education program. Steven is contacting the IDOE to see what the potential impact might be.
- Julie gave an update on art education.
- Nancy noted the addition of a full-time, tenure-track music education faculty member to the Music Department and also discussed potential changes to the music course requirements for music education students.

5. Trends/Concerns impacting our partnerships and/or students were discussed. The main topic was whether a program review and/or revision before CAEP would impact our CAEP work. Since the data has already been collected and submitted, a review and/or revision would be fine, though we would want to discuss changes made when the new standards are announced.

**III. CAEP Accountability Measure 3: Candidate competency at program completion (Outcome Measure)**

The Indiana Core Licensure Examinations by Pearson were the examinations require for Educational Licensure in the state of Indiana up until 2021. Beginning in September 2021, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) transitioned to a new licensure exams administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). In order to provide three years of licensure testing data, scores from both sets of exams are provided. the results presented here are data supplied by ETS for Saint Mary's for the 2022-2023 academic year.

The following tables display licensure test results for those who have completed the Saint Mary’s College Teacher Education program. Score data are not reported for less than five test takers in compliance with FERPA guidelines and title II. Saint Mary's offers no advanced programs. Because we have relatively few Art and Music majors, they are reported with Secondary Education. Also, has many candidates from surrounding states (e.g., Illinois and Ohio), a number of completers opt not to take Indiana licensure examinations.

Elementary Education Licensure Examinations

**2022-2023 (Praxis)**

**Elementary Education 2022-2023**

<b>Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2023</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
Elementary K-6 5622 Principles of Learning and Teaching: grades K-6 (Passing 160)	13	160	196	178.62	100%
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5007 Reading and Language Arts and Social Studies subtest (Passing 160)	12	157	188	175.83	92%
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5008 Math and Science subtest (Passing 158)	12	157	195	173.50	92%

**2021-2022 (Praxis)**

**Elementary Education 2021-2022**

<b>Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2022</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
"Elementary K-6 5622 Principles of Learning and Teaching: grades K-6 (Passing 160)	13	160	187	174.62	100%
Elementary Generalist subtest 5007 Reading and Language Arts and Social Studies subtest (Passing 160)	13	143	193	171.54	92%
Elementary Generalist subtest 5008 Math and Science subtest (Passing 158)	14	116	196	160.86	64%

**2020-2021 Indiana Core (Pearson)**

<b>Pearson Elementary Core Scores Class of 2021</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
005 Pedagogy: Elementary Education (Passing 220)	9	223	266	242.78	100%
060 Content Subtest 1: Reading and English Language Arts (Passing 220)	10	220	266	240.00	100%
061 Content Subtest 2: Mathematics (Passing 220)	10	196	290	244.40	80%
062 Content Subtest 3: Science, Health, and Physical Education (Passing 220)	10	214	256	232.70	80%
063 Content Subtest 4: Social Studies and Fine Arts (Passing 220)	10	198	271	232.40	90%

Secondary Education Licensure Examinations

**2021-2023 (Praxis)**

<b>Praxis Secondary Examination Scores Classes of 2022-2023</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
Principles of Learning and Teaching 5624: grades 7-12 (Passing 157)	17	160	192	178.35	100%
2023 English Language Arts 5038: Content Knowledge (Passing 157)	3				
2022 Mathematics 5165 (Passing 159)	3				
2023 Mathematics (Passing 159)	4				
2022 World and US History 5941: Content Knowledge (Passing 148)	2				
2023 World and US History: Content Knowledge 5941 (Passing 148)	2				
2023 Spanish: World Language 5195 (Passing 166)	2				

**2020-2021 (Pearson)**

<b>Pearson Secondary Core Scores Class of 2021</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
006 Pedagogy: Secondary Education (Passing 220)	4				
035 Secondary Mathematics (Passing 220)	1				
051 Secondary Social Studies: Historical Perspectives (Passing 220)	2				
059 Secondary World Languages Spanish (Passing 220)	1				

Art/Music Education Licensure Examinations

**2021-2023 (Praxis)**

<b>Praxis Art/Music P-12 Examination Scores Classes of 2022-2023</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
2022 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625	2				
2022 Music: Instrumental and General Knowledge 5115	2				

**2020-2021 (Pearson)**

<b>Pearson Art/Music P-12 Core Scores Class of 2021</b>					
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
2021 P-12 Education 007	2				
2021 Fine Arts-General Music 026	1				
2021 Fine Arts-Instrumental Music 027	1				
2021 -Fine Arts-Visual Arts 030	1				

Student-Teaching Rubric

In addition to candidates being evaluated by Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) rubrics for their specific program(s), they are also evaluated using a more generic rubric that is completed for all candidates. The rubric levels progress as follows: 1=*Below Expectation*, 2=*Developing*, 3=*Meets Expectation*, 4=*Exceeds Expectation*. These evaluations are completed by candidates’ EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator at the midpoint (Midterm) and conclusion (Final) of the student-teaching practicum. Rubric directions and criteria with average scores for the final administration are shown below.



*DIRECTIONS: This rubric has been designed to assist you in the evaluation of the candidate you mentored in this field experience. Please note that all levels of the scale may be used. In determining the rating keep in mind you are evaluating based on the preponderance of evidence you have observed.*

<b>Spring 2023 Field Study Evaluation Rubric: Step 3 Evaluation Summary Average Final (N=36)</b>	
<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator Average</b>
1. Student Growth and Development	3.48
2. Cultural Factors	3.48
3. Facilitation of Learning	3.62
4. Learning Environment and Learning	3.46
5. Engagement with Students	4.00
6. Planning and Delivery	3.48
7. Use of Technology	3.87
8. Assessment Design and Use of Data	3.43
9. Reading Knowledge Base	3.42
10. Planning Literacy Instruction	3.23
11. Content Knowledge Base	3.53
12. Creating Content Related Learning Experiences	3.48
13. Initiative in the Classroom	4.00
14. Attitude Toward Students and Learning	3.87
15. Professional Appearance	3.97
16. Adherence to Schedule	3.70
17. Professional Communication	3.67
18. Professional Ethics	3.28

Student-Teaching Dispositions Rubric

Candidates dispositions are evaluated at multiple points culminating with a final evaluation at the conclusion of student teaching. The rubric levels progress as follows 1=*Below Expectation*, 2=*Developing*, 3=*Meets Expectation*, 4=*Exceeds Expectation*. The final iterations of these evaluations are completed by candidates’ School-Based Clinical Educator at the

conclusion of the student-teaching practicum. Rubric directions and criteria with average scores are shown below.

*DIRECTIONS: This rubric has been designed to assist you in the evaluation of the candidate you mentored in this field experience. The extent to which these dispositions criteria have been met is determined using the criteria below.*

<b>Spring 2023 Step 3 SMC Dispositions Rating Scale: Student-Teaching (N=36)</b>	
<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator Average</b>
1. Showing respect for learners' differing strengths and needs	3.66
2. Having a commitment to learning about how learners develop	3.61
3. Believing that all learners can achieve	3.70
4. Having a commitment to learning about cultures and communities	3.45
5. Believing that the classroom environment greatly affects students' learning	3.55
6. Having a commitment to developing as a thoughtful and responsive member of the educational community	3.61
7. Recognizing that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts and appreciating multiple perspectives	3.52
8. Being dedicated to deepening understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the academic disciplines while also keeping abreast of new ideas and understandings	3.55
9. Valuing knowledge outside the targeted content area as a vehicle to enhance student learning	3.50
10. Constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues	3.32
11. Viewing assessment as a tool for instructional decision making and understanding that learners have differing needs that may necessitate accommodations	3.43
12. Seeks data as evidence of student growth and learning	3.43
13. Respecting learners' diverse strengths and needs, and valuing planning as a collegial activity	3.50
14. Draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, standards, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy	3.55
15. Valuing multiple communication strategies, and deep understanding of and across content areas	3.55
16. Being committed to deepening awareness and understanding of learners' strengths and needs	3.64
17. Valuing self-directed learning, critical thinking, and professional growth	3.59
18. Understanding the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy	3.68
19. Embracing the role of teacher as one of advocacy for learners and accountability for their success	3.59
20. Being committed to life-long learning and initiating collaboration with learners, families, colleagues, and community members	3.57

### Social and Emotional Learning

The IDOE (2019) requires that education agencies have a plan for children's social, emotional, and behavioral health. Based on the CASEL model, IDOE has identified seven competencies for Social Emotional Learning (SEL) that are essential for students that teachers need to instill or further develop:

1. **Sensory Motor Integration.** Sensory motor integration refers to the ability to have body awareness and recognize sensations in the body. Gaining sensory-motor integration is an important skill for managing transitions, changing routines, increasing alertness for learning, and improving regulation.<sup>1</sup>
2. **Insight.** Insight refers to the ability to know your emotions and how they affect your thoughts and actions. Gaining insight is an important skill for building self-confidence, self-esteem, and empathy for others. Insight helps students recognize their own strengths and areas of growth.
3. **Regulation.** Regulation refers to the ability to recognize and manage one's emotions. Regulation skills build positive self-control, positive self-discipline, and impulse control.
4. **Collaboration.** Collaboration refers to the ability to work well with others, including in the group and teamwork environment. Collaboration works to build positive communication and conflict management skills.
5. **Connection.** Connection refers to the ability to have strong social awareness, giving students the ability to take the perspectives of others, and empathize with people of diverse backgrounds and cultures.
6. **Critical Thinking.** Critical thinking refers to the ability to make constructive choices and understand metacognitive strategies to enhance learning. Critical thinking skills build responsible decision-making, analytical, and critical inquiry skills which are necessary to approach learning from an innovative, creative, multicultural, and ethical lens.
7. **Mindset.** Mindset refers to the ability to demonstrate cognitive flexibility and a willingness to learn. Developing mindset is a critical learning skill for building perseverance, adaptability, self-discovery, resilience, and to be able to receive and give constructive feedback.

To help our candidates further develop these competencies, as well as integrate them into their teaching, these competencies are addressed in multiple classes including: EDUC 201 Foundations for Teaching in a Multicultural Society, EDUC 301 Teaching Language Arts in Elementary/Middle School, EDUC 304 Teaching Reading in Elementary/Middle School, EDUC 308 Children's Literature in Elementary/Middle School, EDUC 345 Curriculum and Assessment in Middle/High School, EDUC 352 Educational Psychology, and EDUC 406 Reading Assessment and Intervention in Elementary/Middle School.

In addition to receiving SEL training in their classes, candidates receive an SEL in-service during the spring semester immediately prior to beginning

---

<sup>1</sup> Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2018). *What is SEL?*, <https://casel.org/what-is-sel/>

their student-teaching practica. It is provided by Dr. Jennifer Sears, *Director of SEL & Mental Health* for the *Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation* in South Bend, IN.

At the conclusion of the student-teaching practicum, an SEL rubric is completed for each candidate by her EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator to assure SEL competency. Rubric criteria and average scores are provided in the table below. Spring 2023 data are preliminary because practica and completion of rubrics were ongoing at the time of reporting. Data from both rating groups indicate significant levels of competency across all variables, with all candidates meeting expectations. Criteria are rated from 1-4 on the following scale:

Beginning- Level 1: Below Expectations

Developing- Level 2: Developing

Competent- Level 3: Meets Expectations

Accomplished-Level 4: Exceeds Expectations.

SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
<b>Insight</b>			
1. Demonstrates the ability to know her/his emotions and how they affect thoughts and actions that help build self-confidence, self-esteem, empathy for others, and insight that help recognize strengths and areas of growth.	3.90	3.65	3.78
2. The ability to recognize and manage emotions, as well as build positive self-control, self-discipline, and impulse control.	3.90	3.74	3.82
3. The ability to work well with others, including in the group and teamwork environment, using positive communication and conflict management skills.	3.97	3.87	3.92
<b>Critical Thinking Connection</b>			
4. The ability to make constructive choices, analyze decisions, and apply critical inquiry skills that are necessary to approach learning from an innovative, creative, multicultural, and ethical lens.	3.87	3.68	3.87
<b>Mindset</b>			
5. The ability to demonstrate cognitive flexibility, willingness to learn, perseverance, adaptability, self- discovery, and resilience, as well as the ability to receive and give constructive feedback.	3.84	3.84	3.84
6. <b>Cooperative Learning:</b> Facilitates students working together toward a collective goal in accomplishing an instructional task.	3.97	3.81	3.97

<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>7. Classroom Discussions:</b> Encourages students and fellow teachers to dialogue about content.	3.74	3.65	3.74
<b>8. Self-Assessment and Self-Reflection:</b> Facilitates students actively thinking about their own work.	3.81	3.58	3.81
<b>9. Balanced Instruction:</b> Uses multiple instructional strategies.	3.87	3.71	3.87
<b>10. Academic Press and Expectations:</b> Candidate provides meaningful and challenging work and believes that all students can accomplish rigorous work.	3.84	3.61	3.84
<b>11. Competence Building:</b> Candidate helps develop students’ social-emotional skills through the typical instruction cycle.	3.87	3.74	3.87
<b>Social Teaching Practices<sup>2</sup></b>			
<b>12. Student-Centered Discipline:</b> Candidate’s disciplinary strategies are developmentally appropriate for students.	3.74	3.81	3.74
<b>13. Candidate Language:</b> The candidate talks to students with a focus on encouraging students.	3.97	3.84	3.97
<b>14. Responsibility and Choice:</b> Candidate provides students with opportunities to make responsible decisions	3.94	3.61	3.94
<b>15. Warmth and Support:</b> Candidate creates a classroom where the students know that the teacher cares	3.97	3.87	3.97
<b>Culture, Family and Community</b>			
<b>16. Cultural Appreciation:</b> Candidate demonstrates empathy and tolerance in matter’s that concern students’ cultural background.	3.90	3.71	3.90
<b>17. Cultural Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students’ cultural backgrounds.	3.71	3.45	3.71
<b>18. Cultural Engagement:</b> Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students’ cultural backgrounds.	3.68	3.45	3.68
<b>19. Family Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students’ families.	3.68	NA*	NA*

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from Supporting Students’ Social-Emotional Learning. Institute of Educational Sciences and the Indiana Department of Education (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/regions/midwest/pdf/training-and-coaching/Indiana-adult-SEL-webinar-508.pdf>)

<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>20. Family Engagement:</b> Candidate encourages engagement between school experiences and students’ families.	3.74	NA*	NA*
<b>21. Community Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students’ communities.	3.74	NA*	NA*
<b>22. Community Engagement:</b> Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students’ communities.	3.65	NA*	NA*
*EPP-Based Clinical Educators typically do not have opportunity to observe these behaviors.			

Assurance that Candidates Understand the Expectations of the Profession

The EPP’s responsibility to teach educator ethics cannot be understated. The teacher is ultimately responsible for the learning and well-being of children and makes hundreds of decisions a day on their behalf. The Mission Statement of our department calls for development of “ethical school leaders. Indeed, ethical decision-making, awareness of professional risks and vulnerabilities, and an understanding of supervisory liability are critical components of teacher preparation in our program. There are many versions of ethics codes adopted by individual states, but no universal code of teaching ethics. The EPP has adopted the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession (NEA), which includes two Principles: 1) Commitment to the Student and 2) Commitment to the Profession. Candidates learn to treat each individual with dignity and respect; as well, they learn about professional behaviors that create trust in the profession. These two stated principles are in keeping with the recent (2023) update by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification’s (NASDTEC) Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE); the purpose of the MCEE is to serve as a guide for states and school districts to develop their own codes based on a researched and supported set of principles. The principles included in the MCEE are 1) Responsibility to the Profession, 2) Responsibility for Professional Competence, 3) Responsibility to Students, 4) Responsibility to the School Community, and 5) Responsibility and Ethical Use of Technology.

Beginning in EDUC 201 Foundations for Teaching in a Multicultural Society, candidates are exposed to dispositions and expected professional behaviors, and this is built upon throughout the program. The Director of Student Teaching and Field Study describes professional and ethical behavior and expectations each semester before the candidates go to the field. He addresses positive and productive collaboration and communication with students, colleagues, school-based Clinical Educators, and parents. A statement of the Code of Ethics of the Profession noted above is included in the Clinical Experience and Student Teaching handbooks; candidates sign an acknowledgement that they have read and understand the handbook. The InTASC Category of Professional Responsibility is assessed on all field evaluations, beginning with the EDUC 201 experience and through to the Assessment of Student Teaching. In addition, the “Mission” component of the disposition statements addresses some aspects of ethics.

The EDUC 201 course includes information about federal and state education laws and also regulations regarding teacher liability, academic freedom, and anti-bullying legislation, among other things. Our data show average grades of 3.0 or over in EDUC 201 over three years, indicating that candidates understand legal aspects of educational practice. In EDUC 230 Educational Psychology: Foundations of Special Education in Elementary/Middle School and EDUC 356 Educational Psychology: Educating Exceptional Learners in Middle/High School, candidates in elementary and secondary education respectively

study special education/disability-related legislation including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. The roles and responsibilities of the educator with regards to these pieces of legislation are examined; specifically, candidates understand IDEA's provisions of a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for all students with disabilities, the Least Restrictive Environment, the purpose of the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and parental safeguards. They understand the difference between an IEP and a 504 plan. The importance of collaboration with families and other professionals in support of students with disabilities is studied. Our data shows average grades of 3.0 or over in both EDUC 230 and EDUC 356 over three years, with 356 at 4.00.

Candidates' understanding of the expectations of the profession is assured through course grades, field experience and student teaching evaluations with regards to InTASC Category 4: Professional Responsibility, and dispositions evaluations. Before a candidate is recommended for licensure, we use our assessment tools to ensure that they understand the expectations of the profession.

#### Assurance of Content Knowledge and Teaching Effectiveness Prior to Recommendation for Licensure

Candidates exit from our program well prepared to effectively teach all students, through their content knowledge and pedagogical skills in the four InTASC categories, their discipline-specific knowledge and skill, their ability to use research and evidence-based practice, their ability to implement Indiana Academic Standards (college & career ready), and their integration of technology. Multiple measures including the Licensing Test Scores, Assessment of Student Teaching, SPA Student Teaching evaluations, formative lesson assessments, Assessment Cycle, and exit surveys show that our completers demonstrate their proficiency with regards to content knowledge and teaching effectiveness in the fields where certification is sought. Likewise, the dispositions assessments gather evidence that candidates reflect the 30 Scholarship, Mission, and Competence dispositions elements that have been adopted by the EPP.

All EPP-created assessments utilize a 4-point scale with 4 being high, and 1 being low. By completion of Student Teaching, it is expected that overall, the candidate has achieved a ranking of 3.0 (Proficient) or higher in all areas.

Additionally, candidates complete an Education Portfolio during the Student Teaching semester. The written portfolio is evaluated by the EPP-Based Clinical Educator, and candidates prepare an oral presentation of the portfolio in which they describe and justify their proficiency in all SMC Standards. This presentation of the portfolio is to two different EPP-based Clinical Educators. At completion of student teaching, the EPP-based Clinical Educator (supervisor) is responsible for reviewing all relevant information on the candidate's performance during Student Teaching, and for submitting a grade of Pass or Fail. Upon successful completion of Student Teaching, candidates may submit a request for license referral to the Director of Student Teaching, who also serves as the EPP Licensing Advisor. Once this request is received, the Director of Student Teaching logs into the Indiana Department of Education's Licensing Verification and Information System (LVIS). Candidates are officially licensed by the state through that system and must have applied for their license to the state through LVIS. The system allows the Director of Student Teaching to access candidates' license applications and verify Licensure Exam Scores, Suicide Prevention and First-Aid Training, degree completion, and required GPA. Once the Director of Student Teaching has verified these records, he recommends candidates for licensure in their respective area(s) on the LVIS portal.

#### Completer Satisfaction Survey

Saint Mary's administers Completer Satisfaction Surveys annually. These instruments are administered electronically and are completed one year and five years after candidate program completion. This survey based directly on the 10 InTASC standards.

([https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC\\_Model\\_Core\\_Teaching\\_Standards\\_2011.pdf](https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf)). To allow candidates the maximum development time possible during their first year of teaching, these surveys are administered at the end of the academic year, thus creating a one-year reporting delay. At the time of publication, data for the classes of 2018 and 2022 had been collected; data collection for the classes of 2019 and 2023 was in process.

InTASC Standards Grouping for Surveys:

*The Learner & Learning*

- Standard 1: Learner development
- Standard 2: Learning differences
- Standard 3: Learning environments

*Content*

- Standard 4: Content knowledge
- Standard 5: Application of content

*Instructional Practice*

- Standard 6: Assessment
- Standard 7: Planning for instruction
- Standard 8: Instructional strategies

*Professional Responsibility*

- Standard 9: Professional learning and ethical practice
- Standard 10: Leadership and collaboration

<b>Completer satisfaction</b>	EPP administered surveys to one-year and five-year alumnae.  These standards are extensively aligned with multiple sets of standards, including the InTASC and Indiana State Standards. These results are based on a four-point scale: Beginning (1), Developing (2), Proficient (3), Outstanding (4). 2022 data collected Spring 2023 on 2018 (5-year) and 2022 (1-year) completers	<b>Elementary and Secondary Combined</b>				
		<b>Year</b>	<b>Learner &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Content Knowledge</b>	<b>Instructional Practice</b>	<b>Professional Responsibility</b>
		<b>2022</b>	3.35	3.39	3.41	3.46
		<b>2021</b>	2.83	2.73	2.68	2.87
		<b>2020</b>	3.33	3.28	3.33	3.6
		<b>2018</b>	3.00	2.83	3.00	3.05
		<b>2017</b>	3.89	3.88	3.80	3.87
		<b>2016</b>	3.75	3.70	3.72	3.77



**IV. CAEP Accountability Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared (Outcome Measure)**

Completer/Graduation Rate

<b>Completer/Graduation Rate</b>	TITLE II AND STATE REPORTING Attrition: Candidates leaving programs before completion. Retention: Underclasswoman Completion: Graduates	<b>Rates as reported to TITLE II</b>			
		<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Attrition</b>	<b>Retention</b>	<b>Completion</b>
		<b>2022-2023 (N=61)</b>	2% (1)	41% (25)	59% (36)
		<b>2021-2022 (N=66)</b>	5% (3)	53% (35)	42% (29)
		<b>2020-2021 (N=81)</b>	1.2% (1)	80% (65)	40% (16)

Completer/Licensure Rate

<b>Licensure Rate</b>	Teacher License Lookup for Indiana <a href="https://license.doe.in.gov/educator-license-lookup">https://license.doe.in.gov/educator-license-lookup</a>		<b>Three Year Trends for Licenses</b>					
		<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Not Reported</b>
		<b>2022-2023</b>	Elementary	15*	12		79	0
			Secondary/P-12	18	14			0
		<b>2021-2022</b>	Elementary	8	5	AZ: 1 IL: 4	75	6
			Secondary/P-12	13	11			1
		<b>2020-2021</b>	Elementary	11	8	IL: 1 Applied	75	2
	Secondary/P-12	5	4			1		

\*Two completers not included in this count were nuns from Africa who were not seeking licensure.

Alumnae Employment Survey

Saint Mary’s administers surveys to its graduates seeking to better understand their employment outcomes related to their education. The survey is administered annually to graduates one-year following graduation and five-years following graduation. Employment percentages reflect those graduates who are employed as professional educators.

<b>7. Employment Rate.</b>	<b>One-Year Out.</b> As reported by College Institutional Research Office and Career Crossings Office (Graduates 2016-2021)2018-2022	Education Employed Full Time: 87.5% (College 70.4%) Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 35.4% (College 37.0%) Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 89.6% (College 91.8%)
	<b>Five-Years Out.</b> As reported by College Institutional Research Office and Career Crossings Office (Graduates 2012-2017)2014-18	Education Employed Full Time: 97.5% (College 88.3%) Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 59.5% (College 51.9%) Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 97.5% (College 95.1%)

Student Loan Default Rate for Saint Mary’s College

<b>8. Loan Default Rate</b>	HLC Report, SMC Financial Aid Office	The College loan three-year default rate was 0% as of 2020*
*This percentage has decreased from 2018 (1.2%) and 2019 (1.1%)		

**V. Discussion**

The information presented in the tables above and in the discussion below is regularly shared, with feedback sought from, relevant stakeholders including teachers and administrators from local P-12 schools and districts, alumni, college administration, IDOE, and Specialized Professional Associations.

Impact Measures:

Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1)

We have presented three measures of our graduates impact on P-12 learning and development. Our principal survey includes an item assessing graduate impact as well as data sources for that assessment. Our alumnae survey also includes parallel those items added to the principal survey.

Additionally, we are continuing our pretest-posttest research efforts. At the time of reporting our principal survey was currently being circulated. To complete our alumnae survey, we typically contact completers via email. At the same time, we request their principal/supervisor contact information. Thus, our principal survey data lags behind the collection of our alumnae data. Our alumnae survey yielded positive data, on a scale of 1-4 with four being high, the average response to the impact on learning question was 3.36. All seven of the possible data sources were chosen by graduates as those that graduates based their responses on. Our pretest-posttest research also yielded positive results. Positive growth was demonstrated by each of the four graduates' students from pretest to posttest with intervening instruction.

#### Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Components R4.2, R5.3)

The Indiana Supervisor Report for 2020-2021. Supervisor ratings of teachers are provided by the Indiana Department of Education. All St. Mary's graduates observed were judged to be at minimum *Effective*, with the majority receiving ratings of *Highly Effective*. Data can be retrieved at <https://www.in.gov/doi/files/December-2022-ER-Report-for-IDOE.xlsx>, see the institution tab of the spreadsheet.

Regarding employer (Saint Mary's Principal Survey) evaluations, the previous year's measure of Professional Responsibility continued to be the highest rated area for the class of 2022 with both being at 4.00: Exceeds Expectations. Content Knowledge was at 3.5 for this group demonstrating proficiency in content preparation. Averages for Instructional Practice (3.33), and Learner and Learning (3.5) indicated that evaluations seem to be returning to levels observed prior to the COVID pandemic. For the two cohorts measured (2018 and 2022) higher averages were generally received by graduates five years after completing the program, indicating that graduates continue to grow in their professional competencies as they advance in their careers. Overall, cumulative data from the Saint Mary's Principal data are consistent with the Indiana Supervisor Report for 2020-2022 outcomes of all Saint Mary's graduates being rated *Effective* or *Highly Effective*.

We had a very robust response from our Partners in Education Council regarding our with stakeholders reviewing a multitude of EPP created programmatic rubrics. There were a total of 12 teachers and/or administrators participating in the Lawshe analyses or our assessments.

We also had significant activity with our Teacher Education Council, including consultations with faculty from other departments regarding initiatives such as the establishment of the physics education major. We also had a detailed discussion with the council about the role of academic departments and SPAs in the accreditation process, and council members' potential involvement in our November 2024 CAEP site visit.

#### Outcome Measures:

##### Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3)

For the class of 2023, with the exception of Elementary Education: Math & Science, scores for licensure examinations have acceptable to high pass rates between 90% and 100%, with most averaging 100%. Candidates are made aware of resources available for exam preparation <https://www.ets.org/praxis/site/epp/supporting-candidates/test-prep.html?null=5006> and candidates who struggle are counseled by faculty familiar with the respective licensure area.

The student-teaching, dispositions and SEL rubrics are all administered at the conclusion of the student-teaching practicum. All three instruments are based on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (low) to 4 (high). All averages for all instruments were between 3 and 4, indicating that our candidates were meeting or exceeding teaching expectations for beginning educators, as well as conducting themselves in a manner consistent with professional educators. These results are consistent with completer satisfaction averages on surveys completed one and five years after graduation. On a four-point scale ranging from 1 (low) to 4 (high) completers had averages between 3 and 4 on measures of learner and Learning (3.35), Content Knowledge (3.39), Instructional Practice (3.41) and Professional Responsibility (3.46).

Alumnae evaluations are largely consistent with the principal evaluations; respective averages for the class of 2022 for principals and alumnae were Learner & Learning (3.50, 3.35), Content Knowledge (3.50, 3.39), Instructional Practice (3.33, 3.41), and Professional Responsibility (4.00, 3.46).

#### Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared

With regard to completer rates, we are generally satisfied with the rate of attrition and completion. The attrition rate of 2022-2023 (2%) is lower (61 enrolled, 1 withdrew) than the 5.0% attrition rate in 2021-2022 (66 enrolled, 2 withdrew). This may be in part due to being post COVID. However, both sets of numbers indicate that attrition remains an exception rather than a rule. Almost all of our candidates complete the program in four years. It would be an exception should one not be able to do so.

In the area of state licensure, we have strongly emphasized the importance of getting the Indiana License even if the candidate does not intend to stay in Indiana. In most states, having obtained the Indiana license makes the process of obtaining licensure in those states easier. Licensure rates were higher for 2023 graduates (79%) when compared to 2022 and 2021 graduates (75%). Faculty continue to emphasize the value of obtaining Indiana licensure in terms of maximizing marketability.

Data on employment are current through 2022. The education full-time employment rate for the first year is 87.5%, higher than the college in general (70.4%); this trend continues at the five-year mark at 97.5% (general 88.3%). Completers employed full time or enrolled in graduate school increases from 91.8% to 95.1% from the one-year mark to the five-year mark. Employment and continuing education trends are positive for St. Mary's education graduates. Maintaining and continuing that status will remain a priority for the education department.

Given the SES demographics of the College, historically we have a very low loan default rate, which is of 0% as of 2020 (institution wide, data are not available just for education).