

CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA

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

<p>Observations of teaching effectiveness: Indiana Supervisor Report</p>	<p>Review of IDOE Teacher Evaluations</p> <p>A Highly Effective 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>An Effective 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 Improvement Necessary 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>An Ineffective 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>Aggregate principal/supervisor evaluation scores for St. Mary’s first through third year teachers:</p> <p>2020-2021 (N=146) 72% Highly Effective 28% Effective</p> <p>2019-2020 (N=143) 70% Highly Effective 30% Effective</p> <p>2018-2019 (N=146) 64% Highly Effective 34% Effective 2% Improvement Necessary</p>
---	--	--

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 above) 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>).

<p>Impact on P-12 student learning/development</p>	<p>Research designed to measure our Graduates’ Impact on P-12 Learning are currently under development: <i>SMC EDU Measurement of Graduates’ Impact on P-12 Learning Proposal</i>. This proposal for a research paradigm is presented in Appendix A of this document. Because of the increased demands on teachers’ preparation requirements to accommodate in-person and online instruction, we were unable to implement this research project with recent graduates during the 2021-2022 academic year. In lieu of the planned data collection, we piloted the pretest-posttest research methodology with candidates in our elementary and secondary programs to identify any difficulties with the methodology as well as any logistical challenges. We plan to implement similar measures with appropriate content measures during the 2022-2023 academic year with the intent of providing initial data in our spring 2023 annual report.</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>
---	--	--

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

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). 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.

Impact Measure	Source	Elementary and Secondary Combined				
		Year	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 2021 on 2016 (5-year) and 2020 (1year) completers	2020	2.80	3.07	2.88	3.23
		2019	3.65	3.70	3.38	3.80
		2018	3.57	3.44	3.35	3.76
		2017	3.44	3.47	3.20	3.46
		2016	3.38	3.33	3.50	3.42
		2015	3.75	4.00	3.50	3.92

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 Program;
- ◆ 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 semester the council met to review and revise our *Formative Lesson Evaluation Rubric*. The form is used to evaluate a candidate’s delivery of a lesson she or he developed. The agenda for the meeting, challenges the existing rubric presented, instructions for the revision work session, meeting minutes, and follow-up procedures are presented below.

Agenda
<p>Saint Mary’s College Education Department Partners in Education Meeting Agenda Monday, October 11, 4:30 pm Madeleva Hall Room 253</p> <p>1) Welcome/Introductions</p> <p>2) Revision of Formative Lesson Evaluation Form</p> <p>3) Discussion of PD ideas for our teacher candidates as required by CAEP</p> <p>4) Discussion of Process/Timing in our field placements</p> <p>5) Future Topics for Council Meetings/Date for Spring 2022 Council Meeting</p> <p>Rubric Cheat Sheet</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Each important idea is its own criteria; avoid ands, alsos, semicolons</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Use actionable words: interacts, provides examples, answers questions...</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Avoid understands, is empathetic, cares...</p> <p>Standards:</p> <p>CAEP PD</p> <p>Instasc instructions</p>

Challenges	
Revision of Formative Lesson Evaluation Form	
1)	Formative Lesson Rubric is a Performance Evaluation Rubric
2)	Current Rubric includes TOO MANY INDICATORS under a single criterion
3)	Current Rubric May Not Evaluate All Essential CATEGORIES/ELEMENTS
4)	One Possible Missing Category is STUDENT ENGAGEMENT
5)	Other CATEGORIES/ELEMENTS may be missing

Instructions	
1)	Add/Revise/Delete/Move Categories and/or Elements
2)	Each group PLEASE create and LABEL one master list of suggestions
3)	Submit your group's master list and all revision documents (in case we get confused!) 🤔

Meeting Minutes	
Partners in Education Meeting Minutes	
October 11, 2021	
<p>In attendance: Ann Bingham (Niles Community Schools curriculum coordinator), Emma Cassidy (Liberty Elementary School, alum), Insook Chung (Faculty), Kaitlyn Drew (Success Academy, alum), Mansour Eid (Principal – South Bend Virtual School), Haley Green (Walt Disney Elementary School, alum), Jeff Greiner (faculty), Nicole Harris (Beiger Elementary School, alum), Sara Hoover (Beiger Elementary School), Anna Irons (Schmucker Middle School, alum), Courtney Kozcyk (Principal of Beiger Elementary School), Jim Lalley (Faculty), Angelina Lazovich (Beiger Elementary School, alum), Steven Mast (Faculty), Stacy Minegar (Beiger Elementary School), Mary Muzzy (LaSalle</p>	

Elementary School, alum), Nicole Nemeth (St. Joseph High School, alum), Franca Paluso-Mulhert (Vice-principal of Walt Disney Elementary School, adjunct faculty, alum), Michele Sanchez (Prairie Vista Elementary School, alum), Kem Shriver (Principal of Clay High School), Dan Smith (St. Joseph High School, alum), Terri Suico (Faculty), Ryan Towner (Principal of Walt Disney Elementary School), Nancy Turner (Faculty)

Absent – Dan Applegate, Mary Gallagher, Nicole Garcia, Kathy Higgs-Coulthard, Elaine Holmes, Hanna Manspeaker, Heather Short, Sarah Torzewski, Amy Troyer

The meeting started at 4:35 pm with a welcome by Director of Field and Student Teaching and department coordinator Steven Mast. Steven thanked everyone for attending and noted the number of recent alums who have agreed to join the committee. Steven also noted the value of this committee and how their experience and insight assist in the work we do in the Education Department.

The majority of the meeting focused on having the partners review and revise the formative lesson plan evaluation form. Jim introduced the rationale for why the department thinks the revision is necessary. Specific issues included concerns that the current rubric had too many indicators housed under a single criterion, may not evaluate all essential categories/elements, and was missing categories such as student engagement.

Participants separated into groups, with elementary educators and administrators meeting together and secondary educators and administrators forming a group. In these groups, participants reviewed the form and offered feedback and potential revisions. Groups were asked to have a master notetaker who would submit the notes on behalf of their group at the end. Groups met for approximately 40 minutes.

Participants reconvened at 6:30 to submit their master rubrics and discuss overarching themes and ideas from their small-group meetings. Points included having a space for a pre-conference where the teacher candidate and clinical educator met to discuss the lesson during the planning process, moving the categories of technology and differentiation to the planning section, and highlighting the need for teacher candidates to be flexible. Another idea that was broached was the potential value of differentiating between the junior field and student teaching rubrics so that components were gradually introduced to better reflect the time and experiences teacher candidates were having in the field.

Steven, Jim, and Terri thanked the participants for their contributions and said that the department would review their suggestions and make changes to the rubric based on the feedback from today. The revised rubric would be brought to the next Partners in Education meeting in the spring of 2022. The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

On February 14, 2022, the Education Department met to collectively revise the Lesson Evaluation form incorporating suggestions and using feedback generated by council members during the October work session during the October 11, 2021 work session. On April 5, 2022 the revised rubric was sent to all work session participants. Feedback was requested.

Final revisions will be made by Education Department faculty based on any feedback received during this second review and the new form will be implemented during the 2022-2023 academic year.

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

Indiana CORE Licensure Examination Results

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 single test takers in compliance with FERPA guidelines.

2020-2021 (Indiana Core)

Elementary Education 2020-2021

Test (Passing)	N*	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
EE: General Sub: Reading (220)	10	240	10	100	1	100
EE: General Sub: Math (220)	10	242	13	80	1.3	80
EE: General Sub: Science/HE/PE (220)	10	235	13	90	1.3	90
EE: General Sub: SS/Fine Arts (220)	10	231	12	90	1.2	90
Elementary Education (220)	9	240	10	90	1	100
EN: Mild Intervention (220)	5	248	5	100	1	100
English Learners (220)	0					
Reading	1					

* N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some candidates did not seek Indiana licensure.

Secondary Education 2020-2021

Test (Passing)	N	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
English Language Arts (220)	0					
SS-Historical Perspectives	2	195	5	0	2.5	0
SS-Government/Citizenship	1					
Mathematics (220)	1					
Secondary Education (220)	3	248	3	100	1	100
* N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some candidates did not seek Indiana licensure						

P-12 Education 2020-2021

Test (Passing)	N	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
Fine Arts: General Music (220)	0					
Fine Arts: Instrumental Music (220)	1					
Fine Arts: Vocal Music (220)	0					
Fine Arts: Visual Arts (220)	1					
P-12 Education (220)	2	255	2	2	1	100

2019-2020 (Indiana Core)

Elementary Education 2019-2020

Test (Passing)	N*	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
EE: General Sub: Reading (220)	25	236	31	83	1.24	96
EE: General Sub: Math (220)	24	238	29	82	1.21	90
EE: General Sub: Science/HE/PE (220)	24	231	29	90	1.21	69
EE: General Sub: SS/Fine Arts (220)	24	215	39	67	1.63	63
Elementary Education (220)	24	256	24	100	1	100
EN: Mild Intervention (220)	7	246	7	100	1	100
English Learners (220)	1					
Reading (220)	1					
* N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some did not seek Indiana licensure.						

Secondary Education 2019-2020

Test (Passing)	N*	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
English Language Arts (220)	3	234	4	67	1.33	100
SS-Historical Perspectives (220)	1					
SS-Government/Citizenship (220)	1					
SS-Sociology (220)	1					
Mathematics (220)	3	231	3	50	1.5	100
Science-Life Science	1					
World Languages	1					
Secondary Education (220)	5	242	5	100	1	100

* N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some did not seek Indiana licensure

P-12 Education 2019-2020

Test (Passing)	N*	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
Fine Arts: General Music (220)	1					
Fine Arts: Instrumental Music (220)	1					
P-12 Education (220)	1					

*N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some did not seek Indiana licensure

2018-2019 (Indiana Core)

Elementary Education 2018-2019

Test (Passing)	N*	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
EE: General Sub: Reading (220)	17	232	22	71	1.2	77
EE: General Sub: Math (220)	16	242	18	88	1.1	94
EE: General Sub: Science/HE/PE (220)	16	240	18	88	1.1	94
EE: General Sub: SS/Fine Arts (220)	16	230	24	75	1.5	94
Elementary Education (220)	17	250	17	93	1	94
EN: Mild Intervention (220)	3	256	3	100	1	100
English Learners (220)	3	227	3	67	1	67
Reading (220)	2	214	4	0	2	25

* N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some did not seek Indiana licensure

Secondary Education 2018-2019

Test (Passing)	N	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
English Language Arts (220)	4	237	4	100	1	100
SS-Historical Perspectives	2	247	2	2	1	100
SS-Government/Citizenship	1					
SS-Sociology (220)	1					
Mathematics (220)	4	232	5	75	1.3	75
Secondary Education (220)	12	261	12	92	1	92

* N reflects the number of completers attempting a test. Some did not seek Indiana licensure

P-12 Education 2018-2019

Test (Passing)	N	Mean	Attempts	Passing % First Time	Average Attempts	Passing %
Fine Arts: General Music (220)	1					
Fine Arts: Instrumental Music (220)	0					
Fine Arts: Vocal Music (220)	0					
Fine Arts: Visual Arts (220)	1					
P-12 Education (220)	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' College Supervisor and Clinical Educator at the midpoint (Midterm) and conclusion (Final) 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. 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.

Spring 2021 Field Study Evaluation Rubric: Step 3 Evaluation Summary Final (N=18)	
Rubric Criteria	College Supervisor and Clinical Educator Average
1. Student Growth and Development	3.74
2. Cultural Factors	3.84
3. Facilitation of Learning	3.87
4. Learning Environment and Learning	3.76
5. Engagement with Students	3.97
6. Planning and Delivery	3.79
7. Use of Technology	3.95
8. Assessment Design and Use of Data	3.55
9. Reading Knowledge Base	3.68
10. Planning Literacy Instruction	3.66
11. Content Knowledge Base	3.84
12. Creating Content Related Learning Experiences	3.84
13. Initiative in the Classroom	3.95
14. Attitude Toward Students and Learning	4.00
15. Professional Appearance	3.97

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 two of these evaluations are completed by candidates’ College Supervisor and Clinical Educator at the midpoint and 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.

Spring 2021 Step 3 SMC Dispositions Rating Scale: Student-Teaching (N=18)	
Rubric Criteria	College Supervisor and Clinical Educator Average
1. Showing respect for learners' differing strengths and needs	3.74
2. Having a commitment to learning about how learners develop	3.84
3. Believing that all learners can achieve	3.87
4. Having a commitment to learning about cultures and communities	3.76
5. Believing that the classroom environment greatly affects students' learning	3.97
6. Having a commitment to developing as a thoughtful and responsive member of the educational community	3.79
7. Recognizing that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts and appreciating multiple perspectives	3.95
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	3.68
10. Constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues	3.66
11. Viewing assessment as a tool for instructional decision making and understanding that learners have differing needs that may necessitate accommodations	3.84
12. Seeks data as evidence of student growth and learning	3.84
13. Respecting learners' diverse strengths and needs, and valuing planning as a collegial activity	3.95
14. Draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, standards, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy	4.00
15. Valuing multiple communication strategies, and deep understanding of and across content areas	3.97

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). 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.

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

Completer satisfaction	College Institutional Research administered surveys to one-year and five-year alumnae. These standards are extensively aligned with multiple sets of, including the InTASC and Indiana State Standards. These results are based on a four-point scale: Beginning (1), Developing (2), Proficient (3), Outstanding (4). Data collected Spring 2021 on 2016 (5-year) and 2020 (1-year) completers	Elementary and Secondary Combined				
		Year	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
		2020	3.43	3.25	3.50	3.72
		2019	3.34	3.36	3.07	3.36
		2018	3.38	3.46	3.34	3.50
		2017	3.54	3.48	3.44	3.57
		2016	3.75	3.67	3.67	3.95
		2015	3.78	3.75	3.68	3.82

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

Completer/Graduation Rate

Completer/Graduation Rate	TITLE II AND STATE REPORTING Attrition: Candidates leaving programs before completion. Retention: Underclasswoman Completion: Graduates	Rates as reported to TITLE II			
		YEAR	Attrition	Retention	Completion
		2020-2021 (N=81)	1.2% (1)	80% (65)	40% (16)
		2019-2020 (N=75)	1.3% (1)	60% (45)	40% (30)
		2018-2019 (N=56)	0% (0)	48% (27)	52% (29)

Completer/Licensure Rate

Licensure Rate	Teacher License Lookup for Indiana https://license.doe.in.gov/educator-license-lookup	Three Year Trends for Licenses						
		YEAR	Program	N	Indiana	Other	Percentage	Not Reported
		2020-2021	Elementary	11	8	IL: 1 Applied	75	2
			Secondary/P-12	5	4			1
		2019-2020	Elementary	23	13	IL:1, 1 Applied IL: 1 Applied	67	8
			Secondary/P-12	7	6			
		2018-2019	Elementary	17	15	IL:1, MI 1	95	
			Secondary/P-12	12	11			1

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.

7. Employment Rate.	One-Year Out. As reported by College Institutional Research Office (Updated 2021): Graduates 2010-2019	Education Employed Full Time: 81.4% (College 64.6%) Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 19.3% (College 34.8%) Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 87.9% (College 86.6%)
	Five-Years Out. As reported by College Institutional Research Office: Graduates 2006-2015	Education Employed Full Time: 91.4% (College 84.6%) Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 50.7% (College 50.3%) Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 96.7% (College 94.7%)

Student Loan Default Rate for Saint Mary’s College

8. Loan Default Rate	HLC Report, SMC Financial Aid Office	The College loan three-year default rate was 1.1% as of 2019
-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--

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, and Specialized Professional Associations.

Impact Measures:

The Indiana Supervisor Report for 2019-2020 (<https://www.in.gov/doi/files/December-2021-ER-Report.xlsx>, see *Institution* tab) data are provided by the Indiana Department of Education based on supervisor evaluation of teachers. All St. Mary’s graduates observed were judged to be at minimum *Effective* , with the majority receiving ratings of *Highly Effective*.

Regarding employer (Saint Mary’s Principal Survey) evaluations, Impact Measure 2, the previous year’s measure of Professional Responsibility continued to be the highest rated area followed by Content Knowledge. Averages for both criteria for the class of 2020 were between 3 and 4, falling within the range between Meets Expectations (3) and Exceeds Expectations (4). Learner and Learning (2.80) and Instructional Practice (2.88) averages dipped below 3.0 for this group, a rare to non-existent occurrence for Saint Mary’s candidates. That these candidates completed their student-teaching practicum, to the extent that practica were allowed to occur, during the onset of the COVID 19 pandemic, provides the likely rationale for the low, outlying numbers: Most, if not all, candidates were required to complete some sort of makeshift practicum that typically

involved online learning as a developing teacher. As such, teacher candidates were involved in online learning at the discretion of their clinical educators. Some candidates were allowed to be very involved during online instruction while others had very limited interactions. Candidates were often forced to focus on overly extensive learning about technology at the expense of developing teaching skills. This is corroborated by the fact that every average for the principal survey for the 2020 cohort was lower than all respective averages for the previous 5 cohorts. Data to test the assertion that these shortcomings were not due to programmatic deficiencies will be collected during spring 22 on completers from the class of 2021. Finally, of the two cohorts measured (2016 and 2020) higher averages were 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, data from the Saint Mary's Principal data are consistent with the Indiana Supervisor Report for 2019-2020 outcomes of all Saint Mary's graduates being rater *Effective* or *Highly Effective*.

We had a very robust response from our Partners in Education Council regarding our Lesson Evaluation Form revision. There were a number of excellent suggestions made about revision, with participants displaying a serious commitment to assignment and program rigor, as well as a sense of ownership in the process. A number of the participants were Clinical Educators who host our candidates for their student-teaching practica and/or Saint Mary's teacher education program alumnae. We anticipate that the form will be significantly improved and more effective when the revised edition is implemented.

Outcome Measures:

Alumnae evaluations are largely consistent with the principal evaluations, with the only consistent pattern of variation found for the class of 2020. Context regarding that class is provided in the previous paragraph. Given the 2020 classes' practica experience, they may have different perceptions than principals regarding Learners and Learning, as well as Instructional Practice; graduates may perceive proficiency with technology as satisfying these requirements while principals may focus more on traditional learning and teaching. Overall, there is a positive trend toward being highly satisfied. Averages for all criteria were between 3 and 4, falling within the range between Proficient (3) and Outstanding (4).

With the exception of secondary social studies (history), data for licensure examinations have acceptable to high pass rates between 80% and 100%, with most averaging 100%. We have made additional resources available to those 2021 graduates continuing to seek licensure in secondary social studies, as well as current social studies majors as a proactive measure.

The student-teaching and dispositions rubrics are both administered at the conclusion of the student-teaching practicum. Both instruments are based on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (low) to 4 (high). All averages for both 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 (3.43), Content Knowledge (3.25), Instructional Practice (3.50) and Professional Responsibility (3.72).

With regard to completer rates, we are generally satisfied with the rate of attrition and completion. The 1.2% attrition rate in 2020-2021, slightly

lower than the prior years' 1.3%, indicates 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 have increased for 2021 graduates (75%) compared to 2020 graduates (67%). While these numbers do raise some concern compared to the 2019 licensure rate (95%), many 2021 graduation candidates would have taken licensure examinations in the spring 2021 semester and after; some may still be in the process of completing licensure requirements which may have been obstructed by the COVID pandemic's impact on test taking opportunities.

Data on employment are current through 2021. The education full-time employment rate for the first year is 81.4%, higher than the college in general (64.6%); this trend continues at the five-year mark at 91.4% (general 84.6%). Completers employed full time or enrolled in graduate school increases from 87.9% to 96.7% 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, we have a very low loan default rate of 1.1% as of 2019 (institution wide, data are not available just for education).

Appendix A

SMC EDU Measurement of Graduates' Impact on P-12 Learning

Goal: Assess the impact of Saint Mary's College education graduates on P-12 learning in their current P-12 classrooms. Collect those data in a stratified manner so that the data reflect impact reflecting the following variables:

- K-6 and 5-12 levels
- Urban, Suburban and Rural settings
- Diversity in SES, racial, ethnic, and gender
- Public/Private settings

Purpose: to determine if Saint Mary's education department programming is effective in producing teachers capable of affecting positive change in student achievement in the current P-12 learning and teaching milieu.

Methodology: use of a pretest-posttest design to measure change (i.e., growth) in student achievement to measure the impact of instruction occurring between pretest and posttest.

Presumptions¹:

1. Instruction and assessment would align to typical methodologies, procedures and curricula for the class being studied.
2. The class being studied would be relatively homogeneous in terms of age/grade level.
3. Assessments will be teacher-made to align with current instructional goals in place at the time of the study.
4. Instruction will be teacher-designed to align with current instructional goals in place at the time of the study.
5. Instructional objectives, goals, methods, materials and procedures will be documented for analysis.
6. Assessments will be objective (e.g., True/False, Multiple Choice, Fill-in the-Blank, Matching, etc.) or will use an assessment rubric for measures such as essays and other written/more subjective works.
7. Objective assessments will consist of a minimum of 5-10 items for grades K-6 and 10-15 items for grades 5-12². Rubrics will consist of a minimum of 5 criteria.
8. To allow for comparison and assess change, Assessment One and Assessment Two will follow the same format as outlined in item 5 and consist of the same number of questions/criteria.
9. At least half of the assessment questions will be above the knowledge level.
10. Achievement and changes (i.e., growth) will be measured and reported using percentages to allow for comparisons within and among groups, as well as aggregation.
11. The interval between Assessment One (pretest) and Assessment Two (posttest) will be a minimum of 24-48 hours.

¹ Modifications of presumptions, policies and/or procedures may be required when studying specific populations such as exceptional learners or speakers of English as a new language.

² Number of questions may vary to accommodate younger learners, those with special needs, English language learners, or for questions that are multifaceted and have requirements such as "show your work".

12. Students **will not** be provided feedback (correct answers) on Assessment One prior to subsequent instruction/Assessment Two. Instruction will be documented using teacher notes, class handouts or other materials.
13. To assist with the evaluation of teacher-created assessments, EPP faculty will use the *Graduate Impact Study Rubric* (see below) and the results of its application to aid in interpreting the data collected.

Graduate Impact Study Rubric (Completed by St. Mary's Education Faculty to Determine Research Quality)					
	Below Expectation (1)	Developing (2)	At Expectation (3)	Above Expectation (4)	Score*
Assessment items and instructions are clearly worded.	Assessment items and instructions lack clear wording.	Some Assessment items and instructions are clearly worded.	Assessment items and instructions are generally clearly worded.	All Assessment items and instructions are clearly worded.	
Assessments are developmentally appropriate in organization and format.	Assessments are clearly not appropriate for grade level.	Some elements of the assessments are grade appropriate, but it is inconsistent.	The assessments are generally grade appropriate in organization and format.	The assessments are clearly grade appropriate in organization, format and presentation.	
Assessments are scored according to answer keys.	Scoring does not follow the answer keys and/or is inaccurate.	Scoring is inconsistent and does not effectively relate to instruction.	Scoring is generally accurate and provides the basis instruction.	Scoring is clearly accurate and provides a clear basis for instruction.	
Instruction	Lesson objectives do not relate to assessments/instruction	Lesson objectives generally relate to assessments/instruction	Lesson objectives relate to assessments/instruction	Lesson objectives clearly relate to assessments/instruction	
Change (student growth)	No students demonstrated growth	A minority of students demonstrated growth	A majority of students demonstrated growth	Nearly all students demonstrated growth	
Question Level (for tests)	All questions are at the knowledge level	Some questions above the knowledge level	50% of questions are above the knowledge level	The majority of questions are above the knowledge level	
OR					

Graduate Impact Study Rubric (Completed by St. Mary's Education Faculty to Determine Research Quality)					
	Below Expectation (1)	Developing (2)	At Expectation (3)	Above Expectation (4)	Score*
Assignment Level (for all other types of assignments)	Assignment Only Requires Thinking at the Knowledge Level	Assignment Requires Some Thinking above the Knowledge Level	Assignment Cannot Be Completed Without Thinking above the Knowledge Level	Assignment Mostly Requires Thinking above the Knowledge Level	
Reviewer Name		Candidate Name		Total Score	
Comments:					
Scoring: *All scores should be 3 or higher for research to be judged acceptable. Extenuating circumstances will be considered for exceptions in scoring.					
Analysis: The change/student growth will be used to determined Saint Mary's Graduates' impact on P-12 learning and achievement. The remaining criteria will be used to inform modifications/additions to courses and/or programs.					