

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 (Alumnae Survey).....	5
	Pretest-Posttest Assessments of Student Learning.....	6
II.	CAEP Accountability Measure 2: Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Impact Measure).....	13
	IDOE Supervisor Performance Observation Evaluations of Completer Effectiveness.....	13
	Saint Mary's Principal Survey	14
	Partners in Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement)	15
	Teacher Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement)	16
III.	CAEP Accountability Measure 3: Candidate competency at program completion (Outcome Measure).....	17
	Elementary Education Licensure Examinations.....	17
	Secondary Education Licensure Examinations	20
	Art/Music P-12 Education Licensure Examinations	21
	Student-Teaching Rubric.....	21
	Student-Teaching Dispositions Rubric	23
	Social and Emotional Learning	25
	Assurance that Candidates Understand the Expectations of the Profession.....	31
	Assurance of Content Knowledge and Teaching Effectiveness Prior to Recommendation for Licensure	32
	Completer Satisfaction (Alumnae) Survey.....	33
IV.	CAEP Accountability Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared (Outcome Measure)	35
	Completer/Graduation Rate	35
	Completer/Licensure Rate	35
	Alumnae Employment Survey.....	36

Student Loan Default Rate for Saint Mary's College	36
V. Discussion.....	36
Impact Measures:.....	36
Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1)	36
Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Components R4.2, R5.3).....	37
Outcome Measures:	37
Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3)	37
Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared	38
Appendix A.....	39
SMC EDU Measurement of Graduates' Impact on P-12 Learning Research Rubric	39

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) Principal Survey of Impact on Student Learning, (2) Graduate Self Evaluation of Impact on Student Learning, and (3) Pretest-Posttest Assessments of 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 2024 we received three responses from the class of 2019 (two elementary and one secondary), and four responses from the class of 2023 (one elementary and three secondary) 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 3.67 for the class of 2019 and 3.50 for the class of 2023. Data sources identified by the principal for the class of 2019 were 1-7 above with the exception of *Students' performance on this graduate's teacher-made objective tests and essays*. Data sources identified by the principal for the class of 2023 were 1-7 above. Both sets of numbers demonstrated a positive impact and useful information sources. We are currently in the process of modifying our data collection procedures to increase response rate (see Section II Saint Mary's Principal Survey for a more detailed discussion).

Graduate Self Evaluation of Impact on Student Learning (Alumnae Survey)

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 2024 we received six responses each from the classes of 2019 and 2023. On a scale of 1-4 with four being high, the response to the impact on learning impact question was 3.83 for the class of 2019 and 3.67 for the class of 2023. For both years, all seven of the possible data sources were chosen by graduates as those that graduates based their responses on with the exception of Students' performance on this

graduate's teacher-made objective tests and essays. We are currently in the process of modifying our data collection procedures to increase response rate (see Section III Saint Mary's Completer Satisfaction Survey for a more detailed discussion).

Pretest-Posttest Assessments of Student Learning

During the spring of 2023 we contacted recent graduates to inquire if they were documenting their impact on their students' learning. In particular, we were interested graduates who were involved in a process that followed the pretest-instruction-posttest design, a process the Saint Mary's Education Program requires to be completed during student teaching (the assignment is called the *Assessment Cycle*); in this current era, completion of this type of educational sequence is often required of working teachers as part of their annual professional review by school administration. We had four graduates supply data and supporting information. The research is detailed in the tables below.

Saint Mary's College Graduate Impact Pretest-Posttest Research Descriptions 2024-2025		
Impact on P-12 student learning/development	Coordinating with graduates working in P-12 schools during the 2024-25 and 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.	Third Grade Music Rhythm Assessments. On two occasions students were assessed using flashcards of musical notation that emphasized rhythm. The class was mixed in terms of race and gender and included several students with IEPs. Students were required to clap the note and rest patterns on the flashcard. Performances were scored using a rubric. The two assessments were administered with a 6 week interval between the during which time rhythm was taught as part of students' music instruction.. Prior to each assessment, students were given a warm-up exercise, such as watching a video or teacher instruction on the assessment topic.

Saint Mary's College Graduate Impact Pretest-Posttest Research Descriptions 2022-2023		
Impact on P-12 student learning/development		<p>Fourth Grade Math. 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>Fourth Grade Music Performance. 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>Sixth Grade Literacy with Central Ideas Remediation. 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>Seventh Grade Music Projects with Terminology. 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.

Saint Mary's College Graduate Impact Pretest-Posttest Research Data Spring 2025						
Grade Level	Subject	Assessment Type	Interval Between Assessment	Average Percentage Change from Pretest to Posttest	Percentage Change Range	Number of Students Demonstrating Growth
Third (N=16)	Music Rhythm	Rubric	6 weeks	16%	0% to 60%	8
Saint Mary's College Graduate Impact Pretest-Posttest Research Data Spring 2023						
Grade Level	Subject	Assessment Type	Interval Between Assessment	Average Percentage Change from Pretest to Posttest	Percentage Change Range	Number of Students Demonstrating Growth
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

As shown in the tables above, our data are primarily from the 2022-2023 academic year, with one graduate providing data during the 2024-2025 academic year. Unfortunately, no graduates provided data during the 2023-2024 academic year. This has propelled our EPP to increase our efforts to encourage graduates to participate in this research initiative.

Initially, a small group of graduates was targeted via email for participation in our research. We have expanded our efforts to be multipronged and more systematic. Members of the classes of 2022, 2023 and 2024 have been invited to participate. To improve our response rate, we have (1) made connections between the research and the *Assessment Cycle* to improve our graduates' understanding of the research process and expectations, and (2) provided our current student-teachers with in-service instruction about the research process, our request to have them participate in the future, and the connections to the assessment cycle. For both initiatives, we emphasized that we were *not* asking graduates to modify their teaching practices or perform any additional tasks: simply supply us with the data and a brief description of their

instructional/assessment processes, and any relevant materials used during instruction and/or assessment. Both Communications are provided below.

Student Teaching Seminar In-Service Handout to Current Student-Teachers (Seniors)

Dear Saint Mary's Education Candidates:

As part of our accreditation efforts, we are asked to provide evidence that our graduates are having a positive impact on P-12 student learning. This process of demonstrating impact is similar, if not identical, to the Assessment Cycle that you complete as part of student teaching. Both types of data are required by our accreditors and the state. If our program is not authorized by them, we will no longer be able to offer the program.

The most effective way to demonstrate this would be with learning data from our graduates. Once you have graduated from the program and are teaching as a professional, if as part of your teaching responsibilities you are collecting data that is similar in nature to the Assessment Cycle you completed during student teaching, it would be incredibly helpful if you were to share that data with us. As you recall, the parts of the Assessment Cycle are:

1. Initial Formative Assessment (usually follows some form of instruction)
2. Follow-up lessons and additional formative assessments that are guided by the results of the Initial Formative Assessment
3. Summative Assessment to determine (a) the success of the follow- up lessons and additional formative assessments and (b) the extent to which students have learned the content that was taught.

We will *not* be asking you to do any additional teaching or assessments, develop any additional materials, or to alter your plans for your students in any way. In fact, it would defeat the purpose of our data collection if you were to change your typical instructional practices. We simply request that you share your data and relevant materials with the department, along with contextual information like school type (public, private, religious), grade level, content area, class size and class makeup (ESL, IEP, race, gender). All identifying information will be removed from anything that is shared to assure your confidentiality as well as that of your students and institution.

This communication is simply an advanced notice that we will be contacting you once you are working as a teacher and requesting the information noted above. We look forward to your continued success and cooperation.

Prof. Mast

Email to Recent Graduates

Hello, all!

I hope you are well! We could use your help as outlined below. Please let me know if you might be able to assist. We would be most grateful for any help you might provide.

As part of our accreditation efforts, we are asked to provide evidence that our graduates are having a positive impact on P-12 student learning. These data are required by our accreditors and the state. If our program is not authorized by them, we will no longer be able to offer the program.

The most effective way to demonstrate this would be with learning data from our graduates. If, as part of your current teaching responsibilities, you are collecting data that is similar in nature to the Assessment Cycle you completed during student teaching, it would be incredibly helpful if you were to share that data with us.

As you recall, the parts of the Assessment Cycle are:

1. Initial Formative Assessment (usually follows some form of instruction)
2. Follow-up lessons and additional formative assessments that are guided by the results of the Initial Formative Assessment
3. Summative Assessment to determine (a) the success of the follow-up lessons and additional formative assessments and (b) the extent to which students have learned the content that was taught.

We are not asking you to do any additional teaching or assessments, develop any additional materials, or to alter your plans for your students in any way. In fact, it would defeat the purpose of our data collection if you were to change your typical instructional practices. We simply request that you share your data and relevant materials with the department, along with contextual information like school type (public, private, religious), grade level, content area, class size and class makeup (ESL, IEP, race, gender). All identifying information will be removed from anything that is shared to assure your confidentiality as well as that of your students and institution.

Thanks so much!

Prof. Mast

Steven Mast, MA/MS

Education Department Chair

Director of Student Teaching/Field Study

Licensing Advisor

Saint Mary's College

232 Madeleva Hall

574-284-4246

smast@saintmarys.edu

Our pretest-posttest research request was sent February 13, 2025. We received one response that day and are hopeful that more graduates will respond and also plan to send a follow-up request. Hopefully additional responses will be collected in spring 2025, will be reported on in our CAEP 2024-2025 annual report.

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.

While our graduate pretest-posttest data is not as current as would be desirable, it does demonstrating positive impact on student learning, and we are pleased that preliminary data collected during the spring 2025 semester demonstrated similar effects.

The nature of the data collection for each of these three measures, 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 2025 CAEP Annual Report is from the 2023-2024 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 as noted, 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/doe/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/doe/files/2023-2024-Evaluation-Rating-ER-Data.xlsx>, see the institution tab of the spreadsheet.

Observations of teaching effectiveness: Indiana Supervisor Report	Review of IDOE Teacher Evaluations 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.	Aggregate principal/supervisor evaluation scores for St. Mary's first through third year teachers: 2023-2024 (N=16) 56% Highly Effective 44% Effective
	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. 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.	2022-2023 (N=26) 76% Highly Effective 21% Effective 3% Needs Improvement 2021-2022 (N=146)* 72% Highly Effective 28% Effective 2020-2021 (N=146)* 72% Highly Effective 28% Effective 2019-2020 (N=143) 70% Highly Effective 30% Effective
	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).	

*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.

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://753a0706.flowpaper.com/INTASCLearningProgressionsforTeachers/#page=1>). 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				
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 2024 on class of 2023 (1year) and 2019 (5- year) completers. We received no responses from principals of the 2017 (5- year) cohort so we have included 2016 (5-year).	Year (Cohort)	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
		2023(1)	3.31	3.40	3.25	3.38
		2022(1)	3.50	3.50	3.33	4.00
		2021(1)	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00
		2019(5)	3.67	3.67	3.56	3.67
		2018(5)	2.75	3.00	3.16	3.00
		2016(5)	3.78	4.00	3.83	3.83

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 2024 semester the council participated in our CAEP Self Study and visit to provide corroboratory evidence for our submitted self-study. Participation was robust. Our EPP received support from multiple local school based clinical educators, administrators, and graduates currently working in local area schools (some of whom also serve as school based clinical educators). Our EPP was also fortunate to have the support of current candidates, as well as Saint Mary's faculty and administrators during this review process. In total, we received support from 82 participants from outside of the education department.

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.

Similar to our Partners in Education, during the fall 2024 semester the council participated in our CAEP Self Study and visit to provide corroboratory evidence for our submitted self-study.

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

To demonstrate candidate competency at completion we provide four candidate assessments: licensure examination, student teaching rubric, dispositions rubric, and social/emotional learning rubric.

The Praxis Licensure Examinations by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) are required for Educational Licensure in the state of Indiana. 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, as many candidates are from surrounding states (e.g., Illinois and Ohio), a number of completers opt not to take Indiana licensure examinations.

Elementary Education Licensure Examinations**Title 2 Licensure Assessment Summary Pass Rates**

Group	Number Taking Test	Number Passing Test	Pass Rate (%)
All program completers, 2023-24	20	17	85
All program completers, 2022-23	27	25	93
All program completers, 2021-22	22	19	86

Title 2 Licensure Assessment Pass Rates¹**2023-2024 (Praxis)****Elementary Education 2023-2024**

Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2024				
Examination	Number Attempting	Mean	Number Passing	%Passing
Elementary K-6 5622 Principles of Learning and Teaching: grades K-6 (Passing 160)	11	177	11	100
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5007 Reading and Language Arts and Social Studies subtest (Passing 160)	11	175	10	91
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5008 Math and Science subtest (Passing 158)	11	161	9	82

2022-2023 (Praxis)**Elementary Education 2022-2023**

Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2023				
Examination	Number Attempting	Mean	Number Passing	%Passing
Elementary K-6 5622 Principles of Learning and Teaching: grades K-6 (Passing 160)	13	178	13	100
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5007 Reading and Language Arts and Social Studies subtest (Passing 160)	13	175	13	100
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5008 Math and Science subtest (Passing 158)	13	172	12	92

¹ Title 2 provides detailed scoring information only for groups of ten or more candidates. For groups smaller than ten, only the number of candidates attempting the assessment is reported.

2021-2022 (Praxis)**Elementary Education 2021-2022**

Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2022				
Examination	Number Attempting	Mean	Number Passing	%Passing
Elementary K-6 5622 Principles of Learning and Teaching: grades K-6 (Passing 160)	13	177	13	100
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5007 Reading and Language Arts and Social Studies subtest (Passing 160)	13	175	12	92
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5008 Math and Science subtest (Passing 158)	14	164	10	71

2021-2022 (Praxis)**Elementary Education Minors 2022-2024**

Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Classes of 2022-2024				
Examination	Number Attempting	Mean	Number Passing	%Passing
5362 English To Speakers Of Other Languages (Passing 155)	4	NA	NA	NA
5543 Mild to Moderate Intervention (Passing 155)	5	NA	NA	NA

Secondary Education Licensure Examinations**Secondary Education 2022-2024**

Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Classes of 2022-2024				
Examination	Number Attempting	Mean	Number Passing	%Passing
2024 Principles of Learning and Teaching 5624: grades 7-12 (Passing 157)	5	NA	NA	NA
2023 Principles of Learning and Teaching 5624: grades 7-12 (Passing 157)	12	179	12	100
2022 Principles of Learning and Teaching 5624: grades 7-12 (Passing 157)	6	NA	NA	NA
2024 English Language Arts 5038: Content Knowledge (Passing 157)	1	NA	NA	NA
2023 English Language Arts 5038: Content Knowledge (Passing 157)	5	NA	NA	NA
2024 Mathematics (5165 Passing 159)	3	NA	NA	NA
2023 Mathematics 5165 (Passing 159)	3	NA	NA	NA
2022 Mathematics 5165 (Passing 159)	3	NA	NA	NA
2024 5266 -Physics (Passing 145)	1	NA	NA	NA
2024 Spanish: World Language 5195 (Passing 166)	1	NA	NA	NA
2023 Spanish: World Language 5195 (Passing 166)	2	NA	NA	NA
2023 World and US History 5941: Content Knowledge (Passing 148)	2	NA	NA	NA
2022 World and US History 5941: Content Knowledge (Passing 148)	3	NA	NA	NA

Art/Music P-12 Education Licensure Examinations**P-12 Education 2022-2024**

Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Classes of 2022-2024				
Examination	Number Attempting	Mean	Number Passing	%Passing
2024 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625 (Passing 157)	3	NA	NA	NA
20223 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625 (Passing 157)	2	NA	NA	NA
2022 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625 (Passing 157)	2	NA	NA	NA
2024 Art: Content Knowledge 5134(Passing 158)		NA	NA	NA
2024 Music: Instrumental and General Knowledge 5115 (Passing 150)	2	NA	NA	NA
2022 Music: Instrumental and General Knowledge 5115 (Passing 150)	2	NA	NA	NA

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 final version of this rubric is completed by EPP-Based and School-Based Clinical Educators. 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 (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.

Spring 2024 Field Study Evaluation Rubric: Step 3 Evaluation Summary Average Final (N=28)	
Rubric Criteria	EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator Average
1. Student Growth and Development	3.68
2. Cultural Factors	3.52
3. Facilitation of Learning	3.80
4. Learning Environment and Learning	3.91
5. Engagement with Students	3.88
6. Planning and Delivery	3.86
7. Use of Technology	3.71
8. Assessment Design and Use of Data	3.63
9. Reading Knowledge Base	3.63
10. Planning Literacy Instruction	3.61
11. Content Knowledge Base	3.79
12. Creating Content Related Learning Experiences	3.73
13. Initiative in the Classroom	3.98
14. Attitude Toward Students and Learning	3.98
15. Professional Appearance	3.95
16. Adherence to Schedule	3.89
17. Professional Communication	3.91
18. Professional Ethics	3.25

Spring 2023 Field Study Evaluation Rubric: Step 3 Evaluation Summary Average Final (N=36)	
Rubric Criteria	EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator Average
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.

Spring 2024 Step 3 SMC Dispositions Rating Scale: Student-Teaching (N=36)	
Rubric Criteria	School-Based Clinical Educator Average
1. Showing respect for learners' differing strengths and needs	3.91
2. Having a commitment to learning about how learners develop	3.85
3. Believing that all learners can achieve	3.91
4. Having a commitment to learning about cultures and communities	3.76
5. Believing that the classroom environment greatly affects students' learning	3.94
6. Having a commitment to developing as a thoughtful and responsive member of the educational community	3.85
7. Recognizing that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts and appreciating multiple perspectives	3.79
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	3.82
9. Valuing knowledge outside the targeted content area as a vehicle to enhance student learning	3.82
10. Constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues	3.68
11. Viewing assessment as a tool for instructional decision making and understanding that learners have differing needs that may necessitate accommodations	3.79
12. Seeks data as evidence of student growth and learning	3.79
13. Respecting learners' diverse strengths and needs, and valuing planning as a collegial activity	3.94
14. Draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, standards, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy	3.85
15. Valuing multiple communication strategies, and deep understanding of and across content areas	3.85
16. Being committed to deepening awareness and understanding of learners' strengths and needs	3.91
17. Valuing self-directed learning, critical thinking, and professional growth	3.82
18. Understanding the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy	3.85
19. Embracing the role of teacher as one of advocacy for learners and accountability for their success	3.88
20. Being committed to life-long learning and initiating collaboration with learners, families, colleagues, and community members	3.82

Spring 2023 Step 3 SMC Dispositions Rating Scale: Student-Teaching (N=36)	
Rubric Criteria	School-Based Clinical Educator Average
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.²
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 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.

² Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2018). *What is SEL?*, <https://casel.org/what-is-sel/>

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 tables below. Spring 2023 and 2024 data are provided below. 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.

Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring 2024			
SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
Insight			
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.	3.83	3.63	3.73
2. The ability to recognize and manage emotions, as well as build positive self-control, self-discipline, and impulse control.	3.86	3.60	3.73
3. The ability to work well with others, including in the group and teamwork environment, using positive communication and conflict management skills.	3.89	3.74	3.81
Critical Thinking Connection			
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.	3.83	3.51	3.67
Mindset			
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.	3.89	3.86	3.87
6. Cooperative Learning: Facilitates students working together toward a collective goal in accomplishing an instructional task.	3.89	3.74	3.81

Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring 2024			
SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
7. Classroom Discussions: Encourages students and fellow teachers to dialogue about content.	3.83	3.51	3.67
8. Self-Assessment and Self-Reflection: Facilitates students actively thinking about their own work.	3.74	3.63	3.69
9. Balanced Instruction: Uses multiple instructional strategies.	3.89	3.63	3.76
10. Academic Press and Expectations: Candidate provides meaningful and challenging work and believes that all students can accomplish rigorous work.	3.94	3.69	3.81
11. Competence Building: Candidate helps develop students' social-emotional skills through the typical instruction cycle.	3.91	3.46	3.69
Social Teaching Practices³			
12. Student-Centered Discipline: Candidate's disciplinary strategies are developmentally appropriate for students.	3.74	3.60	3.67
13. Candidate Language: The candidate talks to students with a focus on encouraging students.	3.91	3.89	3.90
14. Responsibility and Choice: Candidate provides students with opportunities to make responsible decisions	3.91	3.69	3.80
15. Warmth and Support: Candidate creates a classroom where the students know that the teacher cares	3.94	3.91	3.93
Culture, Family and Community			
16. Cultural Appreciation: Candidate demonstrates empathy and tolerance in matter's that concern students' cultural background.	3.89	3.49	3.69
17. Cultural Connections: Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.77	3.31	3.54
18. Cultural Engagement: Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.77	3.37	3.57
19. Family Connections: Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' families.	3.66	NA*	NA*

³ 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>)

Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring 2024			
SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
20. Family Engagement: Candidate encourages engagement between school experiences and students' families.	3.66	NA*	NA*
21. Community Connections: Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' communities.	3.69	NA*	NA*
22. Community Engagement: Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' communities.	3.66	NA*	NA*
*EPP-Based Clinical Educators typically do not have opportunity to observe these behaviors.			

Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring 2023			
SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
Insight			
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
Critical Thinking Connection			
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
Mindset			
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

Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring 2023			
SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
6. Cooperative Learning: Facilitates students working together toward a collective goal in accomplishing an instructional task.	3.97	3.81	3.97
7. Classroom Discussions: Encourages students and fellow teachers to dialogue about content.	3.74	3.65	3.74
8. Self-Assessment and Self-Reflection: Facilitates students actively thinking about their own work.	3.81	3.58	3.81
9. Balanced Instruction: Uses multiple instructional strategies.	3.87	3.71	3.87
10. Academic Press and Expectations: Candidate provides meaningful and challenging work and believes that all students can accomplish rigorous work.	3.84	3.61	3.84
11. Competence Building: Candidate helps develop students' social-emotional skills through the typical instruction cycle.	3.87	3.74	3.87
Social Teaching Practices⁴			
12. Student-Centered Discipline: Candidate's disciplinary strategies are developmentally appropriate for students.	3.74	3.81	3.74
13. Candidate Language: The candidate talks to students with a focus on encouraging students.	3.97	3.84	3.97
14. Responsibility and Choice: Candidate provides students with opportunities to make responsible decisions	3.94	3.61	3.94
15. Warmth and Support: Candidate creates a classroom where the students know that the teacher cares	3.97	3.87	3.97
Culture, Family and Community			
16. Cultural Appreciation: Candidate demonstrates empathy and tolerance in matter's that concern students' cultural background.	3.90	3.71	3.90
17. Cultural Connections: Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.71	3.45	3.71
18. Cultural Engagement: Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.68	3.45	3.68

⁴ 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>)

Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring 2023			
SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)	School-Based Clinical Educator (n=32)	EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=31)	Average
19. Family Connections: Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' families.	3.68	NA*	NA*
20. Family Engagement: Candidate encourages engagement between school experiences and students' families.	3.74	NA*	NA*
21. Community Connections: Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' communities.	3.74	NA*	NA*
22. Community Engagement: 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 (including the class of 2024), with EDUC 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 (Meets Expectation) 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 made 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 (Alumnae) 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://753a0706.flowpaper.com/INTASCLearningProgressionsforTeachers/#page=1>). 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 2019 and 2023 had been collected; data collection for the classes of 2020 and 20224 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

Survey instructions and results are shown below.

For each item, please indicate which one of the following that best reflects your knowledge and skills that area.

1. **Beginning/Not Prepared** – I do not believe I was well prepared in this area, and I require a lot of assistance.
2. **Developing/Somewhat Prepared** – I believe I was somewhat prepared in this area. With some assistance and support, I performed at expected level.
3. **Proficient/Prepared** – I believe I was prepared in this area and performed at expected level with minimal or no support.
4. **Outstanding/Well Prepared** – I believe I was well prepared, and I brought an expertise in this area to my employer.

Completer Satisfaction One-Year and Five-Year Survey Results					
Completer Satisfaction	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). 2023 data collected Spring 2024 on 2019 (5-year) and 2023 (1-year) completers	Elementary and Secondary Combined			
		Year	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice
		2023(1)	3.43	3.39	3.33
		2022(1)	3.35	3.39	3.41
		2021(1)	2.83	2.73	2.68
		2019(5)	3.37	3.44	3.41
		2018(5)	3.00	2.83	3.00
		2017(5)	3.89	3.88	3.80

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

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
		2023-2024 (N=47)	2% (1)	47% (22)	51% (24)
		2022-2023 (N=61)	2% (1)	41% (25)	59% (36)
		2021-2022 (N=66)	5% (3)	53% (35)	42% (29)

Completer/Licensure Rate

Licensure Rate	Teacher License Lookup for Indiana https://license.doe.in.gov/public_data/educator_licenses/		Three Year Trends for Licenses					
		YEAR	Program	N	Indiana	Other	Percentage	Not Reported
		2023-2024	Elementary	13*	11	1 Ohio	87	2
			Secondary/P-12	11	8			3
		2022-2023	Elementary	15*	12		79	0
			Secondary/P-12	18	14			0
		2021-2022	Elementary	8	5	AZ:1 IL: 4	75	6
			Secondary/P-12	13	11			1

*One completer in this count opted to pursue a non-licensure track.

**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.

7. Employment Rate.	One-Year Out. As reported by College Institutional Research Office and Career Crossings Office (Graduates 2019-2023)	Education Employed Full Time: 86.7% (College 69.2%) Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 35.6% (College 37.4%) Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 100.0% (College 92.0%)
	Five-Years Out. As reported by College Institutional Research Office and Career Crossings Office (Graduates 2013-2018)	Education Employed Full Time: 97.5% (College 88.7%) Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 59.5% (College 52.1%) Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 97.6% (College 95.3%)

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 0% as of 2025*
*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 items to those included in the principal survey. Our principal survey yielded positive data, on a scale of 1-4 with four being high, the average response to the impact on learning question

was question was 3.67 for the class of 2019 and 3.50 for the class of 2023. Similar results were obtain from our alumnae survey, with the average response to the impact on learning impact question being 3.83 for the class of 2019 and 3.67 for the class of 2023. All seven of the possible data sources were chosen by graduates as those that graduates based their responses on; five of seven data sources were cited by principals. Our pretest-posttest research also yielded positive results. Positive growth was demonstrated by each of the four graduates' students during the 2022-2023 academic year from pretest to posttest with intervening instruction. Similar results were obtained from one graduate in 2024-2025.

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

The Indiana Supervisor Report for 2023-2024. 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* (44%), with the majority receiving ratings of *Highly Effective* (56%). Data can be retrieved at <https://www.in.gov/doe/files/2023-2024-Evaluation-Rating-ER-Data.xlsx>, see the institution tab of the spreadsheet.

Regarding employer (Saint Mary's Principal Survey) evaluations, on a scale of 1-4 with four being high, averages for Learner and Learning were 3.31(2023) and 3.67 (2019), Content Knowledge were 3.40 (2023) and 3.67 (2019), Instructional Practice were 3.25 (2023) and 3.56 (2019), and Professional Responsibility were 3.38(2023) and 3.67 (2019). For the two cohorts measured (2019 and 2023) higher averages were consistently 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 2023-2024 outcomes of all Saint Mary's graduates being rated *Effective* or *Highly Effective*.

We had very robust involvement from our Partners in Education Council in our accreditation efforts. During fall 2024 semester, numerous members of the council participated in our CAEP Self Study and visit to provide corroboratory evidence for our submitted self-study.

Similar to our Partners in Education, during the fall 2024 semester numerous members of our Teacher Education Council participated in our CAEP Self Study and visit to provide corroboratory evidence for our submitted self-study.

Outcome Measures:

Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3)

For the class of 2024, with the exception of Elementary Education: Math & Science, reported scores for licensure examinations have acceptable to high pass rates between 90% and 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 2024 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 (3.43), Content Knowledge (3.39), Instructional Practice (3.33) and Professional Responsibility (3.73).

Alumnae evaluations are largely consistent with the principal evaluations; respective averages for the class of 2023 for principals and alumnae were Learner & Learning (3.31, 3.43), Content Knowledge (3.40, 3.39), Instructional Practice (3.25, 3.33), and Professional Responsibility (3.38, 3.73).

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 2023-2024 (2%, 49 enrolled, 1 withdrew) is consistent with 2022-2023 (2%, 49 enrolled, 1 withdrew) and lower than the 5.0% attrition rate in 2021-2022 (66 enrolled, 2 withdrew). However, rates for all three years remain relatively low with all seniors successfully completing their programs in 2024. Moreover, 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 increased with the class of 2024, with 87% of graduates obtaining licensure. This was higher than observed for 2023 graduates (79%) who had a higher licensure than 2021 graduates (75%). This three-year trend is positive. Faculty continue to emphasize the value of obtaining Indiana licensure in terms of maximizing marketability.

Data on employment are current through 2023. The education full-time employment rate for the first year is 86.7%, higher than the college in general (69.2%); this trend continues at the five-year mark at 97.5% (general 88.7%). Completers employed full time or enrolled in graduate school was 100% for one-year graduates and was 97.6% at 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 three year loan default rate, which is of 0% as of 2025 (institution wide, data are not available just for education). Past rates were 1.1% (2019) and 1.2% (2018).

Appendix ASMC EDU Measurement of Graduates' Impact on P-12 Learning Research Rubric

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.					