

**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

II. CAEP Accountability Measure 2: Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Impact Measure)..... 7

    IDOE Supervisor Performance Observation Evaluations of Completer Effectiveness..... 7

    Saint Mary’s Principal Survey ..... 9

    Partners in Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement)..... 10

    Teacher Education Council (Stakeholder Involvement)..... 11

    Interprofessional Education (IPE) Initiative..... 12

    Formation of the Strategic Science of Reading (SoR) Initiative Committee & Speech Language Pathology Initiative ..... 12

III. CAEP Accountability Measure 3: Candidate competency at program completion (Outcome Measure)..... 14

    Elementary Education Licensure Examinations..... 14

    Secondary Education Licensure Examinations ..... 18

    Art/Music P-12 Education Licensure Examinations ..... 19

    Student-Teaching Rubric..... 19

    Student-Teaching Dispositions Rubric ..... 21

    Social and Emotional Learning ..... 23

    Assurance that Candidates Understand the Expectations of the Profession..... 29

    Assurance of Content Knowledge and Teaching Effectiveness Prior to Recommendation for Licensure ..... 30

    Completer Satisfaction (Alumnae) Survey..... 31

IV. CAEP Accountability Measure 4: Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared (Outcome Measure)..... 34

    Completer/Graduation Rate ..... 34

    Completer/Licensure Rate ..... 34

Alumnae Employment Survey ..... 35

Student Loan Default Rate for Saint Mary’s College ..... 35

V. Discussion..... 35

Impact Measures:..... 35

    Completer effectiveness and Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component R4.1) ..... 35

    Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement (Components R4.2, R5.3)..... 36

Outcome Measures: ..... 36

    Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3) ..... 36

    Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have been prepared ..... 37

**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 two separate measures of our graduates’ impact on P-12 learning: (1) Principal Survey of Impact on Student Learning and (2) Graduate Self Evaluation of Impact on Student Learning. Invitations to complete both of these instruments are distributed during the spring semester to respective stakeholders for the previous year’s graduates (2024) and graduates who are five years out from graduation (2020).

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			
(Below Expectation) 1	(Developing) 2	(Meets Expectation) 3	(Exceeds Expectation) 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)

In the data reported here, because of low populations, P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity. During the spring of 2025 we received eight responses from the class of 2020 (seven elementary and one secondary), and 12 responses from the class of 2024 (six elementary and six secondary/P-12) on the learning impact question. On a scale of 1-4 with four being high, the response to the impact on learning question was 3.67 (3.57 elementary and 4.00 secondary/P-12) for the class of 2020 and 3.16 (2.83 elementary and 3.50 secondary/P-12 Music) for the class of 2024. Data sources identified by the principal for the classes of 2020 the class of 2024 were 1-7 above. Both sets of numbers demonstrated a positive impact and useful information sources. We are pleased that modifying our data collection procedures to increase response rate (see Section II Saint Mary’s Principal Survey for a more detailed discussion) has positively impacted our response rate. Further, our results are intuitive, with graduates' ratings increasing from year one to year five, indicating they continue to build on their experiences.

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)

In the data reported here, because of low populations, where necessary P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity. During the spring of 2025 we received 14 responses from the class of 2020 (11 elementary and three secondary/P-12), and 14 responses from the class of 2024 (nine elementary and five secondary/P-12) on the learning impact question. On a scale of 1-4 with

four being high, the response to the impact on learning question was 3.64 (3.73 elementary and 3.33 secondary/P-12) for the class of 2020 and 3.43 (3.56 elementary and 3.20 secondary/P-12 Music) for the class of 2024. Data sources identified by the classes of 2020 the class of 2024 were 1-7 above. Both sets of numbers demonstrated a positive impact and useful information sources. We are pleased that modifying our data collection procedures led to an increase response rate. (see Section III Saint Mary's Completer Satisfaction Survey for a more detailed discussion).

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

The Saint Mary's Education Department employs two measures for this accountability measure: *Indiana Department of Education Supervisor Performance Ratings* and the *Saint Mary's Principal Survey*.

IDOE Supervisor Performance Observation Evaluations of Completer Effectiveness

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) requires all school corporations to conduct annual performance evaluations for teachers and report the results of those evaluations disaggregated by Educator Preparation Provider (<https://www.in.gov/doi/educators/educator-evaluations/>). These data must include supervisor observations of performance but are not required to be based on student performance. Data can be retrieved at [2023-2024 Evaluation Ratings \(ER\) Data](#), see the institution tab of the spreadsheet.

<p><b>Observations of teaching effectiveness: Indiana Supervisor Report</b></p>	<p>Review of IDOE Teacher Evaluations</p> <p>A <b>Highly Effective</b> teacher consistently exceeds expectations. This is a teacher who has demonstrated excellence, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Aggregate principal/supervisor evaluation scores for St. Mary's first through third year teachers:</p> <p>2023-2024 (N=16)                      56% Highly Effective                      44% Effective</p>
	<p>An <b>Effective</b> teacher consistently meets expectations. This is a teacher who has consistently met expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes.</p> <p>A teacher who is rated as <b>Improvement Necessary</b> requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations. This is a teacher who an evaluator has determined to require improvement in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>2022-2023 (N=26)                      76% Highly Effective                      21% Effective                      3% Needs Improvement</p> <p>2021-2022 (N=146)**                      72% Highly Effective                      28% Effective</p> <p>2020-2021 (N=146)**                      72% Highly Effective                      28% Effective</p> <p>2019-2020 (N=143)                      70% Highly Effective                      30% Effective</p>

	<p>An <b>Ineffective</b> teacher consistently fails to meet expectations. This is a teacher who has failed to meet expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes (Indiana Teacher Evaluation: Public Law 90).</p>	
<p>* At the time of this document’s publication, 2023-2024 data was the most current available. **Numbers were identical in two different reports. Other institutions listed in the same reports did not have the same numbers reported. For instance, University of Southern Indiana’s report totals were 1947 evaluatees in the 2020-2021 report and 1954 in 2021-2022 report.</p>		

Saint Mary’s Principal Survey

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

(<https://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. In the data reported here, because of low populations, where necessary, P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity.

Impact Measure	Source	Elementary					
		Year (N)	Science of Reading	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 2025 on class of 2024 (1year) and 2020 (5- year) completers. We have updated our survey to address Science of Reading (SoR) at the elementary level. We anticipate further modifications as more information regarding candidate expectations at the secondary level becomes available.	2024(6)	2.78	2.80	2.92	2.90	3.17
		2020(1)	3.33	3.50	3.50	3.33	4.00
		Secondary/P-12					
		Year (N)	Science of Reading	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
		2024(6)	NA	3.42	3.58	3.43	3.58
		2020(5)	NA	4.00	3.50	3.20	3.50

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. During the fall 2025 our EPP was preparing for our Science of Reading (SoR) review and site visit. "The science of reading refers to a body of research from the fields of education, cognitive psychology, developmental psychology, and neuroscience, that explains how individuals learn how to read and best practices for reading instruction"<sup>1</sup>. As such, all teacher preparation programs are mandated to expand the breadth and depth of their curricula to align with new and emerging literacy standards that support SoR. The initial mandates were for the elementary level but are expanding to include secondary and P-12 education. Similar to our CAEP site visit, a number of our Partners in Education members participated in focus groups and hosted student-teachers who were delivering SoR focused lessons in P-12 settings. Some of these participants were also Saint Mary's Alumnae. We received successful rating for our SoR review attributable in many ways to our Partners in Education. Our intent is to convene a PIE meeting during the fall 2026 semester to share and discuss data from the assessments.

#### 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Indiana Department of Education. *The Science of Reading*. <https://www.in.gov/doi/files/3-science-reading.pdf>

- ◆ 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.

#### Interprofessional Education (IPE) Initiative

Drs. Dan Applegate and Insook Chung have been actively involved in an interprofessional education (IPE) committee that brings together faculty from nursing, social work, speech pathology, psychology, and education. This group meets regularly to design, implement, and refine a semester-based simulation experience for its departments' students similar to what they may encounter during their future careers. The committee has implemented multiple interprofessional simulation events. Each event centers on a scripted simulation involving a P–12 student (elementary or secondary) who has experienced a medical trauma. Students from each discipline collaborate to develop a coordinated plan addressing needs across the home, school, and care settings. Faculty from participating departments design and enact the simulation, while additional faculty from the represented disciplines are invited to observe and provide structured feedback. Following each event, we collect student feedback, engage in formal debriefing sessions, and hold planning meetings to review outcomes and make targeted adjustments to the simulation structure, content, and expectations. These iterative revisions are directly informed by faculty and student input and are intended to strengthen interprofessional collaboration skills that are essential for effective practice in P–12 educational settings. While this work is not typical of the Teacher Education Council's work of collaboration on curricular matters, it does represent sustained, documented collaboration across departments that support P–12 and secondary education, along with a clear cycle of implementation, feedback, reflection, and improvement. Further, it fosters collaboration and continuous improvement of candidates' learning opportunities in professional education.

#### Formation of the Strategic Science of Reading (SoR) Initiative Committee & Speech Language Pathology Initiative

Dr. Higgs-Coulthard, the Elementary Literacy Specialist in the Department of Education, recruited a team of six program stakeholders to serve on the Strategic SoR Initiative Committee. Committee members were invited based on their prior involvement with the program, their current level of knowledge related to SoR, and their willingness and availability to serve as a resource. In addition to Dr. Higgs-Coulthard, who served as chair, the committee included the following members: Ryan Towner, principal of Walt Disney Elementary School, Penn-Harris-Madison School District; Amanda Choinacky, principal of Madison STEAM Academy, South Bend Community School Corporation; Katie Carroll, Reading Specialist at Walt Disney Elementary School, Penn-Harris-Madison School District; Emily Cress, Saint Mary's Education program alumna and elementary teacher at Madison STEAM Academy, South Bend Community School Corporation; Dr. Marjorie Schaeffer, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychological Sciences; and Dr. Susan Latham, Associate Professor, Department of Speech Language Pathology at Saint Mary's College.

The purpose of the committee was to explore and evaluate curricular alignment with SoR, connect with resources and personnel in the local school district, identify training opportunities to support faculty, and make recommendations for an ASRI implementation grant proposal. Under Dr. Higgs-Coulthard's leadership, this committee met on several occasions to develop a shared understanding of SoR concepts and to share successful approaches to structured literacy within their individual contexts. Additionally, the committee examined relevant course syllabi and made recommendations for changes that would better align the curriculum with SoR tenets and comply with Indiana HEA 1558.

Drs. Higgs-Coulthard and Latham also attended the three-day Wilson Reading System Introductory Training in June 2023 to gather information and materials and assess the program's appropriateness for supporting Saint Mary's integration of Science of Reading. Again, having two faculty members at the same event facilitated cross-disciplinary support and the opportunity to deepen and extend learning. Dr. Higgs-Coulthard integrated materials from this training into her EDUC 304 Methods for Teaching Reading course revision for Fall 2023. The ASRI Implementation Grant Proposal includes further training for Dr. Latham in Wilson Reading Systems so that she can serve as a resource for the Education courses, integrate the material into her courses, and potentially design inter-departmental collaborations among our students.

**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**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Number Taking Test</b>	<b>Number Passing Test</b>	<b>Pass Rate (%)</b>
<b>All program completers, 2024-25</b>	21	20	95
<b>All program completers, 2023-24</b>	20	17	85
<b>All program completers, 2022-23</b>	27	26	96

**Title 2 Licensure Assessment Pass Rates<sup>2</sup>**

**2024-2025 (Praxis)**

**Elementary Education 2024-2025**

<b>Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2025</b>				
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Number Attempting</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number Passing</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
Elementary K-6 5622 Principles of Learning and Teaching: grades K-6 (Passing 160)	17	181	17	100
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5007 Reading and Language Arts and Social Studies subtest (Passing 160)	15	178	15	10
Elementary Generalist Humanities subtest 5008 Math and Science subtest (Passing 158)	15	170	13	87

**2023-2024 (Praxis)**

**Elementary Education 2023-2024**

<b>Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2024</b>				
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Number Attempting</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number Passing</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**2022-2023 (Praxis)**

**Elementary Education 2022-2023**

<b>Praxis Elementary Examination Scores Class of 2023</b>				
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Number Attempting</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number Passing</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
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

**2023-2025 (Praxis)**

**Elementary Education Minors 2023-2025**

<b>Praxis Minor Examination Scores Classes of 2023-2025</b>				
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Number Attempting</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number Passing</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
5362 English To Speakers Of Other Languages (Passing 155)	4	NA	NA	NA
5543 Mild to Moderate Intervention (Passing 155)	3	NA	NA	NA

Secondary Education Licensure Examinations

**Secondary Education 2023-2025**

<b>Praxis Secondary Examination Scores Classes of 2023-2025</b>				
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Number Attempting</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number Passing</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
2025 Principles of Learning and Teaching 5624: grades 7-12 (Passing 157)	2	NA	NA	NA
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
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
2025 Mathematics (5165 Passing 159)	1	NA	NA	NA
2024 Mathematics (5165 Passing 159)	3	NA	NA	NA
2023 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
2025 World and US History 5941: Content Knowledge (Passing 148)	1	NA	NA	NA
2023 World and US History 5941: Content Knowledge (Passing 148)	2	NA	NA	NA

Art/Music P-12 Education Licensure Examinations

**P-12 Education 2023-2025**

<b>Praxis P-12 (Art and Music) Examination Scores Classes of 2023-2025</b>				
<b>Examination</b>	<b>Number Attempting</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Number Passing</b>	<b>%Passing</b>
2025 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625 (Passing 157)	3	NA	NA	NA
2024 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625 (Passing 157)	3			
2023 Principals of Learning And Teaching Pre K-12 5625 (Passing 157)	2	NA	NA	NA
2024 Art: Content Knowledge 5134(Passing 158)	1	NA	NA	NA
2025 Music: Instrumental and General Knowledge 5115 (Passing 150)	1	NA	NA	NA
2024 Music: Instrumental and General Knowledge 5115 (Passing 150)	2	NA	NA	NA
2025 Music: Vocal and General Knowledge 5115 (Passing 150)	1	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 in all programs. 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. In the data reported here, because of low populations, P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity.

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

<b>Spring 2025 Field Study Evaluation Rubric: Step 3 Evaluation Summary Average Final Elementary (N=18)</b>	
<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator Average</b>
1. Student Growth and Development	3.92
2. Cultural Factors	3.81
3. Facilitation of Learning	3.89
4. Learning Environment and Learning	3.89
5. Engagement with Students	4.00
6. Planning and Delivery	3.75
7. Use of Technology	3.72
8. Assessment Design and Use of Data	3.56
9. Reading Knowledge Base	3.75
10. Planning Literacy Instruction	3.69
11. Content Knowledge Base	3.67
12. Creating Content Related Learning Experiences	3.72
13. Initiative in the Classroom	3.94
14. Attitude Toward Students and Learning	3.97
15. Professional Appearance	3.97
16. Adherence to Schedule	3.92
17. Professional Communication	3.89
18. Professional Ethics	3.28

<b>Spring 2025 Field Study Evaluation Rubric: Step 3</b> <b>Evaluation Summary Average Final Secondary/P-12 (N=6)</b>	
<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator Average</b>
1. Student Growth and Development	3.50
2. Cultural Factors	3.33
3. Facilitation of Learning	3.58
4. Learning Environment and Learning	3.42
5. Engagement with Students	3.58
6. Planning and Delivery	3.42
7. Use of Technology	3.42
8. Assessment Design and Use of Data	3.50
9. Reading Knowledge Base	3.50
10. Planning Literacy Instruction	3.25
11. Content Knowledge Base	3.67
12. Creating Content Related Learning Experiences	3.50
13. Initiative in the Classroom	3.58
14. Attitude Toward Students and Learning	3.75
15. Professional Appearance	4.00
16. Adherence to Schedule	3.75
17. Professional Communication	3.50
18. Professional Ethics	3.17

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. In the data reported here, because of low populations, P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity.

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

<b>Spring 2025 Step 3 SMC Dispositions Rating Scale: Student-Teaching Elementary (N=27)</b>	
<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator Average</b>
1. Showing respect for learners' differing strengths and needs	3.89
2. Having a commitment to learning about how learners develop	3.85
3. Believing that all learners can achieve	3.96
4. Having a commitment to learning about cultures and communities	3.63
5. Believing that the classroom environment greatly affects students' learning	3.78
6. Having a commitment to developing as a thoughtful and responsive member of the educational community	3.74
7. Recognizing that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts and appreciating multiple perspectives	3.74
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	3.81
9. Valuing knowledge outside the targeted content area as a vehicle to enhance student learning	3.70
10. Constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues	3.52
11. Viewing assessment as a tool for instructional decision making and understanding that learners have differing needs that may necessitate accommodations	3.74
12. Seeks data as evidence of student growth and learning	3.67
13. Respecting learners' diverse strengths and needs, and valuing planning as a collegial activity	3.74
14. Draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, standards, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy	3.81
15. Valuing multiple communication strategies, and deep understanding of and across content areas	3.74
16. Being committed to deepening awareness and understanding of learners' strengths and needs	3.85
17. Valuing self-directed learning, critical thinking, and professional growth	3.74
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	3.81
20. Being committed to life-long learning and initiating collaboration with learners, families, colleagues, and community members	3.81

<b>Spring 2025 Step 3 SMC Dispositions Rating Scale: Student-Teaching Secondary/P-12 (N=6)</b>	
<b>Rubric Criteria</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator Average</b>
1. Showing respect for learners' differing strengths and needs	3.83
2. Having a commitment to learning about how learners develop	3.67
3. Believing that all learners can achieve	3.83
4. Having a commitment to learning about cultures and communities	3.17
5. Believing that the classroom environment greatly affects students' learning	3.67
6. Having a commitment to developing as a thoughtful and responsive member of the educational community	3.50
7. Recognizing that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts and appreciating multiple perspectives	3.50
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	3.67
9. Valuing knowledge outside the targeted content area as a vehicle to enhance student learning	3.67
10. Constantly exploring how to use disciplinary knowledge as a lens to address local and global issues	3.33
11. Viewing assessment as a tool for instructional decision making and understanding that learners have differing needs that may necessitate accommodations	3.50
12. Seeks data as evidence of student growth and learning	3.33
13. Respecting learners' diverse strengths and needs, and valuing planning as a collegial activity	3.67
14. Draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, standards, cross-disciplinary skills and pedagogy	3.67
15. Valuing multiple communication strategies, and deep understanding of and across content areas	3.50
16. Being committed to deepening awareness and understanding of learners' strengths and needs	3.50
17. Valuing self-directed learning, critical thinking, and professional growth	3.50
18. Understanding the expectations of the profession including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant law and policy	3.67
19. Embracing the role of teacher as one of advocacy for learners and accountability for their success	3.67
20. Being committed to life-long learning and initiating collaboration with learners, families, colleagues, and community members	3.50

Social and Emotional Learning

The IDOE (2019) requires that education agencies have a plan for children's social, emotional, and behavioral health. Based on the CASEL model, IDOE

has identified seven competencies for Social Emotional Learning (SEL) that are essential for students that teachers need to instill or further develop:

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

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

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

---

<sup>3</sup> Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2018). *What is SEL?*, <https://casel.org/what-is-sel/>

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

At the conclusion of the student-teaching practicum, an SEL rubric is completed for each candidate by her EPP-Based Clinical Educator and School-Based Clinical Educator to assure SEL competency. Rubric criteria and average scores are provided in the 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.

In the data reported here, because of low populations, P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity. Variations in Ns are due some candidates completing more than one placement (e.g., elementary education and mild intervention).

<b>Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data Spring Elementary 2025</b>			
<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=26)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=18)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Insight</b>			
<b>1.</b> 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.	3.92	3.89	3.91
<b>2.</b> The ability to recognize and manage emotions, as well as build positive self-control, self-discipline, and impulse control.	3.92	3.89	3.91
<b>3.</b> The ability to work well with others, including in the group and teamwork environment, using positive communication and conflict management skills.	3.96	3.89	3.93
<b>Critical Thinking Connection</b>			
<b>4.</b> 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.	3.69	3.83	3.76
<b>Mindset</b>			

<b>Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data Spring Elementary 2025</b>			
<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=26)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=18)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>5.</b> 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.	3.92	3.83	3.88
<b>6. Cooperative Learning:</b> Facilitates students working together toward a collective goal in accomplishing an instructional task.	3.77	3.94	3.86
<b>7. Classroom Discussions:</b> Encourages students and fellow teachers to dialogue about content.	3.73	3.89	3.81
<b>8. Self-Assessment and Self-Reflection:</b> Facilitates students actively thinking about their own work.	3.77	3.83	3.80
<b>9. Balanced Instruction:</b> Uses multiple instructional strategies.	3.81	3.89	3.85
<b>10. Academic Press and Expectations:</b> Candidate provides meaningful and challenging work and believes that all students can accomplish rigorous work.	3.81	3.83	3.82
<b>11. Competence Building:</b> Candidate helps develop students’ social-emotional skills through the typical instruction cycle.	3.73	3.67	3.70
<b>Social Teaching Practices<sup>4</sup></b>			
<b>12. Student-Centered Discipline:</b> Candidate’s disciplinary strategies are developmentally appropriate for students.	3.73	3.94	3.84
<b>13. Candidate Language:</b> The candidate talks to students with a focus on encouraging students.	3.88	3.89	3.89
<b>14. Responsibility and Choice:</b> Candidate provides students with opportunities to make responsible decisions	3.88	3.89	3.89
<b>15. Warmth and Support:</b> Candidate creates a classroom where the students know that the teacher cares	3.88	3.94	3.91
<b>Culture, Family and Community</b>			
<b>16. Cultural Appreciation:</b> Candidate demonstrates empathy and tolerance in matter’s that concern students’ cultural background.	3.77	3.67	3.72

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from Supporting Students’ Social-Emotional Learning. Institute of Educational Sciences and the Indiana Department of Education (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/regions/midwest/pdf/training-and-coaching/Indiana-adult-SEL-webinar-508.pdf>)

<b>Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data Spring Elementary 2025</b>			
<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=26)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=18)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>17. Cultural Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.62	3.50	3.56
<b>18. Cultural Engagement:</b> Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.69	3.50	3.60
<b>19. Family Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' families.	3.58	NA*	NA*
<b>20. Family Engagement:</b> Candidate encourages engagement between school experiences and students' families.	3.58	NA*	NA*
<b>21. Community Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' communities.	3.62	NA*	NA*
<b>22. Community Engagement:</b> Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' communities.	3.58	NA*	NA*
*EPP-Based Clinical Educators typically do not have opportunity to observe these behaviors.			

<b>Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring Secondary/P-12 2024</b>			
<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=8)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=7)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Insight</b>			
<b>1.</b> 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.	3.71	3.25	3.91
<b>2.</b> The ability to recognize and manage emotions, as well as build positive self-control, self-discipline, and impulse control.	3.71	3.25	3.91
<b>3.</b> The ability to work well with others, including in the group and teamwork environment, using positive communication and conflict management skills.	3.71	3.75	3.93
<b>Critical Thinking Connection</b>			

<b>Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring Secondary/P-12 2024</b>			
<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=8)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=7)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>4.</b> 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.	3.57	3.50	3.76
<b>Mindset</b>			
<b>5.</b> 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.	3.71	3.50	3.88
<b>6. Cooperative Learning:</b> Facilitates students working together toward a collective goal in accomplishing an instructional task.	3.71	3.75	3.86
<b>7. Classroom Discussions:</b> Encourages students and fellow teachers to dialogue about content.	3.57	3.75	3.81
<b>8. Self-Assessment and Self-Reflection:</b> Facilitates students actively thinking about their own work.	3.57	3.25	3.80
<b>9. Balanced Instruction:</b> Uses multiple instructional strategies.	3.71	3.75	3.85
<b>10. Academic Press and Expectations:</b> Candidate provides meaningful and challenging work and believes that all students can accomplish rigorous work.	3.57	3.75	3.82
<b>11. Competence Building:</b> Candidate helps develop students’ social-emotional skills through the typical instruction cycle.	3.71	3.25	3.70
<b>Social Teaching Practices<sup>5</sup></b>			
<b>12. Student-Centered Discipline:</b> Candidate’s disciplinary strategies are developmentally appropriate for students.	3.57	3.25	3.84
<b>13. Candidate Language:</b> The candidate talks to students with a focus on encouraging students.	3.71	3.50	3.89
<b>14. Responsibility and Choice:</b> Candidate provides students with opportunities to make responsible decisions	3.71	3.75	3.89
<b>15. Warmth and Support:</b> Candidate creates a classroom where the students know that the teacher cares	3.71	3.75	3.91

<sup>5</sup> Adapted from Supporting Students’ Social-Emotional Learning. Institute of Educational Sciences and the Indiana Department of Education (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/regions/midwest/pdf/training-and-coaching/Indiana-adult-SEL-webinar-508.pdf>)

<b>Social and Emotional Learning Rubric Data spring Secondary/P-12 2024</b>			
<b>SEL Rubric Criterion (CAEP Alignment R1.1-R1.4)</b>	<b>School-Based Clinical Educator (n=8)</b>	<b>EPP-Based Clinical Educator (n=7)</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>Culture, Family and Community</b>			
<b>16. Cultural Appreciation:</b> Candidate demonstrates empathy and tolerance in matter's that concern students' cultural background.	3.43	3.50	3.72
<b>17. Cultural Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.43	3.50	3.56
<b>18. Cultural Engagement:</b> Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' cultural backgrounds.	3.43	3.25	3.60
<b>19. Family Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' families.	3.57	NA*	NA*
<b>20. Family Engagement:</b> Candidate encourages engagement between school experiences and students' families.	3.57	NA*	NA*
<b>21. Community Connections:</b> Candidate facilitates connections between school experiences and students' communities.	3.57	NA*	NA*
<b>22. Community Engagement:</b> Candidate facilitates engagement between school experiences and students' communities.	3.57	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 for each class average grades of 3.0 or over in both EDUC 230 and EDUC 356 over three years (including the class of 2025), 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 2020 and 2024 had been collected; data collection for the classes of 2021 and 20225 was in process. We received 14 responses from the class of 2020 (11 elementary and 3 secondary/P-12) and 14 responses from the class of 2024 (9 elementary and 5 secondary/P-12). In the data reported here, because of low populations, P-12 (Music and Art) graduates were combined with secondary candidates to assure candidate anonymity.

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	Source	Elementary					
	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). 2024 data collected Spring 2025 on 2020 (5-year) and 2024 (1-year) completers. We have updated our survey to address Science of Reading (SoR) at the elementary level. We anticipate further modifications as more information regarding candidate expectations at the secondary level becomes available.	Year (N)	Science of Reading	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility
2024(9)		3.04	3.61	3.52	3.53	3.63	
2020(11)		3.30	3.39	3.33	3.36	3.60	
Secondary/P-12							
Year (N)		Science of Reading	Learner & Learning	Content Knowledge	Instructional Practice	Professional Responsibility	
2024(5)		NA	3.45	3.47	3.40	3.80	
2020(3)		NA	3.33	3.00	3.25	3.44	

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

Completer/Graduation Rate

<b>Completer/Graduation Rate</b>	TITLE II AND STATE REPORTING Attrition: Candidates leaving programs before completion. Retention: Underclasswoman Completion: Graduates	<b>Rates as reported to TITLE II</b>			
		<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Attrition</b>	<b>Retention</b>	<b>Completion</b>
		<b>2024-2025 (N=45)</b>	7% (3)	42% (19)	51% (23)
		<b>2023-2024 (N=47)</b>	2% (1)	47% (22)	51% (24)
		<b>2022-2023 (N=61)</b>	2% (1)	41% (25)	59% (36)

Completer/Licensure Rate

<b>Licensure Rate</b>	Teacher License Lookup for Indiana <a href="https://license.doe.in.gov/public_data/educator_licenses/">https://license.doe.in.gov/public_data/educator_licenses/</a>	<b>Three Year Trends for Licenses</b>						
		<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Indiana</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Not Reported</b>
		<b>2023-2025</b>	Elementary	20*	19		96	1
			Secondary/P-12	3	3			0
		<b>2022-2024</b>	Elementary	15*	12		79	0
			Secondary/P-12	18	14			0
		<b>2021-2023</b>	Elementary	8	5	AZ:1 IL: 4	76	6
			Secondary/P-12	13	11			1

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

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. At the time of publication, the data reported below were the most current available. This document will be updated when more current data become available.

<b>7. Employment Rate.</b>	<b>One-Year Out</b> As reported by College Institutional Research Office and Career Crossings Office (Graduates 2020-2024)	Education Employed Full Time: 85.7% (College 69.9%) Education Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 40.0% (College 38.3%) Education Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 100% (College 93.3%)	35 Education responses 493 College responses
	<b>Five-Years Out</b> As reported by College Institutional Research Office and Career Crossings Office (Graduates 2016-2020)	Education Employed Full Time: 96.8% (College 89.0%) Education Enrolled or Completed Graduate School: 63.6% (College 54.5%) Education Employed Full Time or Enrolled GS: 97.0% (College 96.1%)	33 Education responses 513 College responses

Student Loan Default Rate for Saint Mary’s College

<b>8. Loan Default Rate</b>	HLC Report, SMC Financial Aid Office	The College loan three-year default rate was 0.2% as of 2026*
*This percentage has decreased from 2018 (1.2%) and 2019 (1.1%) but has risen slightly from our 2025 rate of 0%		

**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 two 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 2020 and 3.16 for the class of 2024. Similar results were obtain from our alumnae survey, with the average response to the impact on learning impact question being 3.65 for the class of 2020 and 3.43 for the class of 2024. All seven of the possible data sources were chosen by graduates as those that graduates based their responses on; the same was true for principals.

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

The Indiana Supervisor Report for 2023-2024 (the most current year available). 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/doi/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(2024) and 3.67 (2020), Content Knowledge were 3.40 (2024) and 3.67 (2020), Instructional Practice were 3.25 (2024) and 3.56 (2020), and Professional Responsibility were 3.38 (2024) and 3.67 (2020). 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. A number of these participants were also involved in our Science of Reading review and site visit. 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. This group will continue to be engaged as we enter into our SPA report data collection phase. We also had initiatives in interprofessional education and the Science of Reading that engaged stakeholders beyond the EPP and the college.

Outcome Measures:

Candidate competency at program completion (Component R3.3)

For the class of 2025, 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 2025 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 program completion 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 (2024) and five (2020) 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, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibility.

Alumnae evaluations are largely consistent with the principal evaluations. The majority of averages on both measures were between three and four with the exception of Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, and Instructional Practice on the principal survey completed on first year teachers. They ranged between 2.80 and 2.92. These averages were somewhat lower than graduates' self-evaluation scores, but still within an acceptable range for first-year teachers. It should be noted that because completion of these surveys is voluntary, the 2024 completers who were evaluated by principals were not necessarily those who completed self-evaluations.

#### 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 2024-2025 (7%, 45 enrolled, 3 withdrew) is slightly high than for 2023-2024 (2%, 47 enrolled, 1 withdrew) and 2022-2023 (2%, 61 enrolled, 1 withdrew). However, rates for all three years remain relatively low with an overwhelming majority of seniors successfully completing their programs. 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 2025, with 96% of graduates obtaining licensure. This was higher than observed for 2024 graduates (79%) who had a higher licensure than 2023 graduates (76%). 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 2024. The education full-time employment rate for the first year is 85.7%, higher than the college in general (69.9%); this trend continues at the five-year mark at 96.8% (general 89.0%). Completers employed full time or enrolled in graduate school was 100% for one-year graduates and was 97.0% 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.

Currently and historically we have a very low three year loan default rate, which is 0.2% as of 2026 (institution wide, data are not available just for education). Past rates were 1.1% (2019), 1.2% (2018), and .0% (2025).