

# 2019 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	18117	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	3570
<b>Institution:</b>	Notre Dame College		
<b>Unit:</b>	Division of Professional Education		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup> 94

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)<sup>2</sup> 40

**Total number of program completers** 134

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?**

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements \_\_\_\_\_
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.7 Change in state program approval \_\_\_\_\_

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

**Link:** <https://www.notredamecollege.edu/academics/academic-divisions/education;>  
<https://www.notredamecollege.edu/about/Consumer-Information>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Ohio Teacher Evaluation System report (4.1, 4.2), Ohio Principal Evaluation System report (4.1, 4.2), Ohio Educator and Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates (ability of completers to meet licensing requirements), Value-Added Data (4.1, 4.2), Demographic Information from Value-Added Data, Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results (4.4, A.4.2), Statewide Survey of Ohio Resident Educators' Reflections on their EPP (4.4, 4.2), Principal Intern Survey Results (4.4., A.4.2), Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results (4.3, A.4.1), Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results (4.3, A.4.1), Teacher Residency Program (ability to be hired in educational positions), Consumer Information

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?  
 Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?  
 Are benchmarks available for comparison?  
 Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

The numbers of admitted, enrolled, and completing candidates have decreased in the past three years. This is a trend that we hear from other colleges in Ohio, so we are not overly concerned that it reflects a deficiency in our division. In fact, an analysis of the data gathered in the most recent metrics report through the Ohio Department of Higher Education indicates a unit that is thriving and growing. We earned CAEP accreditation in November 2018 with no stipulations; we will be one of the first institutions to offer the new P-5 license in Ohio, per the change in grade band; we have streamlined the MMIS program to meet new requirements from the state concerning the teaching of Positive Behavior Intervention and Support as well as legal and ethical issues in special education; we have embedded trauma informed instruction in a number of courses; our new Director of School and Community Partnerships has created more MOUs with neighboring schools and districts; and we have made a concerted effort to provide instruction in inclusion and diversity. We are also taking steps to maintain our relationships with area Educators Rising programs for recruiting purposes, and have created a Teacher Education Student Association to assist with retention. Our average first time pass rates on the special education licensure exam are at 78% which is lower than we want them to be. In order to support candidates, we have offered test-taking workshops and revised courses to meet the objectives on the exams. We continue to have a higher percentage of Caucasian females than either males or African American students. Our numbers of Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, and mixed race students remain small. Our intention in the current recruiting efforts is to change

these numbers, and continue to plan strategies to bring more diversity to our candidate population. Scores on the Professional Knowledge licensure tests on the Ohio Assessments for Educators across programs are high, averaging 85% and above. Similarly, average licensure scores on content exams in early childhood, middle childhood content areas, and AYA content areas show averages of 85% and above. The Value-Added information over the past three years indicates a steady percentage of 10% of our completers achieving at the most effective level. In the past year, our averages in the above average and average categories were higher than the last cycle; we had fewer completers receiving approaching average scores; but our least effective scores increased. A possible clue to these statistics is that a significant number of completers (25%) teach in high poverty schools, and an even larger number (59%) teach in high minority schools where test scores are often lower due to socioeconomic factors. Thirty-seven percent of our completers are in schools that receive grades of F for their Value-Added data. We encourage our candidates to teach in underserved areas, and this tendency for our candidates to work in areas of need affects their professional evaluations from the state. The information that we have on our website from the state only reflects completers who teach in community or public schools. Many of our completers get jobs in private and parochial schools within a year after graduation. We unfortunately do not have hard data for this, but we are apprised of completers' successes through electronic communications and phone calls. The college's Alumni Association is working to help us track completers more carefully through exit interviews and alumni communications. We have little information on our principal interns and completers due to a low N. We also know from our data that the average GPAs for undergraduate and graduate admits, enrollees, and completers is well above CAEP's 3.0 criteria. In the past year, the average GPA for undergraduate admissions was 3.1, and for graduates it was 3.6; the average GPA for undergraduate enrollees was 3.4 and for graduates it was 3.7; and the average GPA for undergraduate and graduate completers was 3.7. If candidates struggle academically, they are provided with Action Plans that are monitored by advisors. For students who struggle with dispositions that are necessary for success in P-12 classrooms, we have provided a non-licensure track so that they can graduate with a degree in education but they do not complete student teaching or sit for licensure exams. Our Pre-Service Surveys through the state indicate high averages between 3.0 and 4.0 on all items, and our averages are similar to those across the state. In the past, we have noticed that our Resident Educators Surveys showed slightly less satisfaction with the program than those from pre-service candidates when they were still in the program. Scores from this year, however, tell a different story. There were significant gains in the following areas: The EPP prepared candidates to 1) identify instructional strategies appropriate for different content areas, 2) use assessment data to inform instruction, 3) communicate with caregivers, 4) follow legal and ethical codes, 5) understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences, 6) use technology to enhance teaching and learning, and 6) understand RESA, Value-Added, the Ohio Revised Code, and the Code of Professional Ethics. There were also significant gains in resident educators' perceptions of the EPP's ability to 1) provide field experiences in a variety of settings, 2) work with diverse peers, 3) integrate diversity-related subject matter within courses, 4) allow candidates to voice their concerns, and 5) prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to enter the classroom as Resident Educators. This is the first time in five years that the Resident Educator Survey scores have shown progress and either as much or more satisfaction with the EPP as the pre-service candidates. One other important piece of data from the state concerns the persistence levels of Resident Educators. Over the past five years, our completers have shown a 100% persistence rate in Year 1, Year 2, and Year 4 with a 94.7% persistence rate in Year 3. All of this information will be assessed at the annual Assessment Retreat in May of this year. At that time, we will work with state and local data in the form of capstone assessments and disposition assessments to determine new goals for the 2019-2020 year. We will be launching the new early childhood curriculum in the fall as well as a graduate certificate in teaching children with autism. In an effort to recruit candidates into the online courses, we are piloting a blend of synchronous and asynchronous meetings to better meet the needs of working adults and distance learners. The college has partnered with Learning House in recruiting efforts, as well, and they have been charged with the recruitment of diverse students. We inducted 15 undergraduate candidates into Pi Lambda Theta this year for excellence in scholarship and teaching. Our faculty are dedicated to the mission of the college and the unit to teach students for personal, professional, and global responsibility.

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

### CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

#### 1 Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

**The EPP does not sufficiently demonstrate its candidates' ability to apply content and pedagogical knowledge. (component 1.3)**

The major concern in this area was the lack of a valid and reliable instrument for evaluating student teachers in the field. To address this issue, the division has adopted edTPA which is being locally scored until such time as the state of Ohio deems it a substitute for the professional knowledge test that is currently used in Ohio Assessments for Educators. The Division of Professional Education has created a Maker Space and demonstration classroom complete with a Smartboard, 3-D printer, 3-D printing pens, die cutter, laminator, and materials so that candidates can participate in hands-on teaching demonstrations within an authentic teaching environment. This room will be used for in-class model teaching and for field experiences in which P-12 students from the community will come to the campus for tutoring and instruction. Capstone assessments have been revised and there is now more consistent use of Tk20 so that reports of candidates' application of content and pedagogical knowledge can be reported and interpreted. Field experiences are more closely monitored using a data base to track placements. The new Director of School and Community Partnerships has established more training sessions for candidates and clinical supervisors, and Edthema videos are being used to livestream teaching and to observe and evaluate recorded teaching sessions in the field. Faculty provide time-stamped feedback to candidates on the videos for immediate assessment.

### CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

#### 2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

**The EPP does not adequately co-construct clinical arrangements with its partners. (component 2.1)**

The office of School Partnerships and Community Outreach has established MOUs with three area schools to provide a structured field experience for the first education course that candidates take. These schools are providing free BCI/FBI background checks and experience working in Title I programs. Since July 1, 2018, 23 partnerships have been renewed or developed. School partners have expressed mutually beneficial experiences. New partnerships will continue to be added, including one Montessori community school in an underserved area in Cleveland, Ohio. In the new MOUs, it is made clear that the Division of Professional Education will also provide professional development for area teachers. Teachers in parochial schools in the Cleveland diocese are going to receive tuition discounts beginning in fall 2019. A new partnership with an upper elementary school situated next to the college has resulted in a strong relationship between candidates in a diagnosis and intervention in reading class and students in an after-school program that is sponsored by the YMCA. Our candidates provide reading assessments and case study reports that can be used by the classroom teachers in the school to help them better understand their students' strengths and needs. This school has also provided free BCI/FBI background checks as well as reference letters for each of the candidates.

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)**

4 Program Impact

**The EPP's plan will not yield sufficient data to fully demonstrate that employers of completers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for working with P-12 students. (component 4.3)**

The persistence data that was described in an earlier section of this report indicates a strong message that our Resident Educators stay in their positions for the first four years of teaching. If they were not succeeding, the data would show lower persistence rates. The Office of School Partnerships and Community Relations regularly receives requests for our candidates if there are teaching positions to fill. We need to start collecting more data for these requests. The division is planning to conduct focus groups and case studies in the coming year in order to collect qualitative data concerning employers' satisfaction with completers. We are unlikely to be able to collect quantitative information due to the reluctance of principals to divulge that information, but we hope that the data we do collect will reveal useful feedback on employer satisfaction.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

*The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.*

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

**6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.**

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The Division of Professional Education holds an annual Assessment Retreat in May to review licensure exam data, state surveys, Value-Added data, persistence reports, capstone reports, and any other measurable data that was collected during the year to monitor the progress of the teacher candidates and the division itself. Since we went through our CAEP visit in April 2018, we did not hold our usual retreat, but focused on the CAEP report which we received after the visit instead. Areas for improvement have been considered and actions have been taken. To date, in response to the AFI for demonstrating candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge, the division has adopted edTPA as the evaluation tool for student teachers instead of the former Impact or Student Learning Project that did not have the required validity and reliability measures required by CAEP. The edTPA comes with established measures. We have also begun to assess candidates' skills in reading, writing, and math through Accuplacer tests which are provided by the College Board and which also have established levels of reliability and validity. These tests are used at the time of admission to the division. Candidates who score below the 50th percentile are required to retake the test and may be put on an Action Plan that includes special tutoring in the college's Dwyer Learning Center. Candidates who continue to score low will be counseled out of the division. The second area for improvement had to do with the lack of evidence for reciprocal collaboration between the college and its P-12 partners. The Director of School and Community Partnerships has established new memoranda of understanding with area schools and districts from which members are chosen for a newly reinstated Advisory Board. This group considers assessments and curricula that are either effective or need improvement. One area of concern was that candidates were calling schools to find their own field and clinical placements. The director has rectified this by making sure that candidates understand the process and complete the correct forms before they are placed in schools. This has led to much better communication between the college and its partners. Another project related to this area for improvement involved a new partnership with Greenview Upper Elementary School which is adjacent to the college campus. Teacher candidates have begun serving as volunteer tutors in the after school program run by the YMCA. Books have been donated to the school for use in the school's "Book Nook" for independent reading, and tutors have assessed students in reading, providing valuable data for classroom teachers. The final area for improvement has to do with the division's inability to gather data from our completers' employers. While the Ohio Department of Higher Education sends out a survey to collect this information every year, the number of returns is too low to provide any useful data. The division is planning on creating focus groups and case studies in partner schools to discover qualitative information about our completers' performance. We have been unable to acquire access to quantitative data but we can use the Value-Added, teacher evaluation, and persistence data that is provided through the state. The division collects reports from candidates' capstones in graduate and undergraduate courses using Tk20 that give us a picture of candidates' performance on professional and state standards. Faculty, both full-time and adjunct, review the data and explore strengths and weaknesses that need to be addressed. Action steps are planned and the data is reviewed again in the next cycle. For example, data showed that field experience candidates in ED 342/343, Integrated Instructional Methods, were struggling with extending instruction and differentiation. Rubrics were updated and more intensive progress monitoring has been planned. Also, the division adopted the Edthena platform for recording teaching demonstrations in the field so that faculty members can provide time-stamped feedback on particular areas like differentiation and set commitments, or goals, for candidates to achieve based on the observations. To date, the survey feedback from candidates and faculty members concerning the use of Edthena has been positive (4.7/5.0) and the unit will continue to monitor the capstone results to ensure that the concerns have been met. Another aid for instruction that was adopted this year was the use of Educational Impact videos to provide focused instruction in an accessible format in particular areas such as differentiation and extending instruction using the Danielson and Marzano models. Response to these videos has been positive and they are being embedded in more courses. Results of feedback surveys for both technology additions will be assessed at the Assessment Retreat in May.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  CAEP\_Action\_Report.pdf
-  ED\_342\_AD\_Fall\_2018\_Capstone\_Report.xlsx
-  ED\_655\_Fall\_2017\_Capstone\_Report.xlsx
-  4\_\_5\_Progression\_Report.xlsx
-  Division\_minutes\_October\_3\_2018.docx
-  Assessment\_Retreat\_Agenda\_2019.docx

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.

**I am authorized to complete this report.**

### Report Preparer's Information

Name:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

 **Acknowledge**