

2016 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	10179	AACTE SID:	795
Institution:	Concordia University, Nebraska		
Unit:	Education Governance/Basic Programs		

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 2014-2015 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure

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.)

Total number of program completers 293

***2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.**

Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2014-2015 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 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

No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.

Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.

Entrance and Exit testing data, GPA data, Conceptual Framework self-evaluation data:
<http://wp.cune.edu/accreditation/2016-2/>

Section 6. 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.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	The unit lacks sufficient evidence that advanced candidate dispositions are assessed.	(ADV)
2.	The unit lacks sufficient evidence that advanced candidates can integrate technology in the performance of their duties.	(ADV)

1. The M.Ed. programs in the College of Graduate Studies and Adult Education have a self-evaluation placed in two strategic classes (EDUC 501 and SOC 565) within the assessment system built in Chalk and Wire. The two placements are positioned to demonstrate perceived growth in graduate students regarding the disposition statements. Data collection has begun with the first of the two courses (EDUC 501), the results will be compared to the second class (SOC 565) when it falls in the sequence of courses.

2. The use of technology for Early Childhood Education is still being developed as is appropriate to the goals and objectives of courses that focus on teaching young children. EDUC551 Curriculum & Design - In this class students will use online articles and websites to find ideas and data to support their writing. Students will review their district policy in purchasing technology. Students will use animated video from Youtube (Cognitive Media – Sir Ken Robinson). In EDUC551 students will be asked to share some of their favorite 21st Century tools, resources and apps with their classmates. In the literacy program many of our candidates include the use of technology in their classrooms. Several students write about using iPads to facilitate the writing process in their classroom. They have mentioned revising and peer editing works well with classroom technology. In addition, students have recommended several websites for their peers in relation to that week's particular topic. In my opinion the students that I have worked with are very comfortable with technology and have expressed that they use what is available to them in their school districts. In Special Education Students learn how to use an online Student Records System (SRS) to write, record and share required documents for services for students with disabilities (e.g. IEP, MDT, and Notification of Meetings).

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	The unit does not consistently analyze data for program and unit improvement.	(ITP)	(ADV)
2.	The unit does not involve the professional community in the development and evaluation of its assessment system.	(ITP)	(ADV)
3.	The unit does not systematically and comprehensively monitor candidate performance at transition points.		(ADV)

1. Department meetings are held after each semester to review the data from our annual assessment project and also to look at candidate progress based on the evaluations completed by faculty, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. All evaluations are aligned with our Conceptual Framework which is based on InTASC standards and Nebraska Department of Education requirements. The use of Chalk and Wire has provided data collection by course by program. The integration of Chalk and Wire began across all M.Ed. programs March 2, 2015. The first set of data from all M.Ed. program directors was collected for a January 31, 2016 deadline. Each M.Ed. program has an initial set of data for program assessment. A second set will be collected July 31, 2016.

2. The Education Governance Committee meets at least twice each academic year to review teacher education programs and to discuss evaluations and data collection. The committee consists of three members from the Teacher Education program, one member of the College of Arts and Sciences, two members who are practitioners in P-12 schools, and two teacher education candidates. With the continued implementation of Chalk and Wire, the use of an electronic portfolio continues to be in the forefront of discussion. The professional community has been heavily involved in each program to delineate the appropriate program assessment per course per artifact.

3. Entrance into the program requires a baccalaureate degree, entrance essay and minimum GPA. GPAs are monitored through the program. Program completion requires an exit portfolio with artifacts, a minimum GPA, and a content test for certification.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	Candidates do not have opportunities to interact with unit faculty who are racially diverse.	(ITP)	

2.	The unit does not assure that all candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students.	(ADV)
3.	Candidate proficiency related to diversity is not assessed.	(ADV)

1. Concordia continues to advertise and interview racially diverse candidates for open positions.
 2. The candidates' work in practicum experiences may be limited to the school where they are hire to teach. They may additionally be limited geographically to a rural homogeneous environment. The unit is unable to assure that all candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students due to the limiting factors of work placement, home placement, and time constraints of the work day.
 3. Similar to the response as to why candidates may not have an equal opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students, candidates may have a lack of opportunity to be assessed relating to proficiency in diversity.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway

Continuous Improvement. *Summarize progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected.*

Three years ago in 2013 the Nebraska Department of Education decided to form a Standard Student Teaching/Clinical Practice Evaluation Form, and Concordia University-Nebraska was among the six schools that participated in the meeting that ultimately resulted in the development of the NDE Standard Evaluation. Also at the meeting Concordia University volunteered to be one of the pilot institutions. We were the only institution who adopted the evaluation completely for all of our evaluators (cooperating teachers and supervisors). Other institutions used it with various small groups, but Concordia University-Nebraska adopted it completely and have provided NDE with the most comprehensive data for this evaluation.

When the NDE Standard Evaluation was developed, it included 11 Standards based on InTASC standards. We felt that it was missing the critical evaluative piece of Professional Dispositions and Faith Integration, and opted to add three standards to our evaluation.

After a BUROS report conducted by the NDE on the evaluation indicated the missing element of professional dispositions, a group of representativess from teacher training institutions was again invited to gather to develop a new standard. Concordia University-Nebraska was a participant in the meeting. Concordia University-Nebraska was the only university who already had standards written for evaluating Professional Dispositions. The standards developed by Concordia University-Nebraska were used as the starting point for forming the new standard on the NDE evaluation that eventually will be the required evaluation used by all Nebraska teacher-training institutions.

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 2016 EPP Annual Report.*

☒ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Ronald D. Bork

Position: Associate Dean, Head of Teacher Education

Phone: 402-643-7475

E-mail: ron.bork@cune.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, going forward 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 derided from accreditation documents.