Institution Information

Name of Institution: National-Louis University
Institution/Program Type: Traditional
Academic Year: 2012-13
State: Illinois

Address: 122 S Michigan Ave

Chicago, IL, 60603

Contact Name: Dr. Arlene Borthwick
Phone: 847-947-5025
Email: aborthwick@nl.edu

Is your institution a member of an HEA Title II Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Education?
(http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/tqp/index.html)

Yes

If yes, provide the following:

Award year: 2009

Grantee name: NLU, UIC, NEIU, LUC

Project name: Chicago Teacher Partnership Program

Grant number: U336S0900042-10

List partner districts/LEAs:
Chicago Public Schools

List other partners:
Chicago Community Trust

Project Type: Pre-baccalaureate

Section I.a Program Information

List each teacher preparation program included in your traditional route. Indicate if your program or programs participate in a Teacher Quality Partnership Grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Education as described at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/tqp/index.html.

Teacher Preparation Programs	Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Member?
Early Childhood	No
Elementary Education	Yes
Secondary Education	No
Special Education	No
Total number of teacher preparation programs: 4	

Section I.b Admissions

Indicate when students are formally admitted into your initial teacher certification program:
Junior year for undergraduate

Does your initial teacher certification program conditionally admit students?
Yes

Provide a link to your website where additional information about admissions requirements can be found:
http://www.nl.edu/academics/educationbachelors

Please provide any additional comments about or exceptions to the admissions information provided above:

Fingerprint and background check required prior to clinical experiences for all candidates.

Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification is an admission requirement for Secondary Education students.

Copy of teaching certificate is required for NCE applicants seeking additional (subsequent) certification.

Section I.b Undergraduate Requirements

Please provide the following information about your teacher preparation program's entry and exit requirements. (§205(a)(1)(C)(i))

Are there initial teacher certification programs at the undergraduate level?

Yes

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the Undergraduate level.

Element	Required for Entry	Required for Exit

Transcript	Yes	No
Fingerprint check	No	No
Background check	No	No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	Yes	Yes
Minimum GPA	Yes	Yes
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	Yes	Yes
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	Yes	Yes
Minimum ACT score	No	No
Minimum SAT score	No	No
Minimum basic skills test score	Yes	Yes
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	No	Yes
Recommendation(s)	No	No
Essay or personal statement	Yes	No
Interview	No	No
Other	Data not reported	Data not reported

What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program?

2.5

What was the median GPA of individuals accepted into the program in academic year 2012-13

2.8

What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program?

2

What was the median GPA of individuals completing the program in academic year 2012-13

3.77

Please provide any additional comments about the information provided above:

Section I.b Postgraduate Requirements

Please provide the following information about your teacher preparation program's entry and exit requirements. (§205(a)(1)(C)(i))

Are there initial teacher certification programs at the postgraduate level?

Yes

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the Postgraduate level.

Element	Required for Entry	Required for Exit
Transcript	Yes	No
Fingerprint check	No	No
Background check	No	No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	Yes	Yes
Minimum GPA	Yes	Yes
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	Yes	Yes
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	Yes	Yes
Minimum ACT score	No	No
Minimum SAT score	No	No
Minimum basic skills test score	Yes	Yes
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	Yes	Yes
Recommendation(s)	No	No
Essay or personal statement	Yes	No
Interview	No	No
Other Miller Analogies Test or GRE	Yes	No

What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program?

2.5

What was the median GPA of individuals accepted into the program in academic year 2012-13

3.25

What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program?

3

What was the median GPA of individuals completing the program in academic year 2012-13

4

Please provide any additional comments about the information provided above:

Section I.c Enrollment

Provide the number of students in the teacher preparation program in the following categories. Note that you must report on the number of students by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. Also note that individuals can belong to one or more racial groups, so the sum of the members of each racial category may not necessarily add up to the total number of students enrolled.

For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled student is defined as a student who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not completed the program during the academic year being reported. An individual who completed the program during the academic year being reported is counted as a program completer and *not* an enrolled student.

Additional guidance on reporting race and ethnicity data.

Total number of students enrolled in 2012-13:	788
Unduplicated number of males enrolled in 2012-13:	210
Unduplicated number of females enrolled in 2012-13:	578

2012-13	**Number enrolled**
Ethnicity	
Hispanic/Latino of any race:	67
Race	
American Indian or Alaska Native:	2
Asian:	25
Black or African American:	125

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander:	6
White:	515
Two or more races:	12

Section I.d Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2012-13.

Average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching	122
Average number of clock hours required for student teaching	330
Average number of clock hours required for mentoring/induction support	0
Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year	28
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE and PreK-12 staff)	154
Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	519

Please provide any additional information about or descriptions of the supervised clinical experiences:

The number of full-time equivalent faculty and adjunct faculty above represent unduplicated headcount of faculty involved in clincial supervision.

Section I.e Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by subject area for academic year 2012-13. For the purposes of this section, number prepared means the number of program completers. "Subject area" refers to the subject area(s) an individual has been prepared to teach. An individual can be counted in more than one subject area. If no individuals were prepared in a particular subject area, please leave that cell blank. (§205(b)(1)(H))

Subject Area	**Number Prepared**
Education - General	0
Teacher Education - Special Education	79

Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	49
Teacher Education - Elementary Education	349
Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	0
Teacher Education - Secondary Education	261
Teacher Education - Multiple Levels	0
Teacher Education - Agriculture	0
Teacher Education - Art	0
Teacher Education - Business	0
Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	59
Teacher Education - Foreign Language	4
Teacher Education - Health	0
Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	0
Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	0
Teacher Education - Mathematics	49
Teacher Education - Music	0
Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	0
Teacher Education - Reading	0
Teacher Education - Science Teacher Education/General Science	3
Teacher Education - Social Science	35
Teacher Education - Social Studies	0

Teacher Education - Technical Education	0
Teacher Education - Computer Science	0
Teacher Education - Biology	41
Teacher Education - Chemistry	15
Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	0
Teacher Education - French	2
Teacher Education - German	1
Teacher Education- History	40
Teacher Education - Physics	3
Teacher Education - Spanish	5
Teacher Education - Speech	0
Teacher Education - Geography	0
Teacher Education - Latin	0
Teacher Education - Psychology	3
Teacher Education - Earth Science	1
Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	6
Teacher Education - Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education	0
Education - Other Specify:	

Section I.e Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2012-13. For the purposes of this section, number prepared means the number of program completers. "Academic major" refers to the actual major(s) declared by the program completer. An individual can be counted in more than one academic major. If no individuals were prepared in a particular academic major, please leave that cell blank. (§205(b)(1)(H))

Academic Major	Number Prepared
Education - General	0
Teacher Education - Special Education	0
Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	20
Teacher Education - Elementary Education	46
Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	0
Teacher Education - Secondary Education	0
Teacher Education - Agriculture	
Teacher Education - Art	
Teacher Education - Business	
Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	
Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
Teacher Education - Health	
Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	
Teacher Education - Mathematics	
Teacher Education - Music	

Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	
Teacher Education - Reading	
Teacher Education - Science	
Teacher Education - Social Science	
Teacher Education - Social Studies	
Teacher Education - Technical Education	
Teacher Education - Computer Science	
Teacher Education - Biology	
Teacher Education - Chemistry	
Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
Teacher Education - French	
Teacher Education - German	
Teacher Education - History	
Teacher Education - Physics	
Teacher Education - Spanish	
Teacher Education - Speech	
Teacher Education - Geography	
Teacher Education - Latin	
Teacher Education - Psychology	
Teacher Education - Earth Science	

Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	
Teacher Education - Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education	
Education - Curriculum and Instruction	
Education - Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education	
Liberal Arts/Humanities	
Psychology	
Social Sciences	
Anthropology	
Economics	
Geography and Cartography	
Political Science and Government	
Sociology	
Visual and Performing Arts	
History	
Foreign Languages	
Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	
English Language/Literature	
Philosophy and Religious Studies	
Agriculture	
Communication or Journalism	

Engineering	
Biology	
Mathematics and Statistics	
Physical Sciences	
Astronomy and Astrophysics	
Atmospheric Sciences and Meteorology	
Chemistry	
Geological and Earth Sciences/Geosciences	
Physics	
Business/Business Administration/Accounting	
Computer and Information Sciences	
Other Specify:	

Section I.f Program Completers

Provide the total number of teacher preparation program completers in each of the following academic years:

2012-13: 716

2011-12: 618

2010-11: 478

Section II Annual Goals - Mathematics

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of

prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. (§205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in mathematics in each of three academic years.

Academic year 2012-13

Did your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2012-13?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in mathematics in 2012-13?

30

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in mathematics in 2012-13?

Yes

Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

For 2012-2013,our partner,the Academy for Urban School Leadership, provided additional stipend for mathematics candidates. However, in Fall of 2012, only 2 of 10 AUSL secondary candidates were mathematics candidates.

Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

Incentives for high needs areas may not draw additional applicants.

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2013-14

Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2013-14?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in mathematics in 2013-14?

15

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

School closings in Chicago Public School District may have made potential applicants more cautious about entering the teaching profession.

Academic year 2014-15

Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2014-15?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in mathematics in 2014-15?

15

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Section II Annual Goals - Science

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. (§205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in science in each of three academic years.

Academic year 2012-13

Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2012-13?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in science in 2012-13?

55

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in science in 2012-13?

Yes

Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2013-14

Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2013-14?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in science in 2013-14?

25

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

School closings in Chicago Public School District may have made potential applicants more cautious about entering the teaching profession.

Academic year 2014-15

Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2014-15?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in science in 2014-15?

25

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Section II Annual Goals - Special Education

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. (§205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in special education in each of three academic years.

Academic year 2012-13

Did your program prepare teachers in special education in 2012-13?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in special education in 2012-13?

55

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in special education in 2012-13?

Yes

Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

In 2012-2013, a new SPE BA in special ed was added. However, we did not enroll any candidates in the SPE BA program that year. All candidates were MAT or MEd.

Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

New marketing and relationships with community colleges are expected to slowly build enrollment in the BA program.

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2013-14

Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2013-14?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in special education in 2013-14?

60

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

We have found that the time to degree and number of semester hours of our current special education program are longer than at other area institutions and our own other licensure programs. We are revising and updating our special education curriculum for 2014-2015.

Academic year 2014-15

Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2014-15?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in special education in 2014-15?

60

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Section II Annual Goals - Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. (§205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in each of three academic years.

Academic year 2012-13

Did your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2012-13?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2012-13?

75

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2012-13?

Yes

Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

Some cohorts were held off-campus.

In Illinois, early childhood teachers were required to have an ESL or Bilingual endorsement depending on school demographics.

Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Note: Up until July 2013 applicants could still get the ESL/Bilingual processed as an "approval"directly by the state--as opposed to an endorsement that cost $50. The university could not enter approvals in the state system, thus it is difficult for us to track those completers.

Academic year 2013-14

Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2013-14?

Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2013-14?

80

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2014-15

Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2014-15?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2014-15?

135

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Section II Assurances

Please certify that your institution is in compliance with the following assurances. (§205(a)(1)(A)(iii), §206(b)) Note: Be prepared to provide documentation and evidence for your responses, when requested, to support the following assurances.

Preparation responds to the identified needs of the local educational agencies or States where the program completers are likely to teach, based on past hiring and recruitment trends.
Yes

Preparation is closely linked with the needs of schools and the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom.
Yes

Prospective special education teachers are prepared in core academic subjects and to instruct in core academic subjects.
Yes

Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students with disabilities.
Yes

Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to limited English proficient students.
Yes

Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students from low-income families.
Yes

Prospective teachers are prepared to effectively teach in urban and rural schools, as applicable.
Yes

Describe your institution’s most successful strategies in meeting the assurances listed above:

Some of the programs are offered jointly with our partners. In addition to university faculty support, candidates also receive support from partners and assigned school officials.

SPE candidates have two courses in reading (literacy) and one math course focused on special needs students.

Section III Assessment Pass Rates

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson	2			

All enrolled students who have completed all noncl				
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	16	268	16	100
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	43	269	43	100
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	50	271	50	100
101 -Apt: Birth To Grade 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	42	265	41	98
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	18	271	18	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	87	269	87	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	216	270	216	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	126	270	126	100
103 -Apt: Grades 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	59	272	59	100
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	29	268	28	97
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	45	259	42	93
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	102	265	101	99
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	96	264	96	100

104 -Apt: Grades K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	80	264	80	100
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	18	266	18	100
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	96	266	95	99
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	345	270	345	100
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	360	269	360	100
102 -Apt: Grades K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	239	269	238	100
096 -BASIC SKILLS (0901-0810) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	531	268	531	100
096 -Basic Skills (0901-0810) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	410	267	404	99
302 -BASIC SKILLS LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	93	264	93	100
302 -Basic Skills Language Arts Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	1			
303 -BASIC SKILLS MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	93	277	93	100
303 -Basic Skills Mathematics Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	1			
301 -BASIC SKILLS READING COMPREHENSION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	93	268	93	100
301 -Basic Skills Reading Comprehension	1			

Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11				
304 -BASIC SKILLS WRITING Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	93	268	93	100
304 -Basic Skills Writing Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	1			
141 -DRAMA/THEATRE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
107 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	3			
107 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	23	256	23	100
107 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	44	262	42	95
107 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	49	262	48	98
107 -Early Childhood Education Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	41	259	39	95
152 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	28	264	27	96
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	174	267	167	96
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	345	267	345	100
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson	364	268	364	100

All program completers, 2011-12				
110 -Elementary/Middle Grades Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	239	265	239	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	14	271	14	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	40	267	40	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	58	264	58	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	36	267	36	100
111 -English Language Arts Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	19	268	19	100
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	4			
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	3			
127 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: FRENCH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
127 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: FRENCH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
127 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: FRENCH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	1			

127 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: FRENCH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	3			
128 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: GERMAN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
128 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: GERMAN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
128 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: GERMAN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	1			
128 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: GERMAN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
130 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: ITALIAN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
133 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: LATIN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
133 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: LATIN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
133 -Foreign Language: Latin Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	1			
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	7			
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	13	268	12	92
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	5			
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	10	266	10	100
135 -Foreign Language: Spanish	5			

Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11				
402 -ICTS TAP: LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
403 -ICTS TAP: MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
401 -ICTS TAP: READING COMPREHENSION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
404 -ICTS TAP: WRITING Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
155 -LEARNING BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	18	263	18	100
155 -LEARNING BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	66	265	65	98
155 -LEARNING BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	78	268	78	100
155 -LEARNING BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	74	268	74	100
155 -Learning Behavior Specialist I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	70	264	70	100
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	3			
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	18	264	17	94
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	49	265	49	100
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson	17	267	17	100

All program completers, 2011-12				
115 -Mathematics Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	8			
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	28	260	28	100
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	40	262	40	100
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	17	259	17	100
105 -Science: Biology Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	14	254	13	93
106 -SCIENCE: CHEMISTRY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	3			
106 -SCIENCE: CHEMISTRY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
106 -SCIENCE: CHEMISTRY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	15	255	14	93
106 -SCIENCE: CHEMISTRY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	6			
106 -Science: Chemistry Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	1			
108 -SCIENCE: EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
108 -SCIENCE: EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	2			

108 -SCIENCE: EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	1			
108 -SCIENCE: EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	1			
112 -SCIENCE: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
112 -SCIENCE: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	3			
112 -SCIENCE: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
116 -SCIENCE: PHYSICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
116 -SCIENCE: PHYSICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
116 -SCIENCE: PHYSICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	3			
116 -SCIENCE: PHYSICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	4			
116 -Science: Physics Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	2			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	4			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	5			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY	3			

Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12				
109 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: ECONOMICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
109 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: ECONOMICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
109 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: ECONOMICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	4			
109 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: ECONOMICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	2			
109 -Social Science: Economics Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	1			
113 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: GEOGRAPHY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
113 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: GEOGRAPHY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	6			
114 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: HISTORY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	3			
114 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: HISTORY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	34	261	34	100
114 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: HISTORY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	41	264	40	98
114 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: HISTORY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	23	265	23	100
114 -Social Science: History Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	9			
117 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: POLITICAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson	4			

Other enrolled students				
117 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: POLITICAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	12	267	11	92
117 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: POLITICAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	3			
117 -Social Science: Political Science Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	2			
118 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: PSYCHOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	3			
118 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: PSYCHOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	6			
118 -Social Science: Psychology Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	3			
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	16	256	15	94
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	39	253	31	79
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	70	260	70	100
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	73	255	71	97
163 -Special Ed. General Curriculum Test Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2010-11	70	256	68	97

Section III Summary Pass Rates

Group	Number taking tests	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
All program completers, 2012-13	707	702	99
All program completers, 2011-12	636	633	100

All program completers, 2010-11	426	414	97

Section IV Low-Performing

Provide the following information about the approval or accreditation of your teacher preparation program.

Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited?
Yes

If yes, please specify the organization(s) that approved or accredited your program:
State
NCATE

Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 207(a) of the HEA of 2008)?
No

Section V Use of Technology

Provide the following information about the use of technology in your teacher preparation program. Please note that choosing 'yes' indicates that your teacher preparation program would be able to provide evidence upon request.

Does your program prepare teachers to:

- integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction
  Yes
- use technology effectively to collect data to improve teaching and learning
  Yes
- use technology effectively to manage data to improve teaching and learning
  Yes
- use technology effectively to analyze data to improve teaching and learning
  Yes

Provide a description of the evidence that your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, and to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data in order to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement. Include a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to use the principles of universal design for learning, as applicable. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the four elements listed above are not currently in place.

1. Prepares teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction

Throughout our teacher training program, teacher candidates are exposed to a wide variety of instructional technologies. Candidates are required to demonstrate their proficiency in integrating

technology into their teaching. All of our teacher preparation programs submit annual assessment reports that are mandated by our College. One section of the report is titled “Assessment of Candidate Technology Proficiencies” and consists of nine subsections designed to clarify the exact method by which each program assesses technology proficiency in its candidates. These nine areas require details about who reviews the activity but also requires a rubric. These annual assessment reports are closely aligned to each program’s specialized professional association (SPA) standards.

Based on our annual Faculty Survey of the college’s 41 full-time faculty, 85% reported last year that they either require technology to be used in all of their candidate’s assignments or just about every assignment, while only a handful report a lesser amount. The most common technologies that faculty reported candidates use most often are 1.)Internet websites, which are often used in conjunction with lesson planning; and 2.) the online course management site, which requires all candidates to interact in discussion boards and other collaborative activities.

Other frequently used tools are PowerPoint, Prezi, and digital storytelling. The use of concept mapping software has been steadily growing in our college because of in-house research and workshops that have promoted its use as a method for assessing candidate knowledge. Each of these tools allows our candidates to create new ways of showing that they are understanding course material and, more importantly, to incorporate these tools into their own lesson planning for P12 students.

Led by the University’s Academic Technology Coordinator, a large number of faculty in our teacher preparation programs have explored the use of iPads in their classroom. For the past 2 years, we have also piloted the use of iPads as a required device for students in select programs. Our monthly training sessions for faculty, called our iPad Professional Learning Community, have expanded from once a month to three times a month to accommodate faculty across the Chicagoland area. One of the most beneficial aspects of this has been a renewed interest by our faculty in instructional technologies in general. Some of our monthly topics have included the TPACK framework, content-specific application of technology, technology-supported differentiation, interactive whiteboards, concept mapping, digital storytelling, cloud computing, student technology skills, social media, video-recording students in the field, online tools for recording and tracking observation hours in schools, and video conferencing software.

The Academic Technology Coordinator provides guidance toward the important goal of effectively collecting and analyzing various data points related to technology use by our candidates. Therefore, all teacher preparation programs assess how well students demonstrate their ability to use technology in their lesson planning. These programs collect, manage, and analyze the data in which candidates document their technology use within their electronic teaching portfolio. Elementary Education faculty analyzed candidate technology use in the five areas of the portfolio: Teaching and Students, Teaching and the Environment, Teaching and Instruction, Teaching and the Curriculum, and Teaching and the Profession. In analyzing the data, we learned that our candidates were effectively incorporating technology in the classrooms. We also found candidates in the suburban schools were using more innovative technology in the classroom than in our urban settings. This is a concern that the faculty continues to address.

2. Preparing teachers to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data in order to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement

Impact on Student Learning assignments

Each of our teacher preparation programs requires an assignment commonly referred to as the "Impact on Student Learning." It starts with each candidate creating a unit plan that they are required to teach. Using the same website in which our students create their electronic portfolio, LiveText, students are required to address five areas which include the demographics of the students and the context of the school in which the unit will be taught. The next is creating an assessment method such as a rubric designed to provide quantifiable data. Candidates are then required to analyze and report the findings in relation to student learning which is often done using tables or spreadsheets. Finally, the candidate is expected to provide a "thoughtful and thorough self-reflection" on their lesson and implications for future lessons.

3. Preparing teachers to use the principles of universal design for learning

The professional development and resources from a recent grant have continued to increase our faculty and candidates'awareness of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework and Response to Intervention (RTI). Our computer labs are equipped with many popular pieces of software and hardware, such as E-Text Reader, BoardMaker, JAWS, scanners, and interactive whiteboards. In addition, the Special Education program has redesigned their program to include instructional design principles such as UDL. This program also concentrated on candidate understanding of the frameworks and perspectives of assistive technology and implementing effective, collaborative practices through the lens of universal design principles in order to provide a strong foundation for teaching. Our Technology in Education program was recently redesigned to include UDL which is significant because of the important role this program has in providing courses to teacher candidates.

4. Planning activities with timeline for future improvements

• edTPA Implementation: As part of the Illinois State Board of Education's decision to adopt the Teacher Performance Assessment, otherwise known as edTPA, our College is actively preparing our faculty and students for the Fall 2015 implementation deadline. This includes creating common assessments and support resources from which all candidates can benefit. One instance is to establish one version of the Impact on Student Learning assignment which currently has various iterations depending on the program. Another area that is currently undergoing much discussion is the requirement of video-recording candidates as they teach in a P12 setting. The technology skills necessary for this to be successful are an integral part of this conversation.

• Elementary Education Candidates and online technology modules: One of the ongoing conversations that our Elementary Education faculty frequently have is identifying the most effective methods for getting students to integrate technology into their teaching. Rather than requiring a basic Introduction to Technology course for all students, we plan instead to create a series of online technology modules which will be closely aligned to the existing curriculum. These modules will support the creation of technology skills in our students over the entire

sequence of their coursework and ensure a common set of technology related experiences for all students. This will include the already established, UDL-based methods currently used by our Special Education.

• iPad Pilot Expansion: Recently, our Special Education and Elementary Education programs decided to expand our pilot program to require all candidates to have an iPad in every class in the future.

Section VI Teacher Training

Provide the following information about your teacher preparation program. Please note that choosing 'yes' indicates that your teacher preparation program would be able to provide evidence upon request.

Does your program prepare **general education** teachers to:

- teach students with disabilities effectively
  Yes
- participate as a member of individualized education program teams
  Yes
- teach students who are limited English proficient effectively
  Yes

Provide a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares **general education** teachers to teach students with disabilities effectively, including training related to participation as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*, and to effectively teach students who are limited English proficient. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the three elements listed above are not currently in place.

National Louis University's mission and core belief is that all children can learn. Thus, we provide opportunities for our teacher candidates to learn about and interact with diverse/exceptional populations through placement in field experiences. Our teacher candidates show evidence of proficiencies related to diversity in their professional roles through positive assessments on competency appraisals from university supervisors as well as cooperating teachers/mentor teachers in the field. The Office of Field Experience collects data from the student field experience logs that tracks demographic data of the schools that candidates are visiting and working with. Faculty continues to share techniques, professional articles and strategies to help our teacher candidates excel in this area. Additionally, all our candidates learn and focus on the Universal Design for Individual Learning (UDL) in order to become valuable members of the individualized education program (IEP) Team. The ESL/Bilingual faculty recently (2011-2012) developed undergraduate ESL courses; this will allow undergraduate candidates to take coursework toward an ESL endorsement. All BA and MAT candidates, then, may take six courses as program electives or as courses outside their programs for an endorsement in ESL (and bilingual education if they meet the language requirement).

Does your program prepare **special education** teachers to:

- teach students with disabilities effectively
  Yes
- participate as a member of individualized education program teams
  Yes
- teach students who are limited English proficient effectively
  Yes

Provide a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares **special education** teachers to teach students with disabilities effectively, including training related to participation as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*, and to effectively teach students who are limited English proficient. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the three elements listed above are not currently in place.

All special education candidates complete a minimum of 135 pre clinical hours. They are expected to visit various sites to see and work with students with exceptional learning needs in special education settings on all aspects of the continuum--of least restrictive environments for students seen on a consultative basis—to students in residential settings.. While doing this, candidates are expected to visit settings on different education levels, Kindergarten to Transition settings with students up to 21 years of age. They are also expected to gain experience with students in all categories of disabilities as identified by federal law. While completing various experiences, candidates are working with children of differing ethnicities. The Office of Field Experience collects data from the student field experience logs that tracks demographic data of the schools that candidates are visiting and working with. The above requirements, in concert with other field and classroom work, allow our special education candidates to be a valuable member of IEP teams and to work effectively with ESL students.

Section VII Contextual Information

Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s). You may also attach information to this report card. The U.S. Department of Education is especially interested in any evaluation plans or interim or final reports that may be available.

Note: For Section I.e. Academic Major, only BA candidate information was entered. The NLU database does not record UG major for graduate candidates. The National College of Education (NCE) and the university that has grown up around it have remained true to their roots in progressive, constructivist educational principles and a mission oriented toward social justice. From its beginnings in 1886 as Miss Harrison’s Training School, for kindergarten teachers, in the heart of Chicago, National Louis University has focused upon a commitment to improving the lives of children, adults, and organizations. For example, NCE was instrumental in the founding of the PTA and later played a major role in launching the national Head Start program.

Institutional Mission and Purposes: The mission of National Louis University is to provide access to quality higher education that nurtures opportunity for students through innovative teaching, scholarship, community engagement, and service excellence. Central to this mission is a commitment to life-long and active engagement in learning. As an independent, not-for-profit University that values teaching, NLU links tested theory and practice with the on-going experiences of its students. NLU is sensitive to the changing needs of society and is responsive to the students and public it serves. National College of Education supports the University's endeavors to fulfill its institutional mission. We have programs that are offered in traditional manner as well as alternative licensure programs. Regarding the overall college structure for teacher preparation, NLU has created a Teacher Preparation Council and Advisory Board to help improve communication among all the teacher preparation programs. Implementation of the new structure has helped to focus our attention on progress toward an intensive field and research model for all Teacher Preparation programs, changes in ISBE rules and regulations, and the new edTPA requirement. As part of the new Teacher Preparation Unit, the College is leveraging new technologies to design a practice-centered curriculum called the Adaptive Cycles of Teaching (ACT). The new design provides teacher candidates with more opportunities to implement and receive focused feedback on their mastery of a core set of teaching practices. The ACT design achieves stronger coherence and coordination between teacher candidates' experience of subject matter methods courses and their field-based learning. A pilot has been implemented for literacy and science instruction practices this year, and the planning for a practice-centered approach for preparing teachers in math and social studies instruction is underway. Full implementation of the new design integrating all subject matter methods and associated field experiences in the BA Elementary Education Program is planned for 2014-15 academic year. NLU's Secondary English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics teacher education programs were awarded the ISBE Race to the Top III Program Redesign Grant to support the implementation of the Common Core Standards into both programs. The grant was awarded to extend over three years. In the first phase of the grant, teacher education programs were asked to redesign their related methods courses and implement and analyze the newly designed course. At NLU, the redesigned courses were taught in the winter session of 2014, and the analysis of candidate work with respect to the Common Core Standard will be completed by the end of the spring term. In the second phase, programs are asked to extend their design work to the ELA and math teacher preparation program areas. For several of our traditional program majors, we partner with Academy for Urban School Leadership to certify selected urban teaching residents. We received a $15 million TQP grant to further this relationship. An additional TQP grant was awarded in partnership with three other universities in Chicago to transform undergraduate teacher preparation programs; through the Chicago Teacher Preparation Pipeline (CTPP) grant, we are working in partnership with 20 Chicago public elementary schools and four universities to redesign undergraduate teacher preparation. Professional development opportunities sponsored for CTPP have brought together faculty from the four universities together to learn more about the Common Core Standards and implications for curriculum development, selection of instructional materials, and lesson planning. Another CTPP event will bring national and state leaders to NLU to discuss the foundations and use of the edTPA. NLU is also partnering with ISBE, Loyola, ISU, and the CEEDAR Center to create aligned professional learning systems that provide effective opportunities to learn [O(TL)2] for teachers and leaders to improve core and specialized instruction in inclusive settings. Evidence-based and rigorous content instruction will support students with disabilities in achieving college- and career-ready standards. NLU has also begun

to prepare teachers with the iPad as part of their teacher preparation program. Teacher Candidates learn to use the iPad for productivity, learning, teaching, content creation, educational materials curation, and assessment. Teacher candidates also use 2.0 web tools to enhance their teaching and learning.