title II
highereducationact

National-Louis University
Traditional Program

2015 Title II Reports

Complete Report Card

AY 2013-14

Institution Information

Name of Institution:	National-Louis University
Institution/Program Type:	Traditional
Academic Year:	2013-14
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)

If yes, provide the following:

Award year: 2014

Grantee name: NLU, AUSL and Illinois Institute of Technology

Project name: SER: Science Excellence through Residency

Grant number: U336S140051

List partner districts/LEAs:
Chicago Public Schools

List other partners:

Project Type: Residency

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/educationmastersteacherprep

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		

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 2013-14
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 2013-14
3.86

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 2013-14
3.27

What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program?
3

What was the median GPA of individuals completing the program in academic year 2013-14
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 2013-14:	986
Unduplicated number of males enrolled in 2013-14:	324
Unduplicated number of females enrolled in 2013-14:	662

2013-2014	Number enrolled
Ethnicity	
Hispanic/Latino of any race:	85
Race	
American Indian or Alaska Native:	1
Asian:	41
Black or African American:	121
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander:	3
White:	695
Two or more races:	19

Section I.d Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2013-14.

Average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching	150
Average number of clock hours required for student teaching	300
Average number of clock hours required for mentoring/induction support	0
Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year	15
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE and PreK-12 staff)	87
Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	579

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 2013-14. 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	NumberPrepared
Education - General	
Teacher Education - Special Education	44
Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	25
Teacher Education - Elementary Education	127
Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	0
Teacher Education - Secondary Education	84
Teacher Education - Multiple Levels	
Teacher Education - Agriculture	
Teacher Education - Art	
Teacher Education - Business	
Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	26
Teacher Education - Foreign Language	2
Teacher Education - Health	
Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	

Subject Area	NumberPrepared
Teacher Education - Mathematics	21
Teacher Education - Music	
Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	
Teacher Education - Reading	
Teacher Education - Science Teacher Education/General Science	
Teacher Education - Social Science	12
Teacher Education - Social Studies	
Teacher Education - Technical Education	
Teacher Education - Computer Science	
Teacher Education - Biology	12
Teacher Education - Chemistry	12
Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
Teacher Education - French	1
Teacher Education - German	4
Teacher Education- History	17
Teacher Education - Physics	6
Teacher Education - Spanish	12
Teacher Education - Speech	
Teacher Education - Geography	
Teacher Education - Latin	
Teacher Education - Psychology	2
Teacher Education - Earth Science	5
Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	
Teacher Education - Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education	
Education - Other	

Section I.e Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2013-14. 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	NumberPrepared
Education - General	
Teacher Education - Special Education	
Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	7
Teacher Education - Elementary Education	23
Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	
Teacher Education - Secondary Education	
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	

Academic Major	NumberPrepared
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	

Section I.f Program Completers

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

2013-14: 285

2012-13: 716

2011-12: 618

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 2013-14

Did your program prepare 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:
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:
School closings in Chicago Public School District may have made potential applicants more cautious about entering the teaching profession.

Academic year 2014-15

Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2014-15?
Yes

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

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2015-16

Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2015-16?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in mathematics in 2015-16?

15

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

We have had a steady decline in enrollment in the traditional mathematics program. We are planning to increase focus of the program on meeting the needs of middle grades mathematics educators and to develop online courses.

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 2013-14

Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2013-14?
Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in science in 2013-14?
25

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in science in 2013-14?
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:
School closings in Chicago Public School District may have made potential applicants more cautious about entering the teaching profession.

Academic year 2014-15

Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2014-15?
Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in science in 2014-15?
25

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2015-16

Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2015-16?
Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in science in 2015-16?
18

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 2013-14

Did your program prepare 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

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in special education in 2013-14?
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:
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

Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2014-15?
Yes

How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in special education in 2014-15?
60

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:
Some candidates for the LBS I endorsement are enrolled in an M.Ed. program that allows candidates to earn two endorsements as part of the degree. These candidates, though, are not earning initial licensure.

Academic year 2015-16

Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2015-16?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in special education in 2015-16?

45

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 2013-14

Did your program prepare 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

Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2013-14?
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 2014-15

Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2014-15?

Yes

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

135

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Academic year 2015-16

Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2015-16?

Yes

How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2015-16?

150

Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

The majority of these candidates will be enrolled in an M.Ed. that enables candidates to earn two endorsements as part of their degree work. These candidates are not enrolled in an initial licensure program.

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 (%)
188 -APT (ALL LEVELS) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
188 -APT (ALL LEVELS) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	11	263	10	91
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	4			
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	13	262	12	92
101 -APT: BIRTH TO GRADE 3 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	19	272	19	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
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	26	268	26	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	119	269	119	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	88	272	88	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	214	270	214	100
103 -APT: GRADES 6-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	126	270	126	100
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	16	264	16	100
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	25	266	24	96
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	43	269	43	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	104	265	103	99
104 -APT: GRADES K-12 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	96	264	96	100
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	16	269	15	94
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	121	270	119	98
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	122	271	121	99
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	344	270	344	100
102 -APT: GRADES K-9 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	360	269	360	100
096 -BASIC SKILLS (0901-0810) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	523	269	523	100
302 -BASIC SKILLS LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	93	264	93	100
303 -BASIC SKILLS MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	93	277	93	100
301 -BASIC SKILLS READING COMPREHENSION 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, 2011-12	93	268	93	100
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	5			
107 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	22	255	19	86
107 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	19	261	19	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
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
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	19	270	19	100
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	247	269	244	99
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	122	269	121	99
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	344	267	344	100
110 -ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE GRADES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	364	268	364	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	11	259	11	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	69	267	69	100
111 -ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	25	271	25	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
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	5			
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	2			
126 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: CHINESE (MANDARIN) Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	4			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
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	2			
127 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: FRENCH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	1			
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 Other enrolled students	2			
128 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: GERMAN Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	4			
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			
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	2			
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	6			
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	15	274	15	100
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	8			
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	5			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
135 -FOREIGN LANGUAGE: SPANISH Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	10	266	10	100
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	7			
155 -LEARNING BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	36	269	35	97
155 -LEARNING BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST I Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	30	266	30	100
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
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	36	273	36	100
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	19	267	19	100
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	49	265	49	100
115 -MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	17	267	17	100
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	6			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	33	261	32	97
105 -SCIENCE: BIOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	12	264	12	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
106 -SCIENCE: CHEMISTRY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	7			
106 -SCIENCE: CHEMISTRY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	12	262	12	100
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			
108 -SCIENCE: EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
108 -SCIENCE: EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	3			
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 program completers, 2013-14	2			
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			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
116 -SCIENCE: PHYSICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	7			
116 -SCIENCE: PHYSICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	6			
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			
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	2			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	4			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	5			
121 -SOC.SCI: SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	3			
109 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: ECONOMICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
109 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: ECONOMICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	2			
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			
113 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: GEOGRAPHY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	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	6			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
114 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: HISTORY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	59	263	58	98
114 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: HISTORY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	17	267	17	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
117 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: POLITICAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	6			
117 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: POLITICAL SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	4			
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			
118 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: PSYCHOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
118 -SOCIAL SCIENCE: PSYCHOLOGY Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
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			
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	7			
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	33	258	32	97
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2013-14	30	258	30	100
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2012-13	71	260	71	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
163 -SPECIAL ED. GENERAL CURRICULUM TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2011-12	73	256	72	99

Section III Summary Pass Rates

Group	Number taking tests	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
All program completers, 2013-14	272	271	100
All program completers, 2012-13	706	701	99
All program completers, 2011-12	636	634	100

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. Preparing teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

All teacher preparation programs assess how well students demonstrate their ability to use technology in their lesson planning. In a survey of faculty (N=37) who prepared teacher education candidates in 2013-2014, 81% of the faculty reported using technology in 80-100% of their classes, and over 50%

reported using iPads. The most frequently-used technologies used in both instruction and assignments were Internet websites, PowerPoint, and an online course management tool. Teacher preparation 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 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. As a result of this concern, we continue to integrate new and innovative technology applications in our curriculum with the goal of having our candidates apply these teaching practices in their field experiences. For example, candidates who complete CIL 500 Foundations of ESL and Bilingual Education do a “web fair” project in which they find and demonstrate appropriate online resources for their students. Candidates attending the fair gain multiple, teacher-approved resources for incorporating technology in their classes. All students in CIL 505 Methods and Materials for Teaching English as a Second Language complete a lesson plan assignment that incorporates technology resources appropriate to their students and lesson content.

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 Kurzweil, BoardMaker Plus, 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 awareness of assistive technology applications and implementing effective, collaborative practices through the lens of universal design principles in order to provide a strong foundation for teaching. The college has

supported faculty development through its iPad professional learning community, with regular group meetings focused on use of iPad applications in teaching and learning.

4. Plan and timeline for future activities.

- 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 online support resources from which all candidates can benefit. We are working closely with NLU's Learning & Information Technology Services (LITS) and Academic Technology Coordinator to assist candidates to obtain the skills to meet the requirement of video-recording as they teach in a P12 setting and compressing a selected portion of their video to upload with the edTPA portfolio. LITS has hosted workshops on video editing and file compression for faculty and candidates involved in edTPA pilots. During these workshops students learn how to edit and compress video files using a number of different applications such as Windows Movie Maker, iMovie, and Panopto.
- 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 that will be integrated into the existing curriculum. These modules, embedded in early coursework and continuing through student teaching, support the development of technology skills in our students over the entire sequence of their program and ensure a common set of technology related experiences for all students.
- 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. A timeline has not been established for adoption for Elementary Education, but all candidates enrolling in new Special Education cohorts must have an iPad II or higher for use in special education courses.
- The college's Academic Technology Committee has been focused on demonstrating the importance of the adoption of the ISTE NETS for the National College of Education's teacher preparation programs. During this academic year the Academic Technology Committee met with the NCE Leadership Cabinet to express the importance of adopting these standards.

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 information for 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 Learning (UDL) in order to become valuable members of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Team. The ESL/Bilingual faculty has developed undergraduate ESL courses to 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 100 pre-clinical hours. They are expected to visit various sites to observe and work with students with exceptional learning needs in special education settings on all aspects of the continuum—from least restrictive environments for students seen on a consultative basis—to students in residential settings. While doing this, candidates are expected to visit settings at different education levels, from 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 information for 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 valuable members 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.

For Section I.f, completers are defined as those who completed program requirements qualifying them for licensure.

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, National Louis University has focused on 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. 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 lifelong learning and 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. 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 Leadership Team and the Teacher Education Advisory Board to help improve communication across all the teacher preparation programs and with external stakeholders. 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. In October 2014, we received state approval of a new Elementary Education Grades 1-6 program which will begin to enroll candidates in Winter 2016; this new program addresses state-level changes in grade levels for elementary education endorsements.

As we prepared for the consequential Illinois State licensure requirement of the edTPA (September 1, 2015), an edTPA Task Force was created to design common supports for all Teacher Preparation candidates. This support includes scaffolded assignments in each program that give candidates practice with the edTPA tasks of Planning, Instruction and Assessment. Our university supervisors are supporting candidates in the field with observational tools and questions aligned with the edTPA. All faculty in the School of Teacher Preparation as well as the Reading and Language faculty have gone through local evaluation training to develop a deeper understanding of the edTPA tasks and rubrics. Finally, we currently have a pilot with 68 candidates submitting a full edTPA for official scoring by Pearson; we will host a data summit in June 2015 to examine the outcomes and revise programs as needed.

National College of Education at NLU continues to develop and implement its Adaptive Cycles of Teaching (ACT) model for teacher preparation. The goal of the ACT design is to improve the consistency and quality of teacher candidates' learning through their field experiences. The design utilizes a cloud-based mobile technology platform that incorporates modeling and guided practice to support teacher candidates in implementing core teaching practices with students in elementary classroom environments. Through the ACT model, teacher candidates engage in multiple cycles of teaching a core practice such as word study or shared reading. Each teaching cycle entails four steps: a) lesson planning; b) enacting the lesson while video recording; c) reflecting on the lesson video; and d) analyzing feedback from observers and student assessment data. For each lesson cycle, teacher candidates review and critique their own lesson videos using teaching performance templates and receive timely focused feedback from faculty and mentors. Teacher candidates also analyze student progress on formative assessments to inform the next lesson plan. This structure is intended to scaffold teacher candidates' learning across instructional domains and to promote habits of mind to continually learn from teaching (Hiebert, Morris, Berk, & Jansen, 2007). Data from the initial pilot suggests that we are on the right track with the design of this model. Teacher candidates are more prepared to implement core practices than teacher candidates who have not experienced the ACT model. The pilot data also directed us toward needed refinements. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the BA elementary education program developed the ACT model across subject matter methods courses (i.e., literacy, science, social studies, and math) and all field seminars (i.e., practica and student teaching). The model has helped to forge a strong collaboration among the faculty teaching these courses and to shift their classroom instructional focus to emphasize focused feedback and coaching around core teaching practices.

In addition, NLU is 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. During 2014-2015, faculty worked on the state leadership team to design a blueprint, scope of work and a budget. Beginning this Summer 2015, we will use grant funds to incorporate content into special education teacher preparation classes using the ACT and TREKLEM (learning experience management tool).

We have continued our partnership with the Academy for Urban School Leadership to certify selected urban teaching residents. In a second TQP grant received by the AUSL/NLU teacher residency program, the focus is on strengthening preparation for teaching science in high need settings. The five year grant aims to: 1) bring NLU's new Active Cycles of Teaching (ACT) teacher preparation curriculum to science; 2) have all AUSL training academies be prepared for the implementation of Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS); and 3) strengthen the AUSL science curriculum through connections to community and careers. In this first year of the grant, the ACT science curriculum was piloted in the residency Elementary MAT program, in two sections of science methods classes. Most liaisons are actually faculty teaching courses for the AUSL candidates. A design research team composed of AUSL personnel and NLU faculty will examine the pilot results this summer, and refine implementation. The AUSL residency model now includes a role called the "University Faculty Liaison," an individual who is

assigned to a school site rather than to individual candidates and who serves as both supervisor and as a liaison to the faculty teaching in this model.

For 2014-2015, 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 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 Standards was completed by the end of the spring term 2014.

In 2009, a TQP grant was awarded to NLU in partnership with three other universities in Chicago to transform undergraduate teacher preparation programs through the Chicago Teacher Preparation Project (CTPP). This grant is working with 20 Chicago public elementary schools and four universities to redesign undergraduate teacher preparation. The CTPP grant is in its sixth and final year; major goals of the grant that have led to the redesign of undergraduate teacher education program are: 1) Increased content knowledge for teacher candidates in the areas of math, science and literacy, 2) earlier field experiences in freshman and sophomore years of the teacher education programs, 3) preparation of teacher candidates to work in urban diverse schools, 4) creation of sustainable partnerships with Chicago elementary schools, 5) recruitment and retention of minority teacher candidates , and 6) professional development in the partner schools to support the in-service teachers that mentor the teacher candidates in their field experiences. The Undergraduate Elementary Education program at National Louis University has been redesigned to meet these outcomes and new requirements for elementary education grades 1-6 licensure in the state of Illinois. We anticipate that this proposed new Bachelor's degree program will be offered beginning Fall 2015 at National Louis University.