

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	11895	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	228
<b>Institution:</b>	Auburn University Montgomery		
<b>Unit:</b>	College of Education		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup> 82

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)<sup>2</sup> 48

**Total number of program completers 130**

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/ organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?**

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

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

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: [http://www.education.aum.edu/about/candidate\\_performance\\_data](http://www.education.aum.edu/about/candidate_performance_data)

Description of data accessible via link: Candidate Performance Data; Survey Data; Title II Reports, etc.

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

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

2

Link: <http://www.aum.edu/institutional-effectiveness/assessment>

Description of data accessible via link: Noel-Levitz; Graduation Survey Data; AUM Data

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

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

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

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

Looking at the last few years of data for Title II, Alabama State Department of Education's unconditional admissions report as well

as AUM's Institutional Effectiveness data, we have noticed an increase in enrollment despite the national trend for colleges of education to have fewer candidates enrolling into teacher prep programs. However, the number of completers from our programs have decreased. The decrease in candidates completing our programs include the increase in GPA, the number of Praxis content tests required to take for certification as well as the performance evaluation (edTPA) that is required during their internship. We will continue to review the effects of the new high stakes changes and the impact these changes will have on our graduates.

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

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

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

#### **1. The unit does not ensure consistent involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation of assessments. (ITP) (ADV)**

Auburn University at Montgomery's College of Education firmly believes that the Area for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review has been adequately resolved. Evidence of our efforts to ensure consistent involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation of assessments was documented in our 2017 EPP Annual Report. At this time, the only effort that has not yet yielded data we can share is the completer and employer satisfaction surveys. However, the State Department did disseminate these surveys on 2-28-18 and as reported to Deans of Education, 970 completer surveys had been completed and 640 employer surveys completed. As of 3-12-18, data has not yet been disaggregated and shared with IHEs.

The following has been taken directly from the 2017 EPP Annual Report, Section 6. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations:

The 2016 EPP Annual Report related that all programs would identify advisory committees specific to each program area; that the assessment system would be revised to meet new standards; and that the assessments would be evaluated by COE stakeholders.

A new Internship Evaluation Rubric common to all program areas using the InTASC standards was developed in 2016, and the Lawshe method was used to insure content validity. Specifically, the instrument was sent to 46 cooperating teachers for input. Twenty-four of the forty-six cooperating teachers responded – 52% return rate.

Advisory Board meetings were held with stakeholders on March 4, July 22, November 1, and November 4, 2016. In 2017, meetings with stakeholders have been held so far on February 24 and March 1. The new College of Education Internship Evaluation Rubric and supplemental rubrics relative to each program were discussed and presented to stakeholders (P12 educators and administrators, candidates, alumni, technology coordinators, community partners, and industry leaders) for review and validated as necessary utilizing the Lawshe method. Thus, a concerted effort has been made to ensure involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation of the COE's assessments.

As stakeholders, the AUM College of Arts and Sciences faculty and College of Public Policy and Justice faculty have been provided a breakdown of Praxis content specific scores and participated in discussions to help our teacher candidates in those areas. Meetings with faculty from these two colleges in the targeted secondary areas - history, English, and social studies – took place as well to discuss ways to improve secondary education programs, specifically how to adjust the courses taken so that candidates are more prepared for the content they will teach in the secondary classroom.

During Fall 2016 semester the assessment system was revised and rebuilt and will continue to undergo minor adjustments in order to collect data more efficiently. The COE Assessment Committee met on February 23, 2017 to review the data collected in Fall 2016 and modifications are being made.

In addition to EPP involvement of stakeholders, COE faculty assisted in a statewide partnership to create employer and in-service teachers' assessment instruments. Following the release of the CAEP standards, CAEP coordinators and members of the Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ALACTE) met with members from Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) to discuss accreditation requirements and concerns. EPPs across the state agreed to work on developing statewide employer and alumni surveys based on InTASC Standards and all institutions were asked to share alumni, employer, and exit surveys; field/clinical and professional dispositions evaluations; and impact on student learning assessments. A sub-group of the committee/taskforce was created to draft an instrument with the feedback from all CAEP coordinators. Seven institutions piloted the instrument and content validity was established utilizing Lawshe's Method. The draft instruments were then presented during a state-wide stakeholder meeting that included the executive director of the School Superintendents of Alabama Association; executive director of the Alabama Council for Leaders in Alabama Schools; ALACTE representatives from seven higher education institutions; AACTE's Sr. Vice President for Policy and Programs; and administrators, certification officers, and technology support personnel from the ALSDE. This group refined the survey format, developed a process for content validation of the surveys, and determined that the ALSDE would disseminate instruments utilizing their established platforms. In addition, the ALSDE agreed to analyze the results and distribute the results to each EPP.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

## CAEP Standard 5

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

### CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.

The College of Education has policies and procedures in place to ensure that program assessment results are analyzed and used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. Assessment is discussed at department meetings, and an annual data meeting is devoted to analyzing data, determining whether student learning outcome goals and program operational goals from the previous year have been met, and setting goals for the next year based on assessment results.

The following steps are taken during these data analysis meetings to fill out a template for each goal:

1. Close the loop from the previous year by describing the results of the assessments and whether the criteria for success was met and if candidates achieved expectations.
2. Explain what changes will be made based on the results, or an explanation if no changes are planned.
3. Determine if the goal should be continued and if so, should any changes be made such as the criteria or threshold for success.
4. Select direct and indirect methods of assessment.
5. Determine what level of learning will be expected for student learning outcomes (knowledge, comprehension, ability to apply, etc.).
6. Describe what the candidates are expected to do, how they will do it, and where (specific class, internship, etc.).

The Kinesiology Department follows the EPP policies and procedures to ensure that assessment results are analyzed and used to improve candidate

performance and strengthen the program. Assessment is discussed at every department meeting, and there is an annual meeting devoted to analyzing data, determining whether student learning outcome goals and program operational goals from the previous year have been met, and setting goals for the next year based on assessment results.

An example of how the Physical Education faculty examined the relationship among data, made changes, and studied the results of those changes is described below.

Candidates in the program are assessed on their physical skills in their Techniques of Teaching courses, they take a fitness test

before admission to professional education and again during the semester before their internship, and they must either pass a swimming test or pass a swimming class. When the fitness test was piloted the data indicated that our candidates tended to score low on aerobic fitness and several were barely able to pass the test by the deadline to be eligible for internship. Based on this assessment the whole department came together to offer support to struggling candidates. Some instructors offered for students to attend their fitness based activity classes, some began incorporating practice for the tests during required courses, and exercise science faculty were available to help them develop personal programs to improve their fitness. Now when candidates fail a portion of the test the first time they take it they are required to come up with a plan for improving and maintaining their fitness levels, and they are offered support. Candidates are also required to score at least 70% on skill tests taken during courses on techniques of teaching. If they are unable to pass the test the first time they are offered additional instruction and time to practice until they are able to pass.

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

- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **Key\_Assessment\_2\_AUM\_Fitness\_Test\_\_(SHAPE).docx**

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

**Yes**  **No**

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

**No identified gaps**

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

4.1 and 4.2 - We have no way to track 1st year teachers and the State Department does not provide this data to IHEs. Phone calls were made to CAEP contacts to secure examples, but no examples have been provided to date.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

**Yes**  **No**

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018 EPP Annual Report.*

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

### Report Preparer's Information

Name: Sheila Austin

Position: Dean

Phone: 334-244-3425

E-mail: saustin1@aum.edu

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

### Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

**Acknowledge**