

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11895	AACTE SID:	228
Institution:	Auburn University Montgomery		
Unit:	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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹

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.)²

Total number of program completers 150

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

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

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

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

Link: 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, AUM Graduation Survey Results, AUM data -- Student Engagement - NSSE Visualization

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3

Link: <https://www.alsde.edu/ofc/otl/Ed%20Prep%20Institutional%20Report%20Cards/>

Description of data accessible via link: Educator Preparation Inst Report Card - Responses to First Year Teacher Survey

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

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

4

Link: <http://www.aum.edu/institutional-effectiveness/institutional-research/aum-data>
Description of data accessible via link: Completions; Common Data Set

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

Link: <http://www.aum.edu/admissions/scholarships-and-financial-aid>
Description of data accessible via link: Scholarships and Financial Aid (does not entail student default rates); Payment Plan FAQ

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

6

Link: <http://www.aum.edu/current-students/records-registrars-office/student-accounts/payment-plans-faq>
Description of data accessible via link: Payment Plan FAQ

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

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

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

Based upon data review as well as ongoing Faculty Staff discussions, several positive programmatic continual improvements have been undertaken or are in the process of being implemented. Field Experience Module – digitized the field experience data from past years and moving forward we are setting up the system to collect it via LiveText and have a phase-in implementation plan beginning this semester. Recruitment/retention – we instituted the “Educator Advancement” scholarship for students in traditional online Master’s and EdS programs.

The childhood education program has been reconfigured into two programs – early childhood and elementary. This will provide students a more focused curriculum on both areas, particularly in early childhood, as well as, we believe, enhance employment opportunities.

For internship – we instituted “writing workshops” in all program areas except special education (to this juncture), so that interns could connect with greater efficacy during their internships, engage in further questions of their university supervisors, and work on writing prompts related to teacher certification.

The College has continued to strengthen our sharing partnerships with P-12 institutions in the River Region and beyond.

We have further refined supervised field experiences that help our students become acclimated in schools, and continually review this process. We have produced edTPA curriculum maps to ensure that candidates receive the content and processes they need during coursework to be successful on the edTPA during internship. We have also, in response to candidate needs, implemented

writing workshops during internship to allow candidates time away from the classroom to write their edTPA commentaries and provide further opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the assessment. Additionally, the College has hired a full-time Executive Director (September 10, 2018) whose focus is accreditation and assessment in the context of student services. As one example, the College of Education Assessment Committee has become more active and engaged. P-12 partners are to be further included via the Assessment Committee.

Benchmarks are statistically evaluated in an historical context. Assessment information is shared with Faculty at monthly meetings as one example.

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.

As one example, evidence of our efforts to ensure more consistent involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation of assessments was specifically documented in our 2018 EPP Annual Report. Additionally, a Field Experience Advisory Board has been refined to advise our certification office, including, for example, functioning as a further meaningful conduit with Cooperating Teachers to strengthen our P-12 collaborative ties. Further, the College has redoubled its efforts and further developed employer and alumni surveys satisfaction surveys. As another important feature, we routinely engage a variety of community outreach activities/discussions. As another important component of continued development, we are initiating a College of Education Curriculum Committee that will interact not only internally, but also by using feedback from various stakeholders.

Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) did disseminate/ administer this type report published on September 2018. <https://www.alsde.edu/ofc/otl/Ed%20Prep%20Institutional%20Report%20Cards/> There are twenty-six employer questions. The Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education reports (as published by ALSDE) shows that Auburn University at Montgomery compared to Alabama as a whole scored with a higher combined strongly agree-agree on all but one question. (The strongly agree-agree categories represent more positive/ favorable responses on all the items.)

Of particular note, the external survey administered, collected, and analyzed survey reported that AUM communicates with students, parents, and the public about Alabama's assessment system and major Alabama educational improvement initiatives 62% strongly agree-agree, compared to 48% for Alabama as a whole. As an additional example, regarding "collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth -- AUM scored 81% strongly agree-agree, compared to the state figure of 65%. Several previous important initiatives and refinements regarding this area for improvement were provided in the last NCATE reviews have been detailed in previous CAEP Annual reports as well.

Additionally, in the context of improving our Quality Control System, we are in the process of adding a field experience module. The module, among other aspects, will provide a more effective and integrated assessment by which to examine and make changes in our our clinical practices; thereby further supporting students in becoming effective teachers.

We believe that the concentrated and synergistic effect of all these combined efforts by AUM COE Leadership, Faculty, and Staff in conjunction with our involvement with stakeholders are reflected in AUM's very positive Alabama Association of Colleges for Teacher Education report results. The most recent data (ALSDE, for example) supports that these various efforts have had a positive impact; nonetheless, we continue to strive for continuous improvement for our students and programs, and we appreciate the NCATE/CAEP feedback and constructive comments we have received.

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 cataloging 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.).

As cited earlier in this report a new Executive Director who has as a major responsibility, the College's assessment system has been recently hired (September 10, 2018). This major hiring further reflects the College's vigorous commitment to continuous improvement.. As a few salient examples, a COE Assessment Handbook is being more formally developed, and driven briefs are being developed to further facilitate discussions and the use data/evidence for continuous improvement. It is noteworthy that all of AUM's SPA submissions have either recognized or recognized with only modest conditions.

Additionally, the College of Education Faculty has written over 20 Academic Assessment Reports, primarily based upon 2016-2017 data. The reports include: Intended Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment Methods, and Results Use of Results. One example Academic Effectiveness Report for each of the three Departments, and by initial and advanced (total six example reports) are attached herein. The Reports demonstrate that the Faculty are committed to a data driven approach and when statistically supported, use the data to make continual improvement changes for our student's academic development. The rubric is also attached. Overall, the Academic Effectiveness TAGS apply to: 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards; 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress

3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students; 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession; 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning; A.2.2 Clinical Experiences; and x.1 Diversity.

Additional continuous improvement steps have also been implemented (relevant to Kinesiology):

The teaching/lesson plan evaluation form used in Techniques and Methods classes was revised in response to edTPA results and to incorporate new SHAPE standards.

A self-evaluation form on Professional Dispositions is now being administered in a course early in the program and again during internship to measure whether a renewed emphasis on professionalism in Kinesiology programs will impact student perceptions and behaviors.

To insure an early emphasis on achieving and maintaining a health enhancing level of fitness, as required by state and national Physical Education standards, the AUM Fitness Test is now being administered during the Foundations of Physical Education course which is required of all our majors early in the program. Students who do not pass one or more items on the test are provided resources for developing a plan to improve.

As previously mentioned herein, a Field Experience Advisory Board has been refined to advise our certification office, including, for example, functioning as a conduit with Cooperating Teachers. Further, the College has redoubled its efforts and further developed employer and alumni surveys satisfaction surveys. As another important feature, we routinely engage a variety of community outreach activities/ discussions. As another important component of continued development, we are initiating a College of Education Curriculum Committee that will interact not only internally, but also by engaging and using feedback from stakeholders.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
- 3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- x.1 Diversity

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  edTPA_withRetakesAnalysis_CAEP2019AnnualReport.docx
-  Childhood_Education_BS_Effectiveness_ReportXx.docx
-  Sec_Ed_English_MEd_Effectiveness_ReportXx.docx
-  Special_Education_(Alt._A)K12_MA_Effectiveness_ReportXx.docx
-  Sec_Ed_Social_Sciences_MS_Effectiveness_ReportXx.docx
-  Sec_Ed_Math_BS_Effectiveness_ReportXx.docx
-  Sec_Ed_Gen_Sci_MS_Effectiveness_ReportXx.docx
-  SLO__OPG_MetaAssessment_Rubrics_TEMPLATE.docx

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

Yes No

6.3 Optional Comments

We (Associate Dean and Executive Director) have attended the Spring 2019 CAEP Conference. We appreciate the learning opportunities provided and the availability and very useful dialogue with our CAEP colleagues. We also attended the Post-Conference and found it to be very helpful, instructive, and collegial.

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a success transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the fo

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 in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use 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 prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

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

Not applicable

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Leonard Lock

Position: Executive Director, Accreditation and Student Services

Phone: 3342443135

E-mail: llock@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