

# 2020 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. EPP 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"/>

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation<sup>1</sup> applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

## 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 2018-2019 ?

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>

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>

**Total number of program completers** 127

<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 2018-2019 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](http://www.education.aum.edu/about/candidate_performance_data)

**Description of data accessible via link:** Impact measures for initial and advanced programs

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

1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1) The EPP began collecting impact data using a case study methodology that was reported for the first time in the 2020 CAEP Self-study. After submitting this information the EPP learned that the CAEP board has extended the phase in schedule indefinitely. The EPP will continue to gather data in the coming years.

2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2). The Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) has recently provided Alabama EPPs access to employer evaluation data that would demonstrate teacher effectiveness associated with individual completers. Trend data is not available but based upon this one year report the conclusions were that overall, AUM candidates in this sample had an average score of 2.83 on a 5 point scale. Twelve of the candidates had scores in the range between 2.0 and 2.86, eight had scores in the range between 3.0 and 3.64. One completer had an average score of 4.82.

3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 | A.4.1) Two years of data from the Employer Satisfaction survey of first year teachers are currently available. The third cycle is scheduled to be conducted in Spring 2020 and reflect results of employer perceptions of first-year teachers during their first year of employment. Two areas of strength noted for AUM were "Create learning experiences that make discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of content" - 77% were rated as Effective Teacher and 9% as Teacher Leader. "Engage in continuous professional learning to more effectively meet the needs of each learner" - 73% were rated Effective Teacher and 9% as Teacher Leader.

In order to measure employer satisfaction for advanced program completers, the college of education surveyed 24 Alabama superintendents to gather evaluations of completers' professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The response were:

1. Demonstrate the content appropriately to the subjects they teach (100% agree)
2. Create learning experiences that make the content meaningful to students (83% agree and 17% strongly agree)
3. Deliver instruction adapted to diverse learners (100% agree)
4. Provide learning opportunities that support intellectual, social, and personal development (100% agree)
5. Apply instructional strategies that promote critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills (100% agree)

4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 | A.4.2). A statewide collaborative developed a completer satisfaction survey and two years of data are available. The two items in the completer satisfaction survey identified as "Strongly agree" and/or "Agree" by first year teachers were:

Understand and use a variety of instructional strategies and make learning accessible to all learners. (47% Agree / 53% Strongly Agree / 100% Total)

Collaborate with others to build a positive learning climate marked by respect, rigor, and responsibility. (51% Agree / 49% Strongly Agree / 100% Total)

Advance Program Completers:

During the Fall 2019 semester, all advanced program completers from 2018-2019 were invited to complete a survey indicating satisfaction with their program. The survey reached 203 completers who were asked to complete Likert-type questions to report if they strongly agree (1), agree (2), disagree (3), or strongly disagree (4) with the effectiveness of their specific program. The summary of the results are provided below.

My latest graduate educational experience from AUM better prepared me for the demands of my current job. (Mean= 1.64; 55% strongly disagree and 27 % agree)

My latest graduate program from AUM extended my knowledge of how to use technology in appropriate ways within my profession. (Mean= 1.64; 55% strongly disagree and 27 % agree)

My latest graduate educational experience at AUM enhanced my expertise and commitment to working with diverse individuals including those with exceptionalities. (Mean=1.55; 64% strongly agree and 18% agree)

My latest graduate program of study at AUM heightened my understanding of how to collect and use assessment data to inform my practice. (Mean= 1.73; 55% strongly agree, 18% agree, and 27% disagree)

As a result of my latest graduate program at AUM, I feel more confident in independently engaging in research in my discipline. (Mean=1.55; strongly agree 55% and 36% agree)

My latest graduate educational experience from AUM enhanced my awareness to practice my profession in responsible and ethical ways. ( Mean =1.55; 64% strongly agree and 18% agree)

5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels):

Advance Program Completers (and certifiable students) by program

Initial 75 / 72 = 96%

Advanced 54 / 54 = 100%

6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)

7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels):

CAEP Annual Reporting Measures

During the Fall 2019 semester, all completers from 2016-17, 2017-2018, and 2018-19 academic cycles were invited to complete a survey indicating their employment status. Completers reported the following:

Initial Bachelor Program: Total% of candidates employed in field: Out of 19 responses, 95% were working in the field of their preparation at AUM.

Initial Alt-A Program: 94% were employed in the field out of 18 responses.

The FY2016 cohort default rate was released on September 23, 2019. The FY2016 national cohort default rate is 10.1%, and AUM's FY2016 cohort default rate is 10.4%.

## 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 ) )**

AUM has developed a protocol that delineated the agenda for stakeholder meetings so that they are involved in the evaluation of assessments and in the creation of new assessments. For example, the October 2019 meeting minutes of the advisory board demonstrate their involvement in reviewing data results and the creation of a new instrument used for the evaluation of Clinical Educators. As mentioned above in 5.2, "The Standard 2 committee presented a draft of the Evaluation of the Clinical Educator form to teacher candidates and university supervisors on 9/26/2019. These stakeholder groups provided feedback on the form, and changes were included. The revised form was then sent to cooperating teachers for their additional feedback and recommendations. Once all feedback was received and changes made, the instrument was presented to 31 individuals representing K-12 and higher ed for validation purposes.

## 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?

AUM has a quality assurance system that utilizes web-based platforms (Livetext, qualtrics, ) that is monitored by the Standard 5 chairperson and the assessment committee. The chair developed a template for programs to provide assessment data to the advisory board meetings for analysis and discussion. The purpose of this process is to improve our efforts to obtain stakeholders' input. This template was introduced and utilized at the Spring 2020 data and advisory meetings to improve our QAS. Two examples of changes in program that came about from the Fall 2019 Advisory board that focused on elementary education:

- #1: Clarity concerning Praxis tests window of time for taking so we can plan on taking the Reading classes prior to the reading praxis; move reading up to first method class; put math, science, ss after that; reading applies to everything
- #2: More practice work on edTPA woven into the methods classes not just waiting until practicum or internship to focus on edTPA; more professors understanding edTPA so they can embed instructional activities for practice.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards  
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **Fall\_2019\_COE\_Advisory\_Board\_Meeting\_Minutes(1)\_(1).pdf**

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

The AUM College of Education is actively involved in improving programs through collaboration with their state partners (Alabama Dept of Education) and three different specialized accreditors. The Early Childhood program has a center that is accredited by NAEYC, the School Counseling program is accredited by CACREP, and the remainder of the programs are transitioning from NCATE to CAEP culminating at an October 2020 site visit. The EPP worked diligently to create EPP assessments that would meet these different accreditors and would love to share their journey with others.

## 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 on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's™ assessment of its evidence. It may help 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 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 2020 EPP Annual Report.

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

## Report Preparer's Information

Name: Timothy Lewis  
Position: LiveText Coordinator  
Phone: 3342443184  
E-mail: tlewis19@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 complete 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**