

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11895	AACTE SID:	228
Institution:	Auburn University Montgomery		
Unit:	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 EPPs seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation]. Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial-Licensure Level 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 2019-2020 ?

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 134

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 2019-2020 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: https://www.aum.edu/collegeofeducation/academic-departments/accreditation/candidate_performance_data/#Measure5

Description of data accessible via link: This website contains URL's that will redirect you to the 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?

Reviewing the annual report has provided an opportunity to explore various aspects of our unit's impact. COVID-19 has created a monumental disruption in our growth and plans for establishing new benchmarks associated with Impact on P-12 learning and development. Our state implemented a new assessment system that included new standardized tests, and the first administration was cancelled due to COVID-19. Therefore, we were not able to obtain accurate measures of our completers' impact. However, the unit has developed benchmarks in diversity/recruitment and technology integration.

Diversity and Recruitment Benchmarks:

The COE developed an enrollment plan that had several specific goals:

1. Goal 1: Increase the ethnic diversity, specifically of African American education majors
2. Goal 2: Increase majors in high need areas, specifically Math (Pre-K-12), Science (6-12), English (Pre-K-12), and Special Education (K-12)
3. Goal 3: Increase male education majors in Elementary, Early Childhood, Secondary, and Special Education; Increase female Physical Education majors

Goal 1 was based upon demographic data pertaining to the state's and the campus population. This is an important goal as only

20% of Alabama educators are Black while the K12 student population is 33% Black. During the last three years, the AUM population of Black students has increased from 37 to 41%, and the COE population of Black students from 38% to 43%. The specific goal is to steadily increase the percentage of Black students starting in Fall 2020 from 44% to 46% in Fall 2024.

Goal 2 to increase majors in high need areas has been difficult in that the number of Math, Science, English Language Arts, Special Education and Early Childhood/Elementary candidates have all decreased in actual numbers between 2017-2019. One of the reasons is that students are having difficulty passing the Praxis Core. In Fall 2019 there were 559 candidates enrolled in the COE; 193 have taken the Praxis and 40 of those did not pass (20.7%). Of that group:

- o Didn't pass Math – 25
- o Didn't pass Reading – 15
- o Didn't pass Writing - 23

Ten of these 40 students have taken the Praxis Core more than once and failed in these areas:

- 6 didn't pass Reading
- 6 didn't pass Writing
- 8 didn't pass Math
- 5 have below 3.0 GPA

The COE developed a program that began Spring 2020 to offer financial assistance to students who have taken but not passed the Praxis Core exam and for those who have not taken the exam. Students were provided with a mentor/tutor who worked with them to formulate a study plan based on past score reports and/or practice test reports which indicated areas for further study and improvement.

Technology Integration:

Assessment results and feedback from stakeholders help the unit identify technology integration as a benchmark area for growth even though evidence demonstrates that AUM has integrated technology throughout the initial teacher preparation programs. One example, which is also tagged to CAEP 1.5, is indicator 2.6 of the AUM Common Internship Rubric: Candidates can integrate technology media into instructional activities and actively engage students in the use of this technology. The 2.6 rubric is used to demonstrate that technology is introduced, practiced and assessed in courses prior to internship and then again at two times during internship by both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. The AUM common internship rubric cluster 2.6 asks candidates to "integrate technology media into instructional activities and actively engages students in the use of technology." On the positive side of the data results for the last three cycles there were no candidates scoring at the lowest score of developing. In Spring 2019 there were 18 candidates who scored at the highest level of model (43%), and an average score of 2.4. This was an improvement over scores from Fall 2018 with only 27% scoring at the highest level.

In order to improve the candidate's ability to incorporate technology into the learning experience, the COE strongly supports faculty professional development. AUM's Faculty Development Institute (FDI) offers professional development to assist faculty with the integration of technology into classrooms. Faculty then model and utilize technology for instruction, assessment, communication, collaboration; and they ensure its accessibility in their courses. Even though our data and feedback show that completers are able to integrate technology into the curriculum, the following feedback from various programs have identified technology as an area of growth.

Early Childhood:

The Early Childhood and Elementary programs met with the Advisory Board in late October and early November 2019. Data from these meetings demonstrates that AUM's Elementary Education program has several strengths. For example, participants stated that an increase in technology training would be helpful for student interns. For example, many of the surrounding schools use Google classroom as a way to assign projects, increase collaboration with peers, and communicate with parents. In the future, AUM professors are going to provide Google classroom training for students before they enter into the final phase of the program. The Advisory Board also provided valuable information in regard to the Early Childhood programs. They found many strengths of the program, such as diversity with field experiences and the professor-student relationship to be excellent. However, members did state that several changes could enhance the overall quality of the program. Some areas of improvement include extending the internship hours, providing field experiences outside of the Montgomery area schools, and implementing more technology in the reading and methods courses. As a response to these suggestions, the early childhood program will review the current practicum hours (75) and identify ways they can embed up to 25 more hours hopefully in a school site other than Montgomery. In addition, professors are going to strive to implement more technology use in the classroom so that students are better prepared for the types of technology they will be expected to use during field experiences, practicum, and student internship.

Elementary Education:

The Elementary Education program met with its partners in October 2019. From this discussion, our partners noted several strengths, such as diverse field experiences, use of technology, and good edTPA preparation for teacher candidates. The following were noted as areas for improvement: supervisors should observe more during internship, faculty should provide training on Google classroom or other technology for building lessons, and the program should move reading classes to the beginning of the course sequence. Taking the feedback into consideration, the program is working to learn more about Google classroom training so that faculty can offer this to candidates. The program is also working on a plan to increase the number of supervisor visits during internship as well as a plan to move up the measurement course in the course sequence. These changes will not only address our partners' concerns but will also help our teacher candidates become more adept at technology used in the classroom and will help them to continue growing in the profession.

Physical Education:

The Department of Kinesiology received feedback from stakeholders who attended the October 29, 2019 COE Advisory meeting. The feedback provided to the department is extremely important and will help as we endeavor to better educate our teacher

candidates. Specifically, the feedback allows the opportunity to modify courses and thought processes as we strive to design courses that are rigorous and prepare our teacher candidates for the real world. Stakeholders mentioned the need for the program to incorporate more technology usage in courses to give teacher candidates more opportunities to develop competency in this area. Also, stakeholders noticed that field experiences might need to be better sequenced in an effort to allow more of a progression in tasks/requirements during placements. Lastly, stakeholders suggested we try to simulate real-world experiences as much as possible in our courses in which teacher candidates instruct their peers in an effort to better prepare teacher candidates for what it is really like when they are in charge of a class of students. The Department of Kinesiology plans to use all feedback provided to improve experiences for teacher candidates in an effort to graduate candidates who are well-prepared to take on whatever they may face in their classroom.

At the college level, a professional development focused on Google Level 1 Certification has been developed to support both faculty and candidate use of the Google Educator Suite. This professional development is designed to assist faculty with modeling integrating the tools by incorporating assignments and activities that require collaboration, creation, record keeping, survey feedback, and delivering online content. Required technology courses as the initial and advanced levels have been to require Google Certification by candidates.

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

Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Timothy Lewis

Position: Interim Assessment 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 reviews.
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 review 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