

2022 Annual Accreditation Report

CAEP ID:	11895	AACTE SID:	228
Institution:	Auburn University Montgomery		
Unit:	College of Education		

Section 1. EPP Profile Updates in AIMS

Please review the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS and update the following information for: Contact Persons, EPP Characteristics, Program Listings. [See the Annual Report Technical Guide for additional guidance.]

1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS:

1.1.1 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head."

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree



1.1.2 I confirm that the EPP has listed and updated the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator".

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree



1.1.3 I confirm that the EPP has provided updated contact information for two distinct people for these roles.

[CAEP requires that EPPs provide information for two distinct contact persons to ensure that automatic communications sent from AIMS are received by the EPP in the event of personal turnover.]

Agree Disagree



1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS:

1.2.1 *Basic Information* - I confirm that the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.

[The individual(s) identified as the EPP head should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP.]

Agree Disagree



1.2.2 *EPP Characteristics and Affiliations* - I confirm that the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS

[The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in coordinating accreditation activities. This contact may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.]

Agree Disagree



1.2.3 *Program Options* - I confirm that EPP's program listings (including program name, program

review level, certificate level, program category, and program review option) are up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS for all EPP programs that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation; (programs outside of CAEP's scope of accreditation should be archived and not listed in AIMS).

Agree Disagree



Section 2. EPP's Program Completers [Academic Year 2020-2021]

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in P-12 settings during Academic Year 2020-2021?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

91

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

116

Total number of program completers 207

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II in the [CAEP Accreditation Policies and Procedures](#)

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Please report on any substantive changes that have occurred at the EPP/Institution or Organization, as well as the EPP's current regional accreditation status.

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2020-2021 academic year?

3.1 Has there been any change in the EPP's legal status, form of control, or ownership?

☐ Change ☒ No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Has the EPP entered a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach out agreements?

☐ Change ☒ No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 Since the last reporting cycle, has the EPP seen a change in state program approval?

☐ Change ☒ No Change / Not Applicable

3.4. What is the EPP's current regional accreditation status?

Accreditation Agency:

Auburn University at Montgomery is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges

Status:

AUM will be up for reaffirmation in 2028.

Does this represent a change in status from the prior year?

☐ Change ☒ No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 Since the last reporting cycle, does the EPP have any other substantive changes to report to CAEP per CAEP's Accreditation Policy?

☐ Change ☒ No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. CAEP Accreditation Details on EPP's Website

Please update the EPP's public facing website to include: 1) the EPP's current CAEP accreditation status with an accurate listing of the EPP's CAEP (NCATE, or TEAC) reviewed programs, and 2) the EPP's data display of the CAEP Accountability Measures for Academic Year 2020-2021.

4.1. EPP's current CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status & Reviewed Programs

4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPP's website where information relevant to the EPP's current accreditation status is provided along with an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review.

<https://www.aum.edu/collegeofeducation/>

4.2. CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]

Provider shares a direct link to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures, as gathered during the 2020-2021 academic year, are clearly tagged, explained, and available to the public.

CAEP Accountability Measures (for CHEA Requirements) [2020-2021 Academic Year]

- **Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)** Data must address: (a) completer impact in contributing to P-12 student-learning growth **AND** (b) completer effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- **Measure 2 (Initial and Advanced): Satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement. (R4.2|R5.3| RA4.1)**
Data provided should be collected on employers' satisfaction with program completers.
- **Measure 3 (Initial and Advanced): Candidate competency at completion. (R3.3)**
Data provided should relate to measures the EPP is using to determine if candidates are meeting program expectations and ready to be recommended for licensure. (E.g.: EPP's Title II report, data that reflect the ability of EPP candidates to meet licensing and state requirements or other measures the EPP uses to determine candidate competency at completion.)
- **Measure 4 (Initial and Advanced): Ability of completers to be hired** (in positions for which they have prepared.)

CAEP Accountability Measures (Initial) [LINK] www.aum.edu/caep-annual-reporting-measures

CAEP Accountability Measures (Advanced) [LINK] www.aum.edu/caep-annual-reporting-measures

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. The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP provided insufficient evidence that the EPP and its partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements. (component 2.1)

In order to improve the partnerships of the EPP and community, the EPP has created a Dean's Council to become a regular operation for the improvement of partnerships with the community. The Dean's Council invites 18 to 20 members who are representatives of the EPP and the community partners of P-12 education. The EPP representatives include faculty members from each academic department. The community partners include representatives of school districts (superintendent or principal), classroom teachers and school counselors, AUM alumni, recent graduates, members of the military sector, and regional community members relevant to P-12 education. The EPP remains connected with the council members to co-construct and revise assessments, activities, field experiences, and a host of other practices. This relationship is important so that we can find better ways to support each other as we prepare candidates to enter their own classrooms and mentor inservice teachers as they improve their practice. The council holds two regular meetings in each academic year to discuss the feedback and progress of necessary changes. These discussions are noted in council meeting minutes, and follow-up actions are documented.

To better reflect the efforts of the EPP and community partnership, the EPP's standard 2 committee will develop a platform for reporting the activities between the EPP's faculty and community partners. Utilizing an electronic form, faculty and/or staff members will note their discussions, activities, improvements, etc. on a continuous basis. This data will be collected and stored at the end of each semester to ensure proper evidence is noted of these interactions. The data will be discussed during our continuous improvement meetings at the departmental and college levels. This documentation aims to record the communication and participation in this partnership. The EPP will utilize this platform to provide a clearer view of how we collect the activities in co-construction of mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence that measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making. (component 5.4)

The EPP has taken several steps to address this area for improvement and has several additional steps planned. Before we could begin to address quality assurance, we realized that our conceptual framework for assessment within the EPP needed to be revised and updated. We developed a new framework for our assessment cycle which includes collection, analysis, reporting, and making meaningful changes based on that data. We have articulated a protocol chain within the EPP to ensure that the voices of all leaders and programs are represented in decision-making. One of our first actions was to restructure the EPP Assessment Committee. In doing so, we ensured representation of all departments on the Committee, including data specialists, data repository coordinator (LiveText), Assessment Coordinator, and CAEP coordinator. Currently, we are working toward defining very specific roles and responsibilities of each position, defining pertinent committees and roles within the assessment system, as well as developing a monthly calendar to meet to discuss our assessment-related topics. Second, we worked together as a Committee to systematically collect and analyze EPP-level data for our first cycle. We systematically identified EPP areas of strength and opportunities for growth based on completer data from EPP-created assessments benchmarked to internal measures (ex. EPP rubric), as well as external proprietary measures (ex. edTPA). We also examined state-level external data. Following completion, we shared with our CAEP Steering Committee, Leadership Committee, faculty at large, then our external stakeholders, the Dean's Council. Previously, during our site visit, we were unable to provide three cycles of data due to significant changes within the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE). We are still working toward collecting available data from the ALSDE to measure P-12 impact. Due to COVID-19 and workforce shortage within the ALSDE, release of data was delayed, causing inability to update data we need to complete our case study as planned. Finally, we are drafting an EPP "Assessment Handbook," which is a quality-assurance handbook/model to detail the system of assessment. By taking these steps, we have already worked toward developing a quality assurance system to ensure we collect benchmarked, quality data and that it is analyzed appropriately and widely shared, so voices, both internal and external, are valued in making decisions (change or not) to better our program.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The EPP provided insufficient evidence that the EPP and its partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements. (component A.2.1)

As with the initial programs, the advanced programs will collect evidence in similar fashion. Faculty and/or staff members will note their discussions, activities, improvements, etc. on a continuous basis. This data will be collected and stored at the end of each semester to ensure proper evidence is noted of these interactions. In addition, the Dean's Council will also serve as a means of communicating frequently with our stakeholders as we mutually co-construct activities, etc. for the advanced programs.

In order to improve the partnerships of the EPP and community, the EPP has created a Dean's Council to become a regular operation for the improvement of partnerships with the community. The Dean's Council invites 18 to 20 members who are representatives of the EPP and the community partners of P-12 education. The EPP representatives include faculty members from each academic department. The community partners include representatives of school districts (superintendent or principal), classroom teachers and school counselors, AUM alumni, recent graduates, members of the military sector, and regional community members relevant to P-12 education. The EPP remains connected with the council members to co-construct and revise assessments, activities, field experiences, and a host of other practices. This relationship is important so that we can find better ways to support each other as we prepare candidates to enter their own classrooms and mentor inservice teachers as they improve their practice. The council holds two regular meetings in each academic year to discuss the feedback and progress of necessary changes. These discussions are noted in council meeting minutes, and follow-up actions are documented.

To better reflect the efforts of the EPP and community partnership, the EPP's standard 2 committee will develop a platform for reporting the activities between the EPP's faculty and community partners. Utilizing an electronic form, faculty and/or staff members will note their discussions, activities, improvements, etc. on a continuous basis. This data will be collected and stored at the end of each semester to ensure proper evidence is noted of these interactions. The data will be discussed during our continuous improvement meetings at the departmental and college levels. This documentation aims to record the communication and participation in this partnership. The EPP will utilize this platform to provide a clearer view of how we collect the activities in co-construction of mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

2 Clinical Partnerships and Practice

There is limited evidence that the EPP works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings. (component A.2.2)

Each of the advanced programs is working to design a Field Activities Map that aligns professional activities within each of the required courses. In collaboration with our partners, the EPP will develop this map, which already includes multiple field activities. Documentation of this collaboration will be noted in minutes. Nevertheless, to provide a preponderance of evidence, the EPP is ensuring that the map along with a description of the various activities will be noted, stored, assessed, and discussed each semester. Our advanced candidates are already classroom teachers; therefore, the field activities will help to promote mentors, coaches, and other leaders in the field. These activities will include, but will not be limited to, facilitating professional development sessions, conducting action research, leading data meetings, contributing to professional learning communities, modeling technology, etc.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP provided limited evidence of goal setting and progress monitoring for admission, and support of diverse candidates who meet employment needs. (component A.3.1)

The EPP will continue to evaluate its recruitment plan and activities that will support the recruitment of diverse candidates. Faculty members have participated in recruiting activities in regional high schools and community colleges to increase the recruitment success of diverse candidates. The newly re-structured assessment committee will analyze recruitment data periodically to maintain the directions of recruitment aligning with the goals of admission for the EPP. These analyses are shared with the faculty and other stakeholders for input for continuous improvement towards meeting established goals. At the same time, each program is responsible for implementing a program-level recruitment plan that focuses on the hiring needs of the programs as well as increasing the pool of diverse candidates. The EPP also approves supportive incentives to increase the recruitment of diverse candidates. The supportive incentives include a code to waive their registration fee (if attending the Grad Preview Night, held twice a year) and two scholarship programs: Educator Advancement Program (for current teachers) and the Graduate Incentive Scholarship (for all other candidates) to encourage application of candidates from diverse backgrounds.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP provided limited evidence of admissions criteria and gathering data to monitor candidate progress from admission to completion. (component A.3.2)

Admission into our Advanced Programs is based on an overall appraisal of the applicant's ability to undertake advanced graduate level coursework. Official transcripts from all colleges and universities attended are reviewed for coursework and for a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 on all graduate work completed above the Bachelor's degree. Conditional admittance may be provided based on the evaluation of an applicant's complete application. Entrance exams such as the MAT and GRE are no longer required for admission by the university or EPP which provides opportunities for a wider range of candidates; however, candidates must provide evidence of Alabama's Certification of Teachers Fingerprint Inquiry Clearance. In order to graduate, cumulative GPA's of 3.25 for traditional Masters, 3.5 for traditional Educational Specialist, 3.0 for non-certificate Masters, and 3.25 for non-certificate Educational Specialist are required.

COE Advisors monitor candidates' progress each semester. After grades are posted every semester, each candidate's transcripts are reviewed and "Academic Warning Letters" are sent to all candidates who are in danger of not making satisfactory progress. Likewise, if faculty members find that a candidate is struggling, the faculty member refers the candidate to the Candidate Monitoring Coordinator utilizing a Qualtrics Survey. Once a candidate is identified, the Coordinator schedules a meeting with the candidates and a faculty committee to summarize the concerns and generate a plan of action.

Through CAEP Standard 3 committee meetings, ongoing conversations with our external stakeholders, COE graduate

counselor, as well as informal conversations with some of our Master's degree program candidates, we have formed the following perspectives:

...Retention of our traditional Master's program candidates is an area of improvement; it is essential that we use a proactive strategy: offer a tangible, systematic support system to our candidates throughout the program to ensure their academic learning is purposeful and relevant and that it serves as a framework for their program success. More specifically, we have contemplated the following ideas for consideration within the College of Education:

a) Institute an up-front interview with all candidates to address their questions that may entail program of study, available University resources, mentorship, financial support, counseling, and so forth. Similar to some of our graduate programs, institute a zero-credit hour meet and greet session to get to know our new graduate candidates. We have also contemplated a midway interview with the candidates to address unexpected issues or questions about the overall degree program—in other words, just-in-time mentorship as an intentional strategy to help support the candidates' career aspirations.

b) This year, we implemented a Teacher of the Year event and plan to conduct the same and other similar events that will provide our graduate candidates examples of successful current and past graduates, or a state/nationally recognized educator; in other words, a chance to network with successful candidates or former students.

c) Similar to the undergraduate program, we will continue utilizing our progress monitoring system to identify and help mentor Master and Ed.S. students when difficulties arise; a system that is proactive, not reactive, is deemed essential to promote retention of graduate candidates. Our goal is to recruit and retain our candidates—both pieces are inseparable.

d) In addition to our candidate monitoring system, we propose the following initial ideas to document the effect of our interventions to support our candidates' success in the program and retention in the College of Education:

- Track the progress of our Master and Ed.S. candidates at specific intervals, such as after their completion of 12 semester hours; we recognize that candidates do not all progress at the same pace; some candidates take only one course per semester; some candidates do not take graduate courses in the summer term.
- Host Zoom sessions with our degree program candidates to gain firsthand feedback about their experiences as they progress through the course and after graduation.
- Create a survey that will assess our candidates' impressions of how their Master's degree program meaningfully enhanced their role as educators, classroom teachers and in turn, hold program meetings that will focus on survey data as a basis for continuous program improvement...
- After instituting program changes, track effect of those curriculum or program changes on candidates' progress throughout their program.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP provided limited evidence of criteria for program progression and use of disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. (component A.3.3)

As part of our continuous improvement, the EPP has utilized resources to support a full-time data specialist that ensures that admission and other data are valid, reliable, and shared with stakeholders. The EPP continues to monitor candidates' GPA through admission to completion. Currently, candidates will receive academic warning letters to inform them about lowered GPA. The EPP utilizes GPA criteria to evaluate candidates' progress and disaggregates the data to reflect the progression of those candidates in the advanced programs. Disaggregation allows the EPP to examine any performance gaps between demographic groups. The EPP guides candidates to the AUM Warhawk Writing and Tutoring Lab and other University services as required supporting candidates' progress to completion. As required, conferences with the candidate, course instructor, or department chair are conducted to address circumstances affecting candidate academic performance.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

The EPP provided limited evidence of criteria for candidate completion. (component A.3.4)

Necessary GPA requirement for graduation and certification are included in admission letters and on the program plan that is provided to the candidate each semester in advising. Also, if the candidate's GPA is in question, the advisor warns the candidate and then, if at any time it is not mathematically possible to graduate, they are not allowed to continue. Individual faculty send candidates to the Warhawk Academic Success Center (WASC) for tutoring and counsel them individually if there is an issue in a particular course. There is also the candidate monitoring system that faculty can refer candidates to if there is an issue with professionalism.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

4 Program Impact

The EPP provided limited evidence of employer satisfaction with completers' preparation. (component A.4.1)

The EPP had previously completed one cycle of surveying to collect data on both initial and advanced programs. The surveys used include the AUM Alumni Survey for Advanced Programs to collect data from completers of advanced programs and the COE AUM Employer Survey and the AUM College of Education Alumni Employment Update for initial programs. The EPP will continue to administer these surveys to meet the required 3 cycles of data collection.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence its quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures. (component A.5.2)

Based on our site visit review, we agree that our plan had opportunity for growth. As previously discussed in Indicator 5.4, the first thing we did was to add resources to address quality assurance issues. Dr. Shumack, our Dean, added a CAEP Coordinator and filled the position of Assessment Coordinator, to collaborate with the LiveText Coordinator, using the approach of a three-member "think tank" to address quality assurance concerns. Next, we began to redefine our roles in assessment, starting with our Assessment Committee. We worked to define our boundaries, roles, and responsibilities. We started to develop our "Assessment Handbook," which is still under development. We systematically developed our conceptual framework for assessment within the EPP and used it as a pilot to analyze and disseminate data to gain perspective from internal and external stakeholders which will ultimately result in actionable measures. We redefined our assessment cycle based on available data and needs for considering improvements. Also, we met with our external stakeholders, the Dean's Council, to gain input on relevancy of our internally identified areas of strength and opportunities for growth.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence that it regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards. (component A.5.3)

The EPP has created an assessment committee to assume the duty of quality assurance measures. The EPP also created a Dean's Council to include stakeholders in the decision-making process. The purpose of the "Dean's Council" is to shift from an "Advisory Board" model in the EPP to a targeted, small group which is representative of all programs offered within the college. Additionally, we will offer more targeted support to our external stakeholders based on input and feedback. The feedback from the Dean's Council will be analyzed in the CAEP Steering Committee to assist the decision-making process and record the changes and outcomes of adjustments. This new operation has established a procedure to include internal and external stakeholders in the program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence that measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making. (component A.5.4)

The EPP has taken several steps to address this area for improvement and has several additional steps planned. Before we could begin to address quality assurance, we realized that our conceptual framework for assessment within the EPP needed to be revised and updated. We developed a new framework for our assessment cycle which includes collection, analysis, reporting, and making meaningful changes based on that data. We have articulated a "chain of command" within the EPP to ensure that the voices of all leaders and programs are represented in decision-making. One of our first actions was to restructure the EPP Assessment Committee. In doing so, we ensured representation of all departments on the Committee, including data specialists, data repository coordinator (LiveText), Assessment Coordinator, and CAEP coordinator. Currently, we are working toward defining very specific roles and responsibilities of each position, as well as pertinent committees and roles within the assessment system, as well as developing a monthly calendar to meet to discuss our assessment-related topics. Second, we worked together as a committee to systematically collect and analyze EPP-level data for our first cycle. We systematically identified EPP areas of strength and opportunities for growth based on completer data from EPP-created assessments benchmarked to internal measures (ex. EPP rubric), as well as external proprietary measures (ex. edTPA). We also examined state-level external data. Following completion, we shared with our CAEP Steering Committee, Leadership Committee, faculty at large, then our external stakeholders, the Dean's Council. Previously, during our site visit, we were unable to provide three cycles of data due to significant changes within the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE). We are still working toward collecting available data from the ALSDE to measure P-12 impact. Due to COVID-19 and workforce shortage within the ALSDE, release of data was delayed, causing inability to update data we need to complete our case study, as planned. Finally, we are drafting an EPP "Assessment Handbook," which is a quality-assurance handbook/model to detail the system of assessment. By taking these steps, we have already worked toward developing a quality assurance system to ensure we collect benchmarked, quality data, that it is analyzed appropriately and widely shared, so voices, both internal and external, are valued in making decisions (change or not) to better our program.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ADV)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

The EPP provided limited evidence that appropriate stakeholders are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. (component A.5.5)

Considering the involvement of the stakeholders, the EPP has identified methods to seek involvement from both internal and external stakeholders. Internally, we created a conceptual framework which ensures a process is in place to elicit feedback from faculty in different roles and programs across the EPP. The EPP has created a Dean's Council to become a regular operation for the inclusion of stakeholders in the process of the program evaluation, improvement and identification of models of excellence. The Dean's Council invites 18-20 members who are representatives of stakeholders of the EPP and the community partners. The roles and responsibilities of the Dean's Council are:

Councilmembers will represent a particular program reflective of a distinct area of expertise. Service requests, if chosen, will include:

- Attend two Dean's Council meetings per year (once in fall; once in spring) for approximately 2 hours to provide feedback to the College of Education in the areas of:
 - o Data Analysis and Continuous Improvement (Standards 1,5)
 - o Employer Satisfaction (Standard 4)
 - o Recruitment and Retention (Standard 3)
 - o Candidate Progression Support and Monitoring (Standard 3)
 - o Clinical Partnerships (Standard 2)
- Attend an approximate 1-hour "Council Training Seminar" per year to learn more about processes related to our data, key assessments, etc., to assist in offering feedback.
- If it is not possible to attend a meeting, Councilmembers will notify the Dean of the College of Education as soon as possible. It will be expected that feedback based on minutes of the missed meeting be provided.
- Provide occasional feedback outside of scheduled meetings for our internal assessment purposes.
- Collaborate with the AUM College of Education on how we might collaborate more closely with community stakeholders and Councilmembers.

The Dean's Council will become the platform that represents the involvement of stakeholders to achieve the goals set in this CAEP standard. The EPP will document the feedback of the Dean's Council and the follow-up decision-making process in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. Our evidence will include the Dean's Council description and the biannual meeting minutes. Additionally, our Dean's Council has agreed to periodically provide feedback, which will also serve as evidence.

Section 6. EPP's Continuous Improvement & Progress on (advanced level) Phase-in Plans and (initial-level) Transition Plans

Please share any continuous improvement initiatives at the EPP, AND (if applicable) provide CAEP with an update on the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans.

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 two major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

As far as targeted continuous improvement efforts, our EPP is proud that we were able to review our site visit feedback and transform our perspective to view of constructive support. We are proud of our efforts to revamp our quality assurance system and address resource issues identified in our phase-in plans. We feel that these steps are essential to revamping how we view and utilize continuous improvement measures to improve our EPP. We have modified our quality assurance framework, procedures, and assessments to be aligned with CAEP guidelines. Secondly, and as previously discussed, our EPP has invested in human resource capital and now financially supports various positions needed to gather, analyze, and report data; to lead faculty through the continuous improvement process at the program levels; to allow faculty to focus on reviewing data for continuous improvement instead of spending time on the process (creating data tables, developing reports, and etc); and to focus on monitoring goals established by the EPP and stakeholders.

The revamping of our assessment committee has been crucial to our changes and improvements. This committee has spearheaded the process of developing a framework, procedures, timelines, and processes needed for an effective quality assurance system. Likewise, the creation of the Dean's Council has been crucial to obtaining stakeholder input into our decision-making and enhancing our mutually beneficial partnerships. We had to examine our approaches and fix what was broken. We realized that having an effective quality assurance system that is understood and implemented by all is the key to our success and continuous improvement. This process has tremendously helped our EPP change our mindset from viewing continuous improvement processes as a CAEP requirement to a collective effort to improve the product we offer to our candidates. We do understand that data-driven modifications are important and have included some suggestions from our inaugural Dean's Council but feel that our efforts to develop a quality assurance system that includes internal and external stakeholder input as our most significant programmatic modification. Attached you will find our updated logic model for our quality assurance system, new timeline for assessments, resources provided to stakeholders to assist them with providing input on decisions for the EPP, and minutes from our inaugural Dean's Council. The attachments provide evidence of stakeholder input in our decision-making based on EPP data as well as an example of annual effectiveness report for an advanced program. The annual effectiveness report provide documentation of the improvements we have made to ensure that our continuous improvement process is systematic.

As far as an update on our phase-in plans, we are still working towards revamping and implementing our phase-in plans. The process has been slowed due to a leadership transition at the Dean's level, the revamping of our assessment and accreditation personnel that added new CAEP and Assessment Coordinators, and realigning with the new CAEP workbook's standards and criteria. Areas that have been addressed were included in the feedback for the advanced standards.

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

☐ Yes ☒ No

6.1.3 Optional Comments

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement
R5.1 Quality Assurance System
R5.3 Stakeholder Involvement

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **AUM_Documentation_2022_CAEP_Annual_Report.pdf**

Section 8: Feedback for CAEP & Report Preparer's Authorization

8.1 . [OPTIONAL] Just as CAEP asks EPPs to reflect on their work towards continuous improvement, CAEP endeavors to improve its own practices. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information to identify areas of priority in assisting EPPs.

8.1.1 What semester is your next accreditation visit?

Fall 2027

8.1.2 Does the EPP have any questions about CAEP Standards, CAEP sufficiency criteria, or the CAEP accreditation process generally?

8.2 Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2022 EPP Annual Report, and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages are up to date and accurate at the time of submission..*

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

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Yuh J. Guo

Position: CAEP Coordinator

Phone: 334-244-3026

E-mail: yguo1@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.

☒ **Acknowledge**