**College of Education, Humanities, and Behavioral Sciences**



**CAEP Annual Reporting Measures**

(CAEP Components 5.4/A.5.4)

# IMPACT MEASURES 2018-2019

Measure 1: Impact on P-12 Learning and Development (4.1)

The College of Education, Humanities, and Behavioral Sciences' Educator Preparation Program has prepared its candidates to be successful in the P-12 schools. Presented in standard four is evidence of our graduates' impact on their P-12 students learning. The evidence provided for 2018-2019 includes the Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development, Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness, Satisfaction of Employers, and Satisfaction of Alumni. Currently, value-added evidence is not collected by the Alabama State Department of Education, nor do they provide individual student performance data linked to individual teachers. The EPP there forth cannot directly link the teachers to their students' performance.

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) has developed eight annual reporting measures for Educator Preparation Providers (EPP), in which the EPP is required to provide information to the public on program outcome and program impact.

The eight reporting measures for Alabama A&M University's initial and advanced certification programs provide the data collected based on our Quality Assurance System.

The EPP completed its Self-Study review in the fall of 2018. CAEP accredited all initial programs in April 2019. Since the site visit, the EPP has continued to find ways to address standard 4 (4.1 & 4.2). The CAEP Leadership Advisory Council, established by the Dean, decided to investigate all possibilities for collecting data for standard 4. The first goal in the process includes a protocol to reach out to local school districts to learn about their processes and procedures for requesting data that aligns with the EPP's graduates and their P-12 student achievements. The second goal is for the council to survey the EPP graduates to investigate how comfortable they would feel with a mentor from the university providing professional support and conducting the impact on learning research information in their classrooms.

The research study will consist of observations in the classrooms, student surveys, teacher and administrator focus groups, individual teacher interviews, student assessment data analyzed, and the annual year-1 or year 3 Out Alumni Survey. The third goal consists of researching and deciding upon an assessment instrument for teacher observations and a student survey. This process will include checking with the school districts about instruments they are currently using to collect teacher impact data. The team has started reviewing proprietary instruments to search for student survey instruments with validity and reliability. The team continues to seek information from CAEP and the Alabama State Department of Education for support with standard 4.

 A pilot Case Study of the data collected for 2018-2019 has started. This small-scale experiment will help the EPP to learn how a large-scale project might work in practice for our institution. The EPP continues to evaluate the feasibility, duration of time to complete the research study, cost, adverse events, school district policies and procedures (privacy), and improve upon the study design before a performance of a full-scale research project. The implementation plan is in the process of being executed, so the concepts become a reality in the end. Based on clear goals and expectations, MOUs with the school districts will need revisions based upon mutual agreements of both parties. Materials and supplies with resources will be needed for the EPP to achieve its goals. Critical actions will be taken each year for the project to work.

The pilot case study was to gather quantitative and qualitative evidence that provides supporting data information that Alabama A&M University’s Educator Preparation Provider completers have a positive impact on student learning. The second objective was to analyze the data and to share the evidence gathered with the teacher preparation program faculty and staff to make improvements to the program and to adjust the processes of completing a case study.

Overall, the EPP will continue to collect data from completers and will use this information to improve the EPP’s mission of developing teachers to serve the State of Alabama. The pilot case study and the CAEP Annual Measures suggest that candidates are effective in teaching in the classroom and have a positive impact on their students. These data are limited, but the EPP will continue to collect and learn from our completers and employers to improve the education programs at Alabama A&M University.

**Measure 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (4.2)**

The EPP continues to utilize the ALACTE survey for employers of new teachers to collect teacher effectiveness data. The 2018-2019 ALACTE for Employers of New Teachers <https://www.alsde.edu/ofc/otl/Pages/epirc-all.aspx?navtext=Ed%20Prep%20Institutional%20Report%20Cards>

## Measure 3: Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones (4.3/A4.1)

The 2018-2019 ALACTE for Employers of New Teachers <https://www.alsde.edu/ofc/otl/Pages/epirc-all.aspx?navtext=Ed%20Prep%20Institutional%20Report%20Cards>

### Danielson Framework/Conceptual Framework/InTASC: Planning and Preparation, Content knowledge, Pedagogical Classroom Environment, Instruction. This analysis provides an aggregate view of the survey results and allows for a simpler comparison across alumni and employer satisfaction.

### Comparison of Categories – Class B Initial Program - AAMU (EPP Survey)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Danielson Framework** | **Alumni 1st Year****N= 10** | **Alumni 3rd Year****N=4** | **Employer Survey****N=6** |
| Planning and Preparation | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 100%Satisfied NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied |
| Content and Pedagogical Knowledge | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 10%Satisfied 90%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 10%Satisfied 90%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied |
| Classroom Environment  | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 70%Satisfied 30%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 90%Satisfied 10%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied |
| Professional Responsibilities  | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 100%Satisfied NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 90%Satisfied 10%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied |

## Measure 4: Satisfaction of Completers (4.) 2018-2019

Class B Undergraduate – Initial Program

**SURVEY**

To allow for further comparison across the standard, completers of the EPP were contacted by the Center for Educator Preparation and Certification Services to complete a survey through Survey Monkey regarding their preparation. The alumni survey includes several questions that relate to their satisfaction of their preparation to complete job responsibilities as a teacher. In March of each year, the survey was through Survey Monkey with a hyperlink sent through email to first and third year out teachers. The response rate was 90% for the 2018-2019 academic year for the teachers who contacted to complete the survey. The overall results indicate that 90% or greater of the participating completers were very satisfied or satisfied with how the EPP prepared them to complete their responsibilities on the job.

2018-2019 ALACTE Survey for Employers of New Teachers <https://www.alsde.edu/ofc/otl/Pages/epirc-all.aspx?navtext=Ed%20Prep%20Institutional%20Report%20Cards>

## Measure 4: Satisfaction of Completers (4.) 2018-2019

Class A - Alternative – Initial Program – Comparisons of Categories **(EPP Survey**)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Danielson Framework****Conceptual Framework**  | **Alumni 1st Year****N=8** | **Alumni 3rd Year****N=6** | **Employer Survey****N= 4** |
| Planning and Preparation | Very Satisfied 100%SatisfiedNeutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 50%Satisfied 50%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  |
| Content and Pedagogical Knowledge | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 90%Satisfied 10%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  |
| Classroom Environment  | Very Satisfied 90%Satisfied 10%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 80%Satisfied 20%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 90%Satisfied 10%NeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  |
| Professional Responsibilities  | Very Satisfied 100%SatisfiedNeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied | Very Satisfied 100%SatisfiedNeutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  | Very Satisfied 100%SatisfiedNeutralDissatisfied Very Dissatisfied  |

**INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS:**

Two 30-minute individual interviews conducted with graduates in April. The Director of Assessments led the interviews. Questions prepared in advance of the interview session relate to the InTASC. The participants were contacted by phone to participate. One male and one female teacher were selected to answer the questions independently of each other.

One participant stated, "Alabama A&M prepared me to develop good lesson plans using research and student data to drive my instruction. My students are performing well on the local school's assessments. I can see their progress. I can also see how important edTPA and the other activities were to my growth as a teacher. I could not see it at the time, but I do now."

Second participated stated, "Having my own classroom has been an adventure. I stay up late planning strategies to help my students. I am very satisfied with my preparation from A&M because I know where to find valuable resources, and I know what is important for my students to succeed."

## 4: Satisfaction of Completers (4.) 2018-2019

Class A – Traditional Program – Alumni Survey Categories **(EPP Survey)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Danielson Framework Domains** | **Alumni Survey****N= 5** |
|  | **Exceptionally Prepared** | **Adequately****Prepared** | **Prepared** | **Some What Prepared**  | **Not Prepared** |
| Planning and Preparation | 100% |  |  |  |  |
| Content and Pedagogical Knowledge | 100% |  |  |  |  |
| Classroom Environment  | 90% | 10% |  |  |  |
| Professional Responsibilities  | 100% |  |  |  |  |

**OUTCOME MEASURES**

## MEASURE 5: Graduation Rates – All Initial Programs

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year Admitted**  | **N**  | **Graduates after Six Semesters**  | **Graduation Rate**  |
| Fall 2013 | 168 | 66 | 39.2% |
| Fall 2014 | 86 | 58 | 67.4% |

MEASURE 6: Ability of Completers to meet Certification and Any State Requirements: Title II Reports Posted to AAMU Website

<https://www.aamu.edu/academics/colleges/education-humanities-behavioral-sciences/research-outreach-centers/educator-preparation-certification/index.html>

2015-2016 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative

2016-2017 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative

2017-2018 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative

2018-2019 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative

**Class B – Traditional Certification 2016-2019 (Initial Programs)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year** | **Candidates Recommended****for Certification** | **Program Completers** | **Total Number of Males** | **Total****Number of Females** |
| **2018-2019** | 15 | 15 | 3 | 12 |
| **2017-2018** | 13 | 13 | 4 | 8 |
| **2016-2017** | 23 | 23 | 3 | 20 |

**Class A – Alternative Certification – 2016 – 2019 (Initial Programs)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year**  | **Candidates Recommended****for Certification** | **Program Completers** | **Total Number of Males** | **Total****Number of Females** |
| **2018 - 2019** | **21** | **21** | **6** | **15** |
| **2017 - 2018** | **23** | **23** | **12** | **11** |
| **2016 - 2017** | **24** | **24** | **8** | **16** |

**Class A – Traditional Certification - 2016 – 2019 (Advanced Programs)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year** | **Candidates Recommended****for Certification** | **Program Completers** | **Total Number of Males** | **Total Number of Females** |
| **2018 - 2019** | **8** | **8** | **2** | **6** |
| **2017 - 2018** | **13** | **13** | **6** | **7** |
| **2016 - 2017** | **16** | **16** | **9** | **7** |

**Class AA Education Specialist Certification - 2016 – 2019 (Advanced Programs)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Year**  | **Candidates Recommended** **for Certification**  | **Program Completers**  | **Total Number of Males** | **Total Number of Females** |
|  **2016 - 2017** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **1** |

**EdTPA Data: Results 2018 -2019 Class B Initial Programs and Class A – Alternative**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year**CLASS B INITIAL**  | TotalMean15 RubricsPossible Points-75ALSDE Cut Score 37N=13 | PassRate | Total Mean18 RubricsPossible PointALSDE Cut Score44 N=2 | Pass Rate |
| **2018-2019** | **Mean 39.2** | **100%** | **Mean 51.00** | **100%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **CLASS A-ALTERNATIVE INITIAL**  | TotalMean15 RubricsPossible Points-75ALSDE Cut Score 37N=20 | PassRate | Total Mean18 RubricsPossible PointALSDE Cut Score 44  | Pass Rate |
| **2018-2019** | **Mean 41.46** | **100%** |  N/A | N/A |

## PRAXIS SUMMARY PASS RATE 2018 2019 – Class B Initial Certification

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | **The number taking the Test** | **Number Passing the Test** | **Percentage Rate** |
| All program completers 2018-2019 | 15 | 15 | 100% |
| All program completers 2017-2018 | 13 | 13 | 100% |
| All program completers 2016-2017 | 21 | 21 | 100% |

## PRAXIS SUMMARY PASS RATE 2018 2019 – Class A Alternative Initial Certification

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Groups** | **The number taking the Test** | **Number Passing the Test** | **Percentage Rate** |
| All program completers 2018-2019 | 20 | 19 | 95% |
| All program completers 2017-2018 | 22 | 22 | 100% |
| All program completers 2016-2017 | 24 | 24 | 100% |

## Measure 7: Percentage of Completers Hired in Education Positions for Which they are Prepared

 Percentage of Completers Employed in the State of Alabama – Initial Programs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Year**  | **Percentage**  |
| 2018-2019 | 72% |
| 2017-2018 | 67% |
| 2016-2017 | 74.5% |

Percentage of Completers Employed in the Field of their Certification – Initial Programs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Academic Year**  | **Percentage**  |
| 2018-2019 | 70% |
| 2017-2018 | 78% |
| 2016-2017 | 95.5% |

## Analysis and Discussion of Impact Measures 4.1-4.4

In summary, despite a lack of data from the state and other external sources, the EPP utilizes triangulated data from multiple sources to attempt to determine the impact that our completers have in the P-12 schools. Our data suggest that our completers have a positive impact on their students in their initial years of service. Their employers also appear to be satisfied with the graduates from our programs. Our completers also appear to be satisfied with their preparation as presented on multiple sources of data. The EPP has developed an action plan that includes steps to collect data on student impact in the future that could better inform the development of our programs. Our goal is to continue to revise and develop a quality assurance system that will allow us to better prepare our candidates to impact their students' learning.

**8: Student Loan Default Rates and Other Consumer**

**Alabama A&M UniversitY**

**normal, alabama 35762**

The U.S. Department of Education releases official cohort default rates once per year. A cohort default rate is the percentage of a school's borrowers who enter repayment on certain Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program or William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program loans during a particular federal fiscal year (FY), October 1 to September 30, and default or meet other specified conditions before the end of the second following fiscal year. The latest released student loan default rates can be located on the link below.

<https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/cdr.html>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| U.S. Department of Education and Federal Student Aid logo (Start Here. Go Further.) | School Default RatesFY 2016, 2015, and 2014 | return to search results |

**Record 1 of 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OPE ID** | **School** | **Type** | **Control** | **PRGMS** |  | **FY2016** | **FY2015** | **FY2014** |
| 001002 | ALABAMA AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY4900 MERIDIAN STREETNORMAL   AL  35762-1357 | Master's Degree or Doctor's Degree | Public | Both (FFEL/FDL) | **Default Rate** |  18.2  |  19.8  |  18.9  |
| **No. in Default** |  342  |  378  |  332  |
| **No. in Repay** |  1,875  |  1,902  |  1,753  |
| **Enrollment figuresPercentage Calculation** |  5,872 31.9  |  5,591 34  |  5,513 31.7  |

**ENROLLMENT: To provide context for the Cohort Default Rate (CDR) data, we include enrollment data (students enrolled at any time during the year) and a corresponding percentage (borrowers entering repayment divided by that enrollment figure). While there is no direct relationship between the timing of when a borrower entered repayment (October 1 through September 30) and any particular enrollment year, for the purpose of these data, we have chosen to use the academic year ending on the June 30 prior to the beginning of the cohort year (e.g., FY 2016 CDR Year will use 2014-2015 enrollment).**

**Current Date: 04/03/2020**

# Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Fact Sheet
FY 2016 Cohort Default Rates
September 2019

Section 435(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (the HEA) provides that institutions lose eligibility to participate in the Federal Direct Loan and Federal Pell Grant programs when the institution's federal student loan Cohort Default Rate exceeds 30 percent for each of the three most recently completed federal fiscal years beginning with federal fiscal year 2016. Under Section 435(a)(7) of the HEA, an institution that has a Cohort Default Rate of 30 percent or greater for anyone federal fiscal year is required to establish a Default Prevention Task Force to reduce defaults and prevent the loss of institutional eligibility.

As of September 2019, all 100 eligible HBCUs have official FY 2016 cohort default rates that fall below regulatory thresholds. For the FY 2016 official CDR cycle, only one HBCU is subject to cohort default rate sanctions or the consequent loss of Title IV student financial assistance program eligibility.

HBCUs have deployed innovative approaches towards default management and reduction. Such strategies include implementation of a default management plan that engages stakeholders, identifies approaches to reducing default rates, and tracks measurable goals. These schools have increased borrower awareness of obligations through incorporating borrower topics at orientation sessions and providing enhanced entrance and exit counseling. Other best practices include borrower tracking, increased contact with delinquent borrowers, taking advantage of the cohort default rate challenge/adjustment/appeal processes, and partnering with other stakeholders to optimize default prevention, resolution, and reduction.

HBCUs, TCCs, and Navajo Community Colleges are encouraged to continue to use an acceptable default management plan (such as found in Appendix B to 34 CFR 668 Subpart N).

Questions regarding the Title IV student financial assistance program eligibility status of these schools or other HBCUs should be forwarded to:

U.S. Department of Education
Federal Student Aid
Operations Performance Division
(202) 377-4259

Retrieved March 2020 from:

<https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/dmd002.html>