

College of Education, Humanities, and Behavioral Sciences



CAEP EPP Annual Reporting Measures -2018-2019 (CAEP Components 5.4/A.5.4)

IMPACT MEASURES

SECTION 4: Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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. Hence, the EPP 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 Assessment 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. This data is 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.

****** The data from the Case Study will be displayed in April 2021 with the 2021 CAEP Annual Reporting Measures.**

Measure 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (4.2)

1. 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>

2. **The Student Perception Survey** is currently developed for students in grades 3-12 to provide feedback to their teachers to improve practice and inform instruction. The Student Perception Survey was developed by the EPP and school partners during the summer 2018 for a pilot case study. The instrument's data are valid based on the Lawshe Method. Two school partners participated in the Lawshe process with two faculty members. Before the completers issued the survey to students, they required permission from the parents. Approximately one-fourth to half of the students in the classrooms participated. The survey was disseminated electronically using Google Forms. The mean and range of the points earned on the classroom perception survey are displayed below. The EPP will continue to research proprietary student surveys for the 2019 case study for the 2020 CAEP Annual Reporting Measures Report. The data will be shared with faculty and during the EPP's Advisory Council meeting in 2020-2021 with school and community stakeholders.

Table 1. Grades 3-12 Student Perception Survey

COMPLETER PARTICIPANTS	PERCEPTION ELEMENTS EPP STUDENT PERCEPTION SURVEY Total Possible Points 20	POSITIVE RATINGS N= 27 Students	AREAS OF STRENGTHS	AREAS OF FOCUS
Completer 1 Social Studies Secondary Education – Urban 9 th grade History 2 Years Out	Learning in the Class – 5 points Classroom Environment -5 points Classroom Management -5 points Communication – 5 points	N= 12 Mean 18.4 Range 18-20	Classroom Environment Classroom Management	Communication
Completer 2 Physical Education – Middle School – Suburban Grades 6-9 Physical Education 1 Year Out	Learning in the Class – 5 points Classroom Environment -5 points Classroom Management -5 points Communication – 5 points	N=10 Mean 19.5 Range 19-20	Classroom Management	Learning in the Class
Completer 3 Special Education High School - Urban Grades 9-10 2 Years Out	Learning in the Class – 5 points Classroom Environment -5 points Classroom Management -5 points Communication – 5 points	N=5 Mean 20 Range – Full scores earned from each student.	Learning in the Class Classroom Environment Classroom Management Communication	N/A

N=3 Completers	20 Possible Points	Overall Mean 18.74	EPP Overall Strength: Classroom Management	EPP Overall Areas of Focus: Communication and Student Learning
----------------	--------------------	-----------------------	--	--

B. EPP Employer Survey (2018-2019) –Table 1 includes the data results from the EPP Employer Survey. Employers complete the survey for teachers in years 1,2 or 3 of their teaching experiences. The surveys were conducted by the CAEP Director between February – March of each academic year. The survey asks employers to rate the completers’ teaching effectiveness relative to graduates from another educator preparation programs.

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

A. 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>

B. EPP Employer Survey (2018-2019) –Table 1 includes the data results from the EPP Employer Survey. Employers complete the survey for teachers in years 1,2 or 3 of their teaching experiences. The surveys were conducted by the CAEP Director between February – March of each academic year. The survey asks employers to rate the completers’ teaching effectiveness relative to graduates from other educator preparation programs.

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.

Table 1. Comparison of Categories – Class B Initial Program - AAMU (EPP Survey)

Danielson Framework	Alumni 1 st Year N= 10	Alumni 3 rd Year N=4	Employer Survey N=6
Planning and Preparation	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 100% Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied
Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 10% Satisfied 90% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 10% Satisfied 90% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied

Classroom Environment	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 70% Satisfied 30% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 90% Satisfied 10% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied
Professional Responsibilities	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 100% Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 90% Satisfied 10% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied

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

Class B Undergraduate – Initial Programs

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 were 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 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% Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 50% Satisfied 50% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied

Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 90% Satisfied 10% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied
Classroom Environment	Very Satisfied 90% Satisfied 10% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 80% Satisfied 20% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 90% Satisfied 10% Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied
Professional Responsibilities	Very Satisfied 100% Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 100% Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied 100% Satisfied Neutral Dissatisfied 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 participant 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 2018-2019 Reports

MEASURE 5: Graduation Rates – All Initial Programs

GRADUATION RATE BY DEGREE LEVEL

2018 REPORT: GRADUATION RATE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS – INITIAL PROGRAMS

Year Admitted	Total Number Admitted	Percentage Graduated in 4 Years	Total Percentage Graduated of the Cohort Group
2016-2017	15	46%	86%
2017-2018	10	20%	80%
2018-2019	13	22%	46%
Total	38	29%	71%

2018 REPORT: GRADUATION RATE – ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

Year Admitted	Total Number Admitted	Percentage Graduated in 3 Years (6 semesters)	Total Percentage Graduation Rate of Cohort Group
2016-2017	27	33%	66%
2017-2018	12	58%	66%
2018-2019	12	25%	42%
Total	51	38%	58%

2018 REPORT: GRADUATION RATE: TRADITIONAL - ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Year Admitted	Total Number Admitted	Percentage Graduated in 3 Years (6 semesters)	Total Percentage Graduation Rate of Cohort Group
2016-2017	3	100%	100%
2017-2018	2	100%	100%
2018-2019	2	100%	100%
Total	7	100%	100%

2018 REPORT: GRADUATION RATE – GRADUATE COMPLETERS – SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Year Admitted	Total Number Admitted	Percentage Graduated in 3 Years (6 semesters)	Total Percentage Graduation Rate of Cohort Group
2016-2017	12	58%	58%
2017-2018	2	0	0
2018-2019	0	0	0
Total	14	58%	58%

MEASURE 6: Ability of Completers to meet Certification and Any State

Requirements: Title II Reports are posted on AAMU Website.

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

- 2016-2017 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative
- 2017-2018 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative
- 2018-2019 Title II Reports - Traditional and Alternative

PROGRAM COMPLETERS AND EARNED CERTIFICATIONS

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	20	20	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	Total Mean 15 Rubrics Possible Points-75 ALSDE Cut Score 37 N=13	Pass Rate	Total Mean 18 Rubrics Possible Point ALSDE Cut Score 44 N=2	Pass Rate
CLASS B INITIAL				
2018-2019	Mean 39.20	100%	Mean 51.00	100%
Academic Year	Total Mean 15 Rubrics Possible Points-75 ALSDE Cut Score 37 N=20	Pass Rate	Total Mean 18 Rubrics Possible Point ALSDE Cut Score 44	Pass Rate
CLASS A- ALTERNATIVE INITIAL				
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%

Measure 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>



School Default Rates
FY 2016, 2015, and
2014

[RETURN TO RESULTS](#)

Record 1 of 1

OPE ID	School	Type	Contr ol	PRGMS		FY2016	FY2015	FY2014
001002	ALABAMA AGRICULTURAL &	Master's Degree	Public		Default Rate	18.2	19.8	18.9

MECHANICAL UNIVERSITY 4900 MERIDIAN STREET NORMAL AL 3576 2-1357	or Doctor's Degree	Both (FFEL/F DL)	No. in Default	342	378	332
			No. in Repay	1,875	1,902	1,753
			Enrollment figures	5,872	5,591	5,513
			Percentage Calculation	31.9	34	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>

SECTION 5. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT, WEAKNESSES, AND/OR STIPULATIONS

Alabama A&M University met all five CAEP standards with no areas for improvement or stipulations for the 2018 Self-Study Report for initial programs. All prior AFIs were removed.

NCATE AFI: 1.

The EPP regularly and systematically collects, analyzes, and reviews data from the QAS. Data from Pre-Clinical early field experiences (Transition Phase 111), and from Clinical (Transition Phase IV) are collected every semester during methods courses and clinical experiences. This schedule for assessing and collecting data from candidates is shown in the continuous review schedule for field experiences Exhibit Number #69 EPP Field Experiences assignments Traditional-Class AA and Educational Leadership. The EPP utilizes both proprietary and EPP created instruments. The proprietary instruments are those required or will be required in order for candidates to be fully admitted (Praxis Core) to the program or in order to obtain certification (Praxis 2) SSR Exhibit 1.1.9; 1.1.10; 1.1.11, 1.1.12; 1.1.13; and 1.1.14. The multiple measures used to monitor the EPP's operational effectiveness directly address CAEP's four impact measures - P-12 student learning and development, observations of teaching effectiveness, employer satisfaction and completer persistence, and completer satisfaction. In addition, four outcomes measure of completer rates, licensure rates, employment rates, and loan default rate are also used to help determine EPP's operational effectiveness SSR Exhibit 4.1 ACT Aspire Data Tables, 4.2 Student Survey Data and Principal Walkthrough Data Tables, 4.3 Principal Survey Data Table, and 4.4 Completer & First year Survey Data Tables.

All assessments provide data and information about candidates' performance for meeting standards or demonstrating competence, how well candidates are meeting institutional and other standards and proficiencies as specified in the Conceptual Framework, and about the operations of the EPP. A list of operational components has been identified and the results of assessments and how these have aided in improving operations are included SSR Exhibit 5.3.1 Assessment of Operation in QAS.

In all cases, the changes have been implemented and the impact of many have been identified SSR Exhibit 5.3.2 Chart of Data Driven Changes. To ensure that changes resulted from relevant data, the EPP selected a process to analyze and interpret results over time; identify possible changes to move us to where we desire to be, implement the change noting why the strategy is/was selected, and finally, to do some comparisons on our impact statements relative to where we were and where we are based on continuous monitoring. While it is anticipated that change will lead to improvements or to meet desired goals, it is recognized that some may not. In these cases, decisions about future directions are closely tied to continuous improvement for the EPP. Data has been consulted from many areas including candidate data, clinical partnership data, candidate quality, and program impact data. While several data sets have been used to make changes, the following chart shows data from the four areas above and how this data issued to make changes SSR Exhibit 5.3.2 Chart of Data Driven Changes.

NCATE AFI 2

The Quality Assurance Flowchart is shown in the Conceptual Framework and the elements are consistently implemented as shown in the CIEP reports found in the State Report - Key assessments, program improvements based on data.

NCATE AFI 3

The handbook for field experiences for advanced programs is shown in SSR Exhibit 69 Clinical Experiences.

NCATE AFI 4

The EPP has infused significant resources into the operation and funding of the Assessment system (QAS). A position for Assessment and Praxis support was established and the coordinator is assisting faculty, students and administrators to manage assessment data collected. The EPP has also purchased watermark. Analytics to electronically manage our assessment data, ensuring that we store, analyze and report systematically. A LiveText data entry Clerk was also employed and is working with faculty and students to ensure timely data entry. Faculty also engage in professional development about program assessment.

SECTION 6: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**1. (6.1) DATA IS SHARED WITH STAKEHOLDERS**

Results from assessments, changes made in the EPP, and other actions are shared widely through the AAMU website, written reports, presentations in faculty and staff meetings, in classes, at various meetings on the campus, when requested and otherwise as appropriate. Included within the list of constituents are the president, the Provost, the Board of Trustees, faculty, alumni, students, advisory committees, employers, school and community partners, part-time faculty, and parents. Sharing of information has resulted in new programs, elimination of programs and merging of departments. In October 2019, the President of the University merged the Office of Field Experiences and School Partnership based on the admissions and completion data. The education programs over the last several years has seen a decrease in the number of college students wishing to be teachers. Data sharing also resulted in fund allocations for student and candidate academic supports resulting in the continuous operation of a Center for Learning Academic Support and Success and a Praxis Preparation and Support Center. The EPP has also acquired new technology including most recently Touch smart boards to configure two smart classrooms equivalent to those found in surrounding public schools, and Swivels for candidate use during clinical practice.

ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

In response to areas for improvement related to impact on learning, the EPP added an additional field experience to the reading course requirements by the Alabama Literacy Act to enhance the experiences of candidates in the field to pre-assess, plan, teach, post assess, analyze data on student growth, present the data using graphs and charts, and reflect on the data to make decisions about the impact on student learning. Candidates also reflect on their teaching and other experiences throughout their program and make decisions about professional growth FED 404/504 Samples of Candidate Work. Focused efforts have been made by all programs to include impact on learning components in methods courses to give candidates several chances to practice and be assessed before moving into Transition Phase IV Internship. Plans for future directions of the EPP are consistent with the University's strategic plan, and directly related to evidence collected and analyzed over the past three or more cycles. The EPP already has a sound partnership with our school partners and we will continue to foster mutuality, especially in the areas of our programs and operations where the data shows that there is room for improvement. For example, the EPP will have school partners to lead faculty trainings in areas such as infusing the use of technology and College and Career Ready skills into candidates' learning experiences. The exit survey data and the key assessments identified these areas as needing improvement.

EFFORTS COMPLEMENT EXISTING INITIATIVES

While the state does not currently provide data about completer effectiveness, the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) is in the process of piloting an instrument which when implemented will provide invaluable data sets for making decisions for our EPP. The EPP is also in the process of implementing more rigorous program specific monitoring of candidates' impact on learners and planning for instruction at Pre-clinical Transition Phase III. This will allow implementation of corrective measures before candidates' transition to the Clinical Phase. A teacher work sample rubric and the proprietary test edTPA administered during Clinical Phase IV, are being implemented to provide further multiple measures to gather data related to observed teaching effectiveness.

One effort will focus on the advisement and support of students, who show interest in pursuing education programs, before they complete their sophomore year. Another is exploring innovative ways for education majors and candidates to earn passing scores on the Praxis II content area tests, especially with the looming increases in the cut scores.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholders including full time and adjunct faculty, candidates, alumni, employers, school and community partners are involved in developing and evaluating assessments,

program improvements and candidate/completer assessments. Specific stakeholder involvement and roles from active participation in interpretation of data and decision making to evaluation and continuous improvement is summarized. Many stakeholders have been particularly active in identifying models of excellence in pedagogical content knowledge. The EPP advisory committee which meets once a year comprises of candidates, faculty from within and outside of the EPP, school partners and adjunct faculty. The partners that serve on the committee are part of the ongoing decision-making process of the EPP and have been instrumental in making recommendations about content and pedagogical content knowledge to enhance programs and which will ultimately help candidates/completers to impact P-12 learning. This group also made recommendations on improving the conceptual framework. Most recently the EPP worked closely with faculty from affiliate programs from other colleges at AAMU for secondary education math and sciences to revise program checklists and improve quality of content within those programs. This improvement was directly related to the results of Praxis II content test results that showed candidates scores were lowest on specific concepts such as geometry for math candidates.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR DATA TRIANGULATION

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.