

# 2021 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	11990	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	4150
<b>Institution:</b>	Samford University		
<b>Unit:</b>	Department of Education		

## Section 1. EPP Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

<https://www.samford.edu/education/accreditation>

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2019-2020 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)<sup>2</sup>

**Total number of program completers** 352

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

**Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2019-2020 academic year?**

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP

---

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.

---

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited

---

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited

---

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements

---

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

3.7 Change in state program approval

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3   A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4   A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

**Link:** <https://www.samford.edu/education/accreditation>

**Description of data accessible via link:** CAEP Annual Reporting Measures

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

*What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?*  
*Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?*  
*Are benchmarks available for comparison?*  
*Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

The EPP's focus from the previous year was to review all program assessments and make updates to existing rubrics, create a new dispositions assessment, revise all of the ALTA programs, improve tracking and monitoring processes through Taskstream as well as implement the new pilot advanced survey for employers and completers.

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? The EPP determined the need to track trends for accountability. Therefore, beginning fall, 2020, the EPP published its first Annual Report. This report included a "trend tracker". The report was presented at the fall EPP wide Data Day. The trend tracker collects and summarizes the data and recommendations from various groups from the previous year in one report so faculty can visually see the data trends and the recommendations. This report is published on the EPP's accreditation website under "continuous improvement.

Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data? Based on data from edTPA, the EPP determined that there should be a focus on assessment. The data was corroborated with the measures of teacher effectiveness and P-12 learning from the ALSDE completeter survey. Initial programs engaged in curriculum mapping to address any gaps in instruction as a result of these data.

Are benchmarks available for comparison? Candidate edTPA data is benchmarked by state and national cut scores. Annual edTPA reports are provided on the EPP's accreditation webpage. Additionally Teacher effectiveness, P-12 Impact and employer/completer survey data is benchmarked with other EPPS in the state.

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom? The measures are reviewed at Data Days in fall and spring and are published on the EPP's accreditation website.

## 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.

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

*The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.*

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

*The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

**6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.**

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

What quality assurance system data did the provider review? The EPP's QAS includes a framework based on the 4 INTASC domains. Faculty and staff are dividing into four "data groups" and assigned one of the four domains. These data groups review data relative to their domain through the academic year. The groups review the following measures: edTPA, employer/completer survey data, completer focus groups, key assessments, internship evaluations, survey data, etc. The data is aligned to the four domains and data groups make recommendations for improvement based on the area they are examining. Since the data is presented to each data team by disaggregated InTASC category, the data team can examine one area using a variety of measures. For example, the content knowledge Data Team, exams Praxis core scores, GPA, EPP created key assessments, edTPA areas that focus on only on content knowledge as well as employer/completer survey (only areas on the survey that address content knowledge). Allowing faculty and stakeholders to focus on one areas provides a lens for identifying trends. The content area Data Team after examining several measures, can identify any areas or gaps relative to their InTASC standard. It is also help in managing the enormous amount of data collected annually that needs to be reviewed. Additionally, stakeholder groups convene once a semester to review data and make recommendations.

What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify? The EPP has identified assessment as an area of improvement. Additionally, the EPP recruitment team and the A-Team noted that the ALTA programs needed to be revised in an effort to increase enrollment and staff high needs areas as well as improve tracking and monitoring candidates. EPP faculty worked this past year to revise ALTA programs and will implement the new changes Summer, 2021. How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement? Data from surveys and key assessments noted assessment as an area for improvement.

How did the provider test innovations? The EPP is currently creating a curriculum map to determine gaps in preparation for

assessment. In addition, the department chair assigned a full time faculty member to teach the assessment course rather than an adjunct. For ALTA programs, in the new design, ALTA will now be one program with different tracks (elementary, secondary, collaborative). All ALTA candidates will take five course courses together. Offering different courses that were similar but by program was a drain on our resources. By offering for example, the same "Foundations of Education" course and starting all ALTA cohorts off by taking this course, will ensure consistent messaging and will allow faculty to track candidates more efficiently. Additionally, an assessment course was designed as a common course and will address the identified gaps.

What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data? The ALSDE employer/completer survey as well as edTPA noted that assessment was an area for improvement. This was a trend that EPP faculty has been watching for some time.

How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion? The EPP has an A-Team which is tasked with monitoring candidates from admission to completion. One change that will be implemented in the next academic year- ALSDE is dropping Praxis Core for candidates. The EPP is responding to this decision and determining the best way to assess candidates basic skills at admission. This will be studied in the coming months before a change is implemented.

How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students? The EPP is now publishing an Annual Report that includes a trend tracker. This trend tracker allows faculty to review the data from the previous academic year as well as the recommendations from the various stakeholder groups.

The following thoughts are relevant for advanced-level programs

How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities? Advanced level programs as working towards implementing their plan. Two areas that advanced programs focused their efforts were on creating and piloting the employer/completer survey and creating common rubric elements for research assessment across advanced programs. The pilot survey was launched this spring and the preliminary data was reviewed at Data Day spring, 2021. The EPP conducted advanced program focus groups to gain input for continuous improvement.

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

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 **20192020OBSOECContinuousImprovementAnnualReport1.pdf**

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

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Preparer's authorization.** By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2021 EPP Annual Report.

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

**Report Preparer's Information**

Name: Amy Hoaglund

Position: CAEP Coordinator

Phone: (205)726-4284

E-mail: aehoaglu@samford.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

### **Policy 6.01 Annual Report**

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site reviews.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount complete data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

### **Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements**

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site review report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

**Acknowledge**