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Section 1. AIMS 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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Contact person</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 EPP characteristics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Program listings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 2017-2018?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

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

188

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.)

21

Total number of program completers 209

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

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

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 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 | 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 | 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.

- **Link:** [https://ung.edu/college-of-education/accreditation-and-reporting.php](https://ung.edu/college-of-education/accreditation-and-reporting.php)
- **Description of data accessible via link:** CAEP Eight 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Annual Reporting Measure</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial-Licensure Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced-Level Programs</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

As noted in our review for last year, we knew that our Educator Preparation Program (EPP) needed to create a stronger public-facing reporting mechanism for disseminating data as related to our CAEP Eight Annual Reporting Measures. While we did have this information on our website, it was not easily accessible and it was not organized in a manner for public consumption. This year, we have given these measures their own page on our Teacher Education website, and we have tried to present this information in a way that is more reader-friendly. Additionally, we are still working on compiling three consecutive cycles of information for each of these measures, and there are certain measures for which we will not have three cycles until we go up for accreditation in the spring of 2021, especially in regard to advanced standards for Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership.

For example, in reference to impact measures one through four, we do not have three cycles of data at this point, but we will have three cycles by the time of our accreditation. Recently, our state began providing data to Educator Preparation Providers regarding completer and employer satisfaction (4.3 and 4.4). Thus far, we have received two cycles of this data (2017, 2018), and this year, we will have a third cycle. Unfortunately, our return rates on these surveys have not been over 20 percent for completers, so we are supplementing this data, which we will discuss below. In terms of response rates, however, our EPP state-provided survey data included the following:

- **Teaching Inductee Survey:** This survey is provided to all induction or first-year teachers one year after their program completion. In 2017, the response rate for this survey was 16.75 percent and in 2018, the response rate was 18.04 percent.

- **Teaching Inductee Employer Survey:** This survey is provided to all employers of induction teachers who graduated from our EPP at the end of their first year of teaching. In 2017, we had a 72.27 percent response rate and in 2018, this number fell to 21.68 percent.
Teaching Program Completer Survey: This survey is provided to all program completers in the spring of each year. In 2017, our response rate was 24.08 percent, but this rate fell drastically to 1.6 percent in 2018.

The numbers for 2018 will increase after this semester, as notifications have not yet been sent out to reminder participants to complete these. While the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) handles all aspects of these surveys, we will communicate with our completers, induction-level educators, and principals to ask that they complete these surveys to assist us in program improvement. Fortunately, the GaPSC provides us with emails to be able to encourage participation, and while this has not been done in the past, we will ensure that communication occurs moving forward.

To supplement these, however, we are engaging in a qualitative case study, as well, focused on induction-level teachers and their employers. For this study, we are interviewing a sample of first-year educators from each of our programs, along with their employers and mentors, to assess their performance in the first year and their impact on P-12 student learning and development. Thus far, our Teacher Education Department Head has interviewed administrators from eight of our partner schools and she has interviewed five mentor teachers (with the term “mentor” referring to veteran teachers who have been paired with our induction-level teachers to help guide them through their first year of employment). The interview protocol consists of 20 questions focused on induction teacher performance, impact on P-12 learning and development, strengths and areas for improvement, and feedback on how our EPP could better prepare induction-level educators. Additionally, she has interviewed eight induction-level teachers who graduated from our programs. This interview protocol includes 25 questions focused on their first year of teaching, their impact, perceived strengths and areas for improvement, and feedback on how the program prepared or could have prepared them better. We have developed a qualitative team, which is a subcommittee of our larger Assessment Committee, to analyze the transcripts for results. The committee is currently in the initial stages of analysis, and we are inductively coding transcripts from the first round. Once initial codes are established, we will utilize NVivo to solidify our codes and we will create larger themes around which we will develop our analyses. Once this analysis is completed for the first year of interviews, this will be posted as a report on our website under CAEP Impact Measures one through four, as appropriate. We will continue these interviews each year.

In terms of trends we are discovering in relation to the surveys and interviews, thus far, we have seen a discrepancy between how inductees see themselves in regard to diversity, technology, and differentiation and how their principals/administrators perceive their work. In our first round of survey data, first-year teachers saw themselves as fairly skilled at working with diverse learners and at differentiating curricula, while their employers saw them as needing additional preparation in all of these areas. We are seeing similar trends in our interviews. In addition to the necessity for increased focus on working with diverse learners and differentiating curricula, the data has shown that our program needs more emphasis on using technology as a teaching tool. As a positive trend, administrators have stressed that our first-year teachers have a growth mindset and are flexible and “coachable.” Administrators have also highlighted these first-year educators’ abilities to develop strong relationships with their students, their students’ guardians, and their colleagues. This summer, our program coordinators will be working with this data and their faculty to review their programs for ways in which they can improve in regard to content and field and clinical experience. In addition to reviewing this data, our program coordinators will work with faculty to review EdTPA rubric-level results; GACE licensure exam data; portfolio data; survey data (mentor teacher surveys completed by mentor; mentor teacher and supervising faculty surveys completed by students; institutional completer surveys; and technology surveys); Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS) results (a summative performance assessment for clinical and field experience); and our dispositions assessment data. They will analyze these assessments to discuss areas for improvement in an effort to prepare for programmatic changes prior to our candidates’ return in the fall semester.

We are currently working on developing stronger measures for outcomes three and four for our advanced-level programs. Right now, the state data provided to us does not cover these programs, so we have developed our own surveys for completers at the point of program completion and one year out. Additionally, we have developed surveys for employers. As our educational leadership and curriculum and instruction programs are relatively new, last year was our first year engaging in completer surveys. This year will be our first year surveying our graduates/completers one year out, and this will be our first year surveying employers one year post candidate completion. These individuals will also be included in our qualitative interview process. Currently, though, we know we do not meet those measures with advanced programs.

With the Georgia Professional Standards Commission’s (GaPSC) new Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (PPEM), we will have benchmarks with which to compare data such as EdTPA and GACE scores and teacher effectiveness. This is a new public-facing dashboard that is meant “first, to give EPPs (Educator Preparation Providers) and their programs access to data to inform improvement; second, to hold EPPs accountable for the quality of educators they produce; and third, to provide transparency to the public, including the K-12 education community, about the quality of teachers and leaders produced by each EPP. The ultimate goal of the PPEM is to improve student learning in Georgia through raising the quality of the teachers and leaders responsible for their education” (GaPSC, https://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/ppems.aspx). This dashboard will allow the public and EPPs to compare across programs, both like programs and aspirational ones, and it will be available this summer. Fifty percent of the measures provided are outcome measures (Employer Surveys, Inductee Surveys, Teacher Observation Data), while 50 percent are program measures (Content Knowledge Scores, EdTPA). Starting in the 2018-2019 academic year, these measures are consequential in that EPPs scoring a three or below (out of a total of four) will be required to complete action plans. EPPs scoring a two or one will be monitored for improvement and could be placed on probation if improvements are not evident. Scoring a one with no improvements could result in revocation of GaPSC approval (state approval). The PPEM dashboard reflects results from both initial and advanced certification programs. While this provides us with a mechanism for benchmarking, it also means that our measures are widely shared, disseminated to the public through the GaPSC. We will, however, continue to improve our own dissemination plans by adding to our website and sharing reports with our partners, including our Advisory Board and Mentor Teacher Advisory Council amongst others. Once PPEM scores are published, this web
Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The process for regular and systematic data management of the programs is inconsistent. (ITP)

We have developed a stronger Quality Assurance System (QAS) comprised of multiple measures. For EPP-wide data, we use our edTPA data, GACE content data, GACE Educator Ethics Entry and Exit data, dispositions data, CAPS data, the Induction level portfolio, and two completer surveys provided by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and Educational Benchmark Incorporated (EBI). Additionally, we measure programmatic progress utilizing key assessments. The key assessments, CAPS, and dispositions data help us to measure student progress throughout while the edTPA, GACE content and Educators Ethics Exit, portfolio, overall GPA, and surveys measure achievement at program completion. At admissions, we assess candidate quality via the GACE Program Admissions Assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics (or by the appropriate SAT or ACT exemption scores), overall GPA, GACE Educator Ethics Entry, and a self-dispositions form. We collect data via LiveText for key assessments, the induction portfolio, and student and mentor teacher surveys and via Banner for the majority of our other reporting mechanisms. Information from ETS and the edTPA reporting systems are entered into our institutional database and updated regularly by our staff. We also collect data via the GaPSC.org, including survey data reports for completers and employers and the new PPEM dashboard. Data is shared with program coordinators each summer to prepare for the upcoming academic year.

We are utilizing several proprietary assessments, including EdTPA, all GACE assessments (program admissions, content, and educator ethics entry and exit), CAPS, and the dispositions self-assessment belief survey and the regular dispositions assessment. For dispositions, we are utilizing the instruments created by Drs. Comfort Afolabi, Winifred Nweke, and Tasha Perkins for which both validity and reliability have been established and reported on by the development team (2017). We completed two norming sessions and will continue to complete norming sessions annually. We are utilizing the CAPS, which has been validated by the state and is based on the Teacher Keys annual evaluation for teachers. In 2016, Tracy Elder, Atakan Ata, and Stephen E. Cramer out of the University of Georgia (UGA) developed a report from a validity and reliability study conducted in two phases. We have engaged in two norming sessions for the CAPS and will continue this annually. We are in the process of validating our induction level portfolio with faculty. We have completed content validity exercises for our Educational Leadership portfolio (spring 2019) utilizing Lawshe’s ratings with both our Advisory Council and our faculty and supervisors, and we have engaged in one norming session for the EdL portfolio (spring 2019) and will go through the same process with our undergraduate induction portfolio this year.

We regularly and systematically assess our performance against our goals and standards, we track results over time, we test innovations, and we use our results for improvement of programs, curricula, assessments, and processes. We collect data each year that we collate and assess and share with our program coordinators. Each program coordinator reviews their data over summer to prepare retreats for their faculty in the fall where they review results together and decide on a plan for program improvement. Additionally, the Assessment Committee, comprised of faculty and staff, has run statistical analyses utilizing our edTPA, GACE, GPA, SAT, ACT, and demographic data to share with the College as a whole for the fall annual retreat. Data is regularly shared with the Advisory Council and with the Mentor Teacher Advisory Board. These groups have reviewed data, participated in validation sessions, and provided feedback on field and clinical experience, admissions, and graduation processes. We also regularly request feedback from students in the form of semester course evaluations and annual evaluations of mentor teachers and supervisors, and we have completers fill out program surveys to gain an overall view of our programs, processes, preparation, and supports. We utilize the results of all of these feedback mechanisms to make program improvements.

We are engaging in several means of measuring impact on P-12 student growth. We have requested student growth percentiles and TKES data for all graduates for whom this information is available from the Georgia Department of Education. We will utilize the employer and induction surveys from the Georgia Professional Standards Commission to assess how our graduates are performing in the classroom. We have created surveys for our Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership completers to assess their performance one year after program completion. These surveys will be validated by the faculty and our Advisory Council. We are engaging in qualitative interviews with currently employed graduates from all programs and their administrators to ensure that we’re reviewing graduate performance across programs.

We engage in a continual process of talking with our stakeholders (including candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, administrators, and community members) and receiving feedback; creating and revising tools and approaches based on that feedback; collecting and disseminating data that stems from these changes; and then revisiting the dialogue process with our stakeholders. Then, the process begins again. We meet with partners formally and informally and have engaged our partners in review of key assessments, surveys, and portfolios, and we have utilized our data in the development of new programs, such as the Realizing Aspiring and Successful Educators Undergraduate Program and the Aspiring Teachers Program, both created to increase numbers of diverse teachers in our local communities. We also utilized our data and conversations with partners to develop a new mentoring program for induction-level educators/alumni.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:
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

1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds.

2. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with candidates from diverse backgrounds.

3. The unit does not ensure that all initial and advanced candidates have field experiences and clinical practice with P-12 students from diverse backgrounds.

We are working to increase our candidate diversity and their opportunities to work with diverse faculty. Nationally, we know that upwards of 80 percent of our teachers are white and female, and we have a “demographic imperative” to change these statistics (Jupp, Berry, Lensmire, 2016, p. 2). In 2016, students of color made up 10.41 percent of our current students and our Educator Preparation Program (EPP) body was 14.96 percent male. In 2017, the number of candidates of color went down slightly to 9.53 percent and the number of male candidates went up to 12.98 percent. In 2018, the number of students of color went up to 12.29 percent, while the number of male candidates was 16.94 percent. In 2019, the number of candidates of color went up to 14.91 percent, while the number of male students went up to 17.09 percent.

We are working diligently to increase the number of students of color in our EPP in several ways, the first of which was through the creation of two new positions, the role of Diversity and Recruitment Coordinator and the role of Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships. Part of the work of both of these individuals is to focus on recruitment, with emphasis on the recruitment of diverse candidates. We are making a concerted effort to attend recruitment events in diverse school districts and establish partnerships with diverse schools. Additionally, the Diversity and Recruitment Coordinator and the Associate Dean spent the first year of this Coordinator’s position conducting a needs assessment through interviews with current students, faculty, and staff. We sought out diverse students to talk about their successes and challenges on our campuses so that we could create stronger support systems for students of color. We spoke with staff and faculty to seek their feedback on potential challenges and to gain understanding of the campus climate. We learned that many of our faculty and staff needed additional training in terms of implicit bias, and we worked to develop diversity dialogues to encourage open conversation.

The Associate Dean and Coordinator for Diversity and Recruitment also worked with local diverse school districts to develop two new programs. The first of these is called the Realizing Inspiring and Successful Educators Undergraduate Program (RISE UP) that will hopefully create a pipeline of native-Spanish-speaking educators to our local school districts, two of which have a high number of Spanish-speaking students (Hall County: 42% and Gainesville City School System: 60%). Grow Your Own (GYP) Programs have been developed and studied as a means for increasing the number of teachers of color and, more specifically, that of Latinx educators (Gist et al., 2018; Haddix, 2017; Morales, 2018). Scholars in the area of diversity and teacher education point to the need for teacher preparation programs to not only recruit students of color, but to also provide adequate support to retain students and to prepare student-teachers to enact change in their school systems. RISE UP is designed to encourage heritage Spanish speaking graduates of Hall County high schools to enroll in our Education Preparation Program and concurrently work as paraprofessionals in Hall County elementary schools in classrooms with English learners. These candidates will be hired by the county schools upon completion of their teacher certification program, and we should have our first graduate in 2020. Hall County pays the tuition, fees, and textbook costs of these students, in addition to their providing job-share positions as paraprofessionals to gain experience teaching and earn extra funding while in college. Our Educator Preparation Program provides additional academic, social, and financial support for RISE participants, including faculty mentorship, supplies (i.e., graphing calculators, lab materials), access to resources (i.e., tutoring, GACE, edTPA), and planned social events to bolster their academic success at UNG. In 2017-2018, our first cohort of students included seven participants, which has now expanded to 24 students. After the program's inception, we met with another neighboring district and started a similar program called the Aspiring Teachers Program (ATP). This district also has a high number of Latinx students, but they wanted their mission to expand to increasing the number of teachers from diverse backgrounds including but not limited to linguistic diversity.

Beyond student diversity, we are working to ensure that our faculty is diverse as well. Currently, 17.31 percent of our faculty is racially/ethnically diverse and 25.96 percent of our faculty is male. As part of our college-wide diversity and recruitment plan, we have created plans to increase our numbers of diverse faculty, staff, and students and to increase knowledge of cultural awareness for each group. Part of this plan includes working with our new institutional director of diversity and inclusion to ensure search committees are aware of implicit bias and to ensure that we are taking steps to actively recruit faculty of color.

Lastly, part of our state requirements ensure that all of our teacher candidates have at least one diverse placement over their field and/or clinical experiences (this is typically one out of two or three overall placements). We work with very diverse school partners, and many of our students have the opportunity to participate in two diverse placements. As we branch into the greater Atlanta area, these opportunities are continuing to expand. At this point, we have more diverse placement options than non-diverse ones for our teacher candidates. We will continue to work with these partners on new and innovative means for increasing numbers of diverse teacher candidates and developing programming for cultural awareness, understanding, and affirmation necessary for culturally responsive teaching (Nieto & Bode, 2012).
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?

In working to meet CAEP standard 5, we expanded our efforts over the past three years to include all shareholders (students, alumni, faculty, staff, K-12 partners, and community) in program improvement efforts. At the University of North Georgia (UNG), we approach our partnerships from a multidimensional standpoint, meaning we value the importance of all stakeholders being involved in partnership development (Hesse-Biber, Leavy, Yaiser, 2004). Many scholars have highlighted the importance of reciprocal relationships between institutions of higher education and the communities with whom they work (Butin, 2011; Hill-Jackson & Lewis, 2011; Levine, 2011). Webster and Cofey (2011), in particular, highlight a critical pedagogy approach "centered on dialogic interactions" to ensure voices "are shared and all voices are validated" (p. 250). Additionally, both "models of social identity development (the parts) and the framework of intersectionality (the whole)" are vital to establishing reciprocal relationships (Wijesyesinghe & Jones, 2014, p. 9). Thus, we should think about the populations we serve, with a particular emphasis on how race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, perceived ability, and language impact and intersect within these communities. These identities should be at the forefront of every conversation. Keeping all of these aspects in mind, we have developed the following model for our approach to mutually beneficial partnerships. We engage in a continual process of (1) talking with our stakeholders (including candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, administrators, and community members) and receiving feedback, (2) creating and revising tools and approaches based on that feedback, (3) collecting and disseminating data that stems from these changes, and (4) then revisiting the dialogue process with our stakeholders. Then, the process begins again.

From our candidates, we seek feedback throughout the program in the form of course evaluations and through their participation in our Student Leadership Advisory Panel and our Student Ambassadors group, both of which meet regularly throughout the year. We survey all teacher candidates at the end of each year on technology and coursework and we survey them for feedback on their mentor teachers and on their university supervisors. Using an outside vendor, we also survey them at the completion of their program via Educational Benchmarks Incorporated (EBI) (documentation 1). This is a supplement to the state's evaluation measure.

We always include faculty and staff in our feedback loop as well. We collect data each year that we collate, assess, and share with our program coordinators at the end of each year. Our program coordinators work during the summer (if they desire to do so) on using this data for planning. Last summer, each program coordinator reviewed data over summer to prepare faculty retreats, where they went over the results as a group and decided on plans for improvement. Additionally, we hired faculty over the summer to run statistical analyses utilizing our edTPA, GACE, GPA, SAT, ACT, and demographic data. These basic descriptive statistics have been presented to our Assessment Committee, comprised of faculty and staff in the College of Education (documentation 2). The Assessment Committee is deciding what analyses to run next, and then this information will be presented to the College as a whole for the fall annual retreat. Additionally, data is regularly shared with the Advisory Council and with the Mentor Teacher Advisory Board. Our key assessments and curricula are continually reviewed and revised based on stakeholder feedback. Each program meets twice per semester for Data Days, where we review feedback and engage in revision. Thus far, each group has reviewed all
key assessments utilizing a checklist adapted from the EPP-Created Assessments Framework, and now these assessments are being sent out for review by expert outside stakeholders (documentation 3). We meet as a whole EPP twice per year for norming and validation sessions as a group and for discussions regarding EPP-wide changes (admissions, advising, edTPA, and graduation). Additionally, we have an Admissions and Advising Committee that meets to discuss changes to our larger processes. Based on feedback, we are currently piloting a move to place our application process online for ease for students. We also recently created (fall 2018) an edTPA Steering Committee to discuss the continued integration of edTPA into the overall curriculum and faculty training regarding edTPA upload. Lastly, we have our Coordinators Committee, where program coordinators discuss larger changes to curriculum, such the development of new courses or new programs. All of these committees are meant to make recommendations for change for improvement.

Additionally, we engage our partners and stakeholders via review of key assessments, involvement in our Advisory Council, completion of mentor teacher surveys, and via alumni and administrator interviews. As far as our key assessments, we have begun the process of involving teachers and P-12 experts in review of key assessments. Adapting a form from the University of North Carolina Greensboro provided as a resource at Fall CAEPCon 2017, we shared a checklist with our partners and copies of our key assessments. We provided teachers with lunch and asked them to read the assessments, complete the checklist, and provide open-ended feedback regarding these assessments (documentation 4). Thus far, we have completed this process for our gifted endorsement courses, post baccalaureate and Master of Arts in Teaching courses, and several of our secondary courses. We will continue this work in the coming year for other programs. In terms of Councils, we started an Advisory Council three years ago, and this group is comprised of both on-campus and off-campus partners. This group has participated in a review of our admissions and graduation requirements (spring 2018); a review of our mission, vision, and conceptual framework (summer 2018); and reviews of our EPP-created surveys and assessments such as the portfolio and the dispositions forms (fall 2017). The feedback from this group has assisted us in making edits to our portfolio, clarifying admissions and graduation requirements in our catalogue, and adopting a new dispositions form in place of our EPP-created form. Their review of our Educational Leadership portfolio in a validation and discussion session, along with a validation exercise with faculty, resulted in changes improving and streamlining the portfolio to be more useful for current and future leaders (documentation 5). This also resulted in the development of an Educational Leadership Task Force made up of current administrative leaders from our local communities. Based off of our results from a recently implemented mentor teacher survey, we have also created a Mentor Teacher Advisory Board, with representatives from each of our programs, to provide feedback on field and clinical placements processes, materials, and assessments (documentation 6). In our first meeting in the fall of 2018, this group provided feedback on our mentor teacher manual. In our second meeting in the spring of 2019, they provided feedback on mentor teacher incentives, induction-level support, and our mentor teacher training materials. Lastly, our efforts to improve on CAEP Standard Four have resulted in the development of a case study, where we are engaging in qualitative interviews with our P-12 employers, mentor teachers (not clinical or field experience but mentor teacher for induction-level teacher), and completers currently employed in our partner districts (documentation 7). Our Assessment Committee has created qualitative sub-committee group that is currently analyzing these transcripts. Thus far, we have found that our partners would like for us to improve in working with our teacher candidates on differentiating curricula and assessments, on incorporating technology as a teaching tool, and on providing our candidates with increased opportunities to learn culturally responsive teaching pedagogies. We will continue this case study over the next few years to ensure we have representation for each EPP program.

We have utilized the information from our stakeholders to develop new partnerships and programs. It is through our Advisory Council meetings that we first began the Realizing Inspiring and Successful Educators Undergraduate Program (RISE UP) with Hall County to create a grow-your-own model for heritage Spanish speakers to move into education and the Aspiring Teachers Program (ATP) to encourage a more diverse teaching core in Gainesville City (documentation 8). These conversations also led to the development of our UNG Alumni Teach program, a mentoring program for induction-level teachers, and the extension of our Professional Development Community model into the Gwinnett area. We are also working with Gwinnett to create similar pipelines for teaching or grow-your-own models, especially in critical needs areas such a special education, mathematics, and science. Listening to our stakeholders also resulted in the development of the Mentor Teacher Advisory Board mentioned above. And lastly, listening to all of our stakeholders has resulted in the development of a Recruitment Plan with a specific focus on diversity and critical needs areas in teaching across the state (documentation 9). This plan is being developed by our Diversity Committee, with the help of our institution’s Director of Diversity and Inclusion. The committee is in the process of soliciting input on a draft from all faculty and staff prior to making edits and additions. Once we have a solid draft, this plan will be shared with students and P-12 partners for feedback prior to implementation, starting with our Advisory Council and Mentor Teacher Advisory Board.

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

| 4.1 | Completer impact on student growth and learning |
| 4.3 | Employer satisfaction |
| 4.4 | Completer satisfaction |
| 5.1 | Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures |
| 5.2 | Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data. |
| 5.3 | Results for continuous program improvement are used |
| 5.4 | Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making |
| 5.5 | Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation |
Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

- Documentation_1.pdf
- Documentation_2.docx
- Documentation_3.docx
- Documentation_4.docx
- Documentation_5.docx
- Documentation_6.docx
- Documentation_7.docx
- Documentation_8.docx
- Documentation_9.pdf

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

☐ Yes  ☐ No

6.3 Optional Comments

The documentation presented above is a work in progress. Some documentation includes actual data analysis, but other initiatives are in the planning phases and analysis is not yet available (i.e., the interview protocol and key assessment tools). As we analyze this data over the next couple of years in preparation of our site visit, we will include the actual data analysis with these documents. Many of these documents highlight data-driven changes, such as the development of the Realizing Inspiring and Successful Educators Undergraduate Program and the Aspiring Teachers Program. Additionally, the Mentor Teacher Advisory Board was created out of data-driven changes, as was the Advisory Council.

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP’s evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP’s assessment of its evidence. It may help to use Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

☐ No identified gaps
If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text aq

Our assessment committee at the University of North Georgia (UNG) is comprised of faculty and staff from across EPP programs and departments, and our first assignment was to review our CAEP standards against our evidence to find gaps and work to find ways to address these. From this committee’s work, we have created an evidence chart of all evidence collected by standard. From this, we see gaps related to standards two, three, four, and five.

In relation to standard two, we need to make more of a concerted effort to choose mentor teachers in collaboration with our partners and to ensure that we have truly have mutually beneficial partnerships. We work closely with our P-12 partners, but often, we are not involved in the process of selecting mentor teachers. The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) determines the qualification of our mentor teachers, which necessitates that the teacher be certified in the content area in which the teacher candidate is seeking certification. Additionally, these individuals must have been in their roles for at least three years and they must not have received below a three on the state’s evaluation instrument. Beyond this, there are no limitations, and some of our schools involve us in the decision-making process while others leave this to the discretion of administration. We also need to work on mentor training for work with teacher candidates. Having over 1000 mentor teachers per year, however, makes this difficult. This year, we developed a Mentor Teacher Advisory Board to help us make decisions regarding training, and the consensus has been that online training is the most feasible avenue, given that many of our school districts cannot afford to send teachers to a training and many of our teachers are unavailable during the summer months. With this in mind, we have hired a faculty member to develop training videos and an online assessment for those who will be mentor teachers. These teachers will be trained on utilizing the CAPS and dispositions assessments, both of which are proprietary assessments developed by state research teams. We will create an online mechanism for establishing reliability on these assessments. Completion of these assessments will be connected to the mentor teacher stipend provided at the end of the year. This past year, we developed an online training for co-teaching and a video outlining expectations for teacher candidates. These modules, however, do not include assessments to ensure that mentor teachers have completed these tasks. Next year, we will include a candidate checklist, which requires that candidates sit down with their mentor teachers and complete these modules. One of our programs implemented this checklist this year, and it worked well to ensure that mentor teachers understood expectations. This decision was made based off of the Advisory Board from the recommendation of mentor teachers working with students in that particular program.

In terms of continuing to establish mutually beneficial relationships, we are expanding our Advisory Council to ensure that we have a range of educational representatives from our partner districts. Furthermore, we began a qualitative case study, which includes interviews with partner administrators. Part of the purpose of these interviews is to improve our Educator Preparation Provider programs, but we have included questions on how to further develop our partnerships. We hope that the information gleaned will help us develop other programs similar to our Realizing Inspiring and Successful Educators Undergraduate Program and our Aspiring Teachers Program, which are meant to be grow-your-own programs focused on increasing the numbers of diverse students going into the teaching profession.

In terms of CAEP Standard Three, we have a gap in regard to the number of candidates within the 50th percentile on their admissions test scores. In the state of Georgia, we require the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE) program admissions assessment in mathematics, reading, and writing. Passing scores for these assessments do not necessarily equate to the 50th percentile. Students can exempt this exam with a score of 1000 or higher on the combined verbal and mathematics SAT (changing to 1080 this July 1) or a score of 43 or higher on the combined verbal and mathematics on the ACT. These scores also do not necessarily equate to the top 50th percentile. We are below in mathematics, but we are working on a plan to help our students improve with our Admissions Committee. This plan is going to take time to develop and implement, and although we hope to have a plan in place by 2021, we are worried that we will not meet this standard by the time of our site visit. We are developing a plan, as well, to assist students already admitted into our programs who are weak in writing and mathematics. We have faculty interested in creating supplemental instruction (SI) with a team of other instructors.

For standard four, we have perceived gaps related to impact on P-12 students’ learning and development. The GaPSC has developed surveys to assist with employer and completer satisfaction. As mentioned earlier in our AIMS report, our survey results for completers have been less than the required 20 percent, so we plan to supplement this data with our qualitative case study. Currently, our Teacher Education Department Head and our Director for Clinical Placements and Community Engagement have been involved in interviews with P-12 administrator, mentor teachers (not clinical/field placement mentor teachers, but mentors of induction-level teachers), and induction-level completers employed in public schools. We have completed seven interviews with administrators, 13 interviews with induction-level teachers, and five interviews with mentor teachers. Interviews are ongoing and will continue to be conducted to ensure that evaluation and analysis are ongoing and all programs are represented. Analysis has begun, and we are currently developing an initial coding system using an inductive approach that will be expanded utilizing NVivo software once initial codes are formed. After this point, we will develop themes and engage in a more in-depth analysis as a team. A report will be written and continued over time and results will be shared with the faculty and other stakeholders for program improvement. The first report will be developed this summer to be shared at our retreat in August.

We are currently analyzing data from the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE), including student growth percentiles and teacher evaluation scores. In the state of Georgia, though, we do not have student growth percentiles for the early grades of elementary education. Elementary education is our largest program, however, and we have many completers for whom we did not receive data. Additionally, we do not receive data for our P-12 program teachers and for those teaching untested subjects. This means that we have to supplement, which is one reason why we are engaging in the qualitative case study mentioned above. Currently, we see Standard Four as our biggest gap, but we are working steadily to improve in this area.
Everything relates back to CAEP Standard Five, which requires that we meet all other standards. As noted previously in this report, we have made strides in improving our Quality Assurance System, and we will continue to work on this as we move toward our site visit. One area specifically related to standard five in which we need to improve is the dissemination of reporting, analysis, and results. For example, as of last reporting year, we did not have our CAEP Eight Measure reported in a way that was public friendly and easily accessible. As of the time of this report, we are publishing our CAEP Eight web page. We will not have three consecutive cycles for each reporting measure at this time, but we will continue to add to this as we move toward re-accreditation. We are working on other measures to share information with stakeholders too. As noted previously, we have developed both an Advisory Council and a Mentor Teacher Advisory Board, which are helping us to gain feedback on data and on ways to share data. We hope to be able to create an annual report to share with stakeholders outlining our student and alumni successes. Moreover, the state of Georgia has developed the Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures website, which benchmarks an EPP’s performance. As noted on the GaPSC website, “The PPEMs have three purposes: first, to give EPPs (Educator Preparation Providers) and their programs access to data to inform improvement; second, to hold EPPs accountable for the quality of educators they produce; and third, to provide transparency to the public, including the K-12 education community, about the quality of teachers and leaders produced by each EPP. The ultimate goal of the PPEM is to improve student learning in Georgia through raising the quality of the teachers and leaders responsible for their education. The PPEM ratings for teacher preparation programs will be official and consequential beginning with the 2018-19 PPEMs, to be published in Spring 2019” (https://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/ppems.aspx). This data will be publicly accessible and is also consequential, meaning if EPPs score a three or below (out of a total of four), then they will develop improvement action plans. Scores of two or one will require action plans and improvement or EPPs could face probation or revocation of approval. Fifty percent of these measures are based on outcome measures (employers’ perceptions of preparation, completers’ perceptions of preparation, and teacher evaluations), while 50 percent are based on program measures (assessment of content knowledge and teaching skills). We see this new approach as a way of holding us publicly accountable for our preparation of future educators.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
- 4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
- 4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
- 4.3 Employer satisfaction
- 4.4 Completer satisfaction
- 5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
- 5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.
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 2019 EPP Annual Report.

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer’s Information

Name: Sheri C. Hardee
Position: Dean
Phone: 706-864-1998
E-mail: sheri.hardee@ung.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 visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer 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 visit 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