2021 EPP Annual Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAEP ID:</th>
<th>35001</th>
<th>AACTE SID:</th>
<th>3455</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td>University of North Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.1 Contact person

1.1.2 EPP characteristics

1.1.3 Program listings

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).

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

238

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.)

44

Total number of program completers 282

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 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

If you need this document in another format, please contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at ie@ung.edu.
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.

**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:** Our most current annual reporting measures available are displayed at the link provided.

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 \ 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced-Level Programs</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?

Trends: Our annual reporting measures from 2020 were included with data from the previous two years to yield holistic and actionable evidence. The reflective process enabled us to identify trends, compare our Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) to others in Georgia, and continue to co-construct mutually beneficial partnerships. Our triangulated evidence includes employer surveys, completer surveys, new teacher and leader annual performance measures, and a case study, as well as additional state data from the Traditional Program Management System, Data Bank, and Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) Preparation Provider Effectiveness Measures (PPEMs) to support our evidence of graduation, licensing, and hiring rates and other consumer information.

Initial Programs: Through employer and inductee teacher surveys administered by the GaPSC and the EPP, patterns indicated that first-year educators were confident in their skills and approaches to teaching, instruction, and assessment, along with their use of technology and their understandings of diversity. They also noted that they felt confident in terms of their interactions and professional behaviors as educators. First-year teachers also shared a need for additional training in the differentiation of instruction and classroom management. In addition, literacy was indicated as an area of focus.

We also concluded and synthesized a multi-year case study that included extensive interviews with employers and completers. In all areas, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive regarding inductees’ skills in pedagogy and their overall impact and
example, we have several advisory councils who routinely review our measures and instruments to contribute to the analysis, assessment results, including the annual reporting measures and other EPP-wide assessments with our stakeholders. For years since the creation of the PPEMs.

measure as an EPP is a level four, or exemplary, which is the highest rating on the scale. We have maintained this rating for three years. All of the measures administered by the GaPSC, data on employer satisfaction, completers’ satisfaction, candidates’ teaching skills, candidates’ content knowledge, completers’ classroom performance, student growth percentiles, and the number of completers are provided for the EPP and are also benchmarked with all EPPs and similar-EPPs in our state. Our overall effectiveness on their P-12 students. As mirrored in the employer and inductee surveys, classroom management, differentiation, and literacy skills emerged as areas where inductees could use additional professional development and/or could have used additional or enhanced preparation while in their initial programs. Administrators noted, however, that these are all areas in which they see a need for improvement with veteran teachers as well, and these areas were not specific to completers from our EPP. Our graduates were praised for their ability to build relationships with students, parents, and community members. The interviews also highlighted completers’ use of technology as a teaching tool, a data tool, and a tool for inciting critical thinking. In looking at inductees from across programs, there were no major differences, but again, most comments for all areas were positive. In fact, most of the areas for improvement seemed to be geared to one particular inductee and thus could not be designated as patterns across programs of the EPP as a whole.

Advanced Programs: Through employer and inductee teacher and leader surveys administered by the GaPSC and the EPP, we learned that employers find that completers of the Curriculum and Instruction Program and the Educational Leadership Program are well-prepared for their positions and satisfied with the candidates’ preparation. However, the program completers provided more constructive and actionable feedback. While the program completers mainly noted strengths of the program within the Likert-style questions, their open-ended feedback provided more actionable and nuanced details. For example, the tier I Educational Leadership program completers indicated a need for better logistical plans for managing assignment submissions, direction on the state certification process, consistency in mentor and supervisor expectations, and minimization of documentation required in the portfolio. Completers from Curriculum and Instruction Program indicated a shift to a more positive overall satisfaction and a desire to learn more about using technology to engage learners and about diverse learners. While these areas are not pervasive needs and are certainly present in the program’s curriculum, the design of stranding these areas throughout the curriculum when both areas are prominent needs in education, in general, indicates we can do more to respond to the overall need.

Planned Changes: Initial Programs: Improving literacy and numeracy instruction at the elementary level became a state initiative in 2019, as this is a recognized need across the board. While the EPP developed an action plan, the COVID-19 pandemic slowed progress with this initiative. The EPP has two programs preparing candidates to teach students at the K-5 level: the Elementary and Special Education Program focuses on grades K-5. The Middle Grades Education Program focuses on grades 4-8, but these educators teach upper elementary grades 4-5 in schools with content departmentalization. Since establishing this initiative, the EPP hosted a speaker to provide professional development related to dyslexia and early literacy and reading comprehension techniques. We are currently working on embedding content related to reading, comprehension, and dyslexia in our programs. We are now reviewing our plans and timeline to move this initiative forward. We will begin by conducting a needs assessment to review existing literacy and numeracy practices and analyze specific assessment data. We will design a plan to address areas of weakness, strengthen existing innovations, such as the elementary school-based literacy labs, and similarly, by creating math labs in our partnering schools. Further, we will design a plan to monitor our innovations and ensure their success by reviewing aligned assessment data annually. The EPP also identified Differentiated Instruction as an additional area for improvement through our employer surveys, key assessments, and case study. To address this need, the EPP has strengthened instruction on differentiation throughout its programs, offered training for candidates and faculty, and added a requirement for candidates to differentiate by process, content, and product on the lesson plan template for each program.

Advanced Programs: Regarding the Curriculum and Instruction Program, faculty have initiated curricular changes to better align the Curriculum and Instruction component of the program to the standards, which means decreasing the extensive research project and increasing the coursework in the area of curriculum instruction. Doing so will create additional space to address the need for more training in the use of technology in teaching and learning and a greater emphasis on culturally relevant pedagogy throughout the program. Faculty are proposing an advanced technology course and additional curriculum coursework in advanced pedagogy and assessment. For the Tier 1 Educational Leadership Program, we provided candidates with additional information on the certification process and steps to request their transcripts to upgrade their certification with more ease. We are also selecting a new assessment system that will allow for true integration in our eLearning system, simplifying their assignment submission. Our program faculty also work with mentors and candidates to provide orientation meetings and ensure as much consistency as possible across experiences. In 2020, we focused on developmental assessment work for our newest advanced-level program, the Tier II Educational Leadership Program. This work involved identifying key assessments aligned with CAEP Standards, Georgia Educational Leadership Standards, and Performance Standards for Educational Leaders. Regarding A.1, the EPP created assessments that measured three proficiencies and identified how candidates would meet or demonstrate all six through the program. The EPP created four program assessments and adopted the proprietary Performance Assessment for School Leaders, which is required for state certification. With the creation of these four assessments, the EPP also conducted a content validity study on the Internship Plan using Lawshe’s method and structured alignments to ensure content validity for the other three assessments. In the upcoming year, the EPP will continue this developmental work by seeking external reviewers’ feedback utilizing the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments and conducting validity studies on the remaining three assessments.

Benchmarks: In terms of benchmarks, the majority of measures discussed above are benchmarked through the PPEM Dashboard (https://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/ppeems.aspx). The PPEM Dashboard includes all EPPs in Georgia. Through these measures administered by the GaPSC, data on employer satisfaction, completers’ satisfaction, candidates’ teaching skills, candidates’ content knowledge, completers’ classroom performance, student growth percentiles, and the number of completers are provided for the EPP and are also benchmarked with all EPPs and similar-EPPs in our state. Our overall effectiveness measure as an EPP is a level four, or exemplary, which is the highest rating on the scale. We have maintained this rating for three years since the creation of the PPEMs.

Sharing Our Measures: Our annual reporting measures are shared widely through our website. Moreover, we share our assessment results, including the annual reporting measures and other EPP-wide assessments with our stakeholders. For example, we have several advisory councils who routinely review our measures and instruments to contribute to the analysis,
continuous improvement efforts, and validity studies. These stakeholders include the College of Education Advisory Council, Mentor Teacher Advisory Board, Educational Leadership Taskforce, Education Student Advisory Board, and Graduate Student Advisory Board. These are all active groups that meet at least once per semester, and all have engaged in the review of our data. Lastly, we also shared field placement data, containing placement volume and hiring information, through a system-specific digital communication to our system contacts to reinforce our efforts to co-construct mutually beneficial partnerships and thank them for their partnership.

Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations
Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement
Waived

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>April A. Nelms, Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>706-864-1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anelms@ung.edu">anelms@ung.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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 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