

2021 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11564	AACTE SID:	3515
Institution:	Northern Michigan University		
Unit:	School of Education, Leadership & Public Service		

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://nmu.edu/education/programs>

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 licensure¹

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.)²

Total number of program completers 109

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

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.nmu.edu/education/>

Description of data accessible via link: Accreditation information

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?

Trends for the Ability to be Employed Survey from the candidate, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor all trend positive with survey results showing that candidates are ready to enter the profession. These trends are consistent with survey results from previous years. Although not significant, faculty single out comments that refer to the need for more attention paid to the IEP process from our general education candidates and the need for more focus on facilitating small groups which would benefit classroom management preparation.

Comments in the Ability to be Employed Survey show that university supervisors have been receptive to the changes in the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) meetings through the offering of more sessions available at available times. This has been a key strategy in assuring consistency in the evaluation tool use from university supervisors. This was an expressed need from end of semester debriefing sessions. A majority of cooperating teachers view the feedback on mentoring as an area for improvement as realized by the "Moderate" responses. The same change to the TEAC meeting schedule options and compensation for professional time has been implemented for these professionals to better tie the mentoring and feedback on mentoring to the process.

The Educator Performance Indicator Score shows a score of 88.8% exceeding the state average by 5.1% in the overall score.

NMU received the highest ranking of "Satisfactory" for this review year. Michigan Teacher Test for Certification pass rates remain above the 80% threshold (87.8%) and are slightly below the state average by 1.4%.

MTTC Content Exams

Previous Report:

Areas with an N \geq 10 that fell below the 80% expected pass rate were in the areas of Chemistry (78.6 NMU/83.2 State), Spanish (75 NMU/90.5 State), History (64.9 NMU/71.8 State), Reading (72.7 NMU/85.5 State), Social Studies Elementary (30 NMU/ 57.4 State), and Integrated Science Elementary (74.1 NMU/76.5 State).

Areas with an N < 10 that fell below the 80% target were French (50 NMU/74.1 State), German (33.3 NMU/77.1 State), Journalism (50 NMU/43.8 State), Geography (60 NMU/69.1 State), and Political Science (50 NMU/64 State). MTTC cautions about interpreting data for small populations as such data may not provide a valid indication of how examiners typically perform.

MTTC Report Data:

The N \geq 10 areas of increase were in Spanish (100%), Reading (100%), and Integrated Science Elementary (78.3%). The areas of Chemistry (55.6%), and History (56%) showed decreases with their overarching disciplines of Integrated Science Secondary (100%) and Social Studies Secondary (95.5%) showing increases from the last cycle for exams that are broader in content.

Areas with an N < 10 that fell below 80% were Social Studies Elementary (66.7%) showing a gain of 36.7% from last cycle and an outcome of .8% better than the state average. German was discontinued at NMU. Geography, Economics, and Political Science each had one (1) test taker, none of whom passed the exam.

Comparisons are available for other state institutions.

Overall MTTC scores for all tests show NMU 4th among public universities. U of M Ann Arbor 95.5

Michigan State University 93.2 Grand Valley State University 91.2 Northern Michigan University 88.6 Saginaw Valley State University 87.7 U of M Dearborn 86.2

Oakland University 84.4

Eastern Michigan University 94.9 Michigan Technological University 91.2 Central Michigan University 83.8

U of M Flint 82

Ferris State University 84.5

Lake Superior State University 83.7 Wayne State University 79.4 Western Michigan University 79.9

Educator Effectiveness Ratings are at 94.1% as compared to the state average of 94.7% showing NMU is trending with the other programs in the state. We have learned that a deeper dive into the effectiveness ratings is warranted. A first-year new teacher seminar has been established, with university funding, to enroll up to 30 recent program completers for one-year to do a deeper dive into educator effectiveness. Replicating survey questions and portfolio requirements from the internship into the first year will give the program more substantive data for comparison.

Hiring trends remain positive and rural shortages are adding a level of complexity to student teaching and internship placements due to the need for filling positions. The workgroup established with local administrators to partner on a placement process that supports program expectations should a candidate be up for consideration as a paid intern/student teacher is working effectively and supported by shared understanding through administrator participation in the end of semester mock interview process.

Completer employment placement data show the majority of completers hired and retained in districts that meet the rural school code. These employment data also reinforce the effectiveness ratings and the positive results shown in the Educator Performance Indicator score.

Data are shared at monthly meetings of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and teacher candidates. An annual report for the NMU campus, and our annual MDE Educator Performance Indicator (EPI) score report serve as points of dissemination to faculty and our clinical partners. The use of the monthly TEAC meetings for cooperating teacher and university supervisors and the bi-monthly meetings for all local school districts are used to share program outcomes, trends, and to engage in clinical partner dialogue to determine program needs based on evidence.

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.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

3.1: The EPP lacks an explicit plan with goals and an appropriate timeline to recruit and support completion of high-quality diverse candidates from a broad range of backgrounds.

Aim North recruitment plan implemented fall 2018 with Chief Diversity Officer: A program designed to help students in the Detroit community get a head start on their journey to college. This program will allow students to take two college-level courses in their hometown, earn college credit, and complete some of the requirements needed for a college degree—in their summer after high school graduation. The first group of participants engaged with the program summer 2020 and another cohort has been recruited for summer 2021. The partnership with the Center for Native American Studies has been positive and the program uses clinical experiences and community experiences that leverage education and Native American Studies language and culture courses.

The program is assisting in the recruitment of diverse candidates and has now established a purposeful connection with Anishinaabe tribes.

Implemented a Title II rural residency grant fall 2017 to recruit and retain teachers to rural school settings. Candidate pool represented diversity across socio-economic status. This program has now taken root and has been referenced by our rural schools as a viable and trusted curriculum plan. Building off of this program has now led to a school district supported plan to recruit more candidates into special education through the graduate program (practicing teachers) and memos of understanding and articulation agreements to recruit through career and technical education programs in rural areas representing populations of students of low socio-economic status.

Partnered with the NMU Center for Native American Studies and the NMU Office of Diversity and Inclusion for the Reimagine STEM Summer Youth Academy summer 2018 to engage and recruit Native American students into STEM teaching tracks.

The Indigenous Women Working within the Sciences (IWWS) is a two-year pilot project funded by a National Science Foundation Inclusion across the Nation of Communities of Underrepresented Discovered in Engineering and Sciences (NSF INCLUDES) grant. The IWWS team will address two key challenges: 1) the lack of inclusivity of American Indian teaching methods within sciences education curricula, and 2) the low numbers of Native American female students graduating from four-year universities, specifically within the STEM fields.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

4 Program Impact

4.3: The EPP's plan to gather valid and reliable data to monitor employment milestones and satisfaction does not meet the acceptable level based on the CAEP Guidelines for Plans.

The program uses the Michigan Department of Education data for employer satisfaction, effectiveness ratings, and first-year out completer data as measures under the assumption that these state instruments are valid and reliable as they are used to determine annual scores for the MDE and policy makers. Additionally, the program conducts focus groups with employers and alumni each semester to gather program feedback regarding employability and the needs of the profession.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

5.2 EPP created assessments are not rated at the acceptable level when reviewed using the CAEP minimum level of sufficiency.

Our program was accredited in November 2017. The program filed a complaint with CAEP that resulted in a meeting with the Michigan Department of Education, CAEP president, NMU legal counsel stated that a reasonable result would be to provide NMU with specific information as to which rubrics/assessment did not meet standards. This inquiry from NMU and resolution from CAEP was agreed upon as the CAEP site team requested all syllabi and materials since our last accreditation visit making it unclear as to what assessments did not meet standard. The program has not received the detail necessary from CAEP to address this AFI in more detail.

The program does use Michigan Department of Education data for employer satisfaction, effectiveness ratings, cooperating/supervising teacher ratings, subject-area exam scores, and first-year out completer data as measures under the assumption that these state instruments are valid and reliable as they are used to determine annual scores for the MDE and policymakers. Additionally, the program utilizes the Danielson Framework for Teaching which shows a "good" level of inter-rater reliability.

CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)

5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

5.3 and 5.4. The EPP does not systematically disaggregate candidate performance data from admission through program completion and use the data for program improvement.

A system has been established by licensure area to track the following data points for candidate quality: GPA for admission pre-methods; professional behaviors/dispositions (over three semesters at mid-term and end of semester); pre-methods GPA; methods GPA; content licensure GPA; overall GPA; Danielson Framework Evaluations (early, mid-term, final) assessed by student teacher/intern, cooperating teacher, university supervisor; MTTC subject area scores; practicing administrator interview feedback.

Disaggregated data are shared with the following stakeholders: Danielson Framework results for cooperating teachers/university supervisors at monthly mentoring meetings; NMU campus community annual program report disaggregated by content area; a scholarly resource allocation report (three-year cycle) to the campus community, the public, and university administration; MDE outcomes (employer satisfaction, efficacy scores, effectiveness ratings, MTTC content scores); professional behaviors shared with candidates and program faculty once each semester; mock interview results shared with faculty, practicing administrators, and candidates once a semester; Danielson results shared with candidates on an ongoing basis throughout internship; MDE Educator Performance Indicator score shared publicly with aggregate data for employer, effectiveness, and cooperating/supervisor ratings and disaggregated by content area exam.

Two administrative professionals and the director of field experiences lead the collection and disaggregation of data. Committees that review data on a monthly basis are: Undergraduate Review Committee, Teacher Selection and Retention Committee, Secondary Education Committee, Upper Peninsula Center for Educational Development Committee (P12 partner committee), the Teacher Education Advisory Council (cooperating teachers and university supervisor P12 committee), Graduate Review Committee; on an annual basis Academic Outcomes for Learning Committee (campus-wide data review committee).

All curriculum revisions, grant proposals, and evaluation processes stem from committee and partnership review of program data as required by NMU policies and grant parameters. The Teacher Selection and Retention Committee is responsible for use of disaggregated data review by candidate to make evidence based selection and retention decisions.

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?

To systematically assess performance goals the program utilizes a departmental and university committee review process for the data summarized in 4.2 of the annual report. To determine the needs of the program, region, and clinical partners, a collaborative process is utilized through structured clinical partnership meetings, statewide meetings, and regional meetings.

NEW GRADE LEVEL BANDING CURRICULUM - ELEMENTARY

Building off of last year's Clinical Experiences Revision, the program revised the elementary program to meet the new standards for PK-3 and 3-6 grade level banding. This is a major undertaking and one that the faculty chose to develop in the true spirit of the intent of the revisions. Attendance at the statewide stakeholder meetings made it clear that developing a program that would accept associate's degrees from community and tribal colleges was important. To that end, the faculty designed a pathway that would accept associate's degrees and also meet the university's expectation that candidates complete their program in four years. The reduction of credit hour, while meeting the standards from the MI Dept of Ed, was met and faculty are using the 16 credit flat rate tuition to drive these changes. Faculty identified data collection points through clinical experiences and developed a program that would allow individuals to obtain both bands in four years. Since April 1, 2021, we have been sharing our plan with community and tribal colleges, colleagues on campus, alumni, and with our local schools. The formal curriculum writing will occur summer 2021

and the program revisions will be submitted to the university's academic senate and the MI Dept of Ed October 1 and November 1, 2021, respectively. A video was created to share the vision with faculty, alumni, and clinical partners:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XxuZqwuhQ8MrF4mFx7-NlJq4Hu45AjpR/view>

Outcomes for this program are identified in the MI Dept of Education professional standards and corresponding licensure exams. The specific instruments for the assessment of these standards are under development. The program did use focus group and survey data to address the expressed need from program completers to more intentionally create experiences that addressed students with special needs and leading group (large and small) discussions. These program needs were consistent with the state stakeholder meeting data presented by the MI Dept of Education. The program revisions reflect these needs areas.

ANISHINAABEMOWIN TEACHING CERTIFICATE - HIGH NEEDS AREA

Building off of the them to better serve and develop candidates to meet the needs of underrepresented populations, the program partnered with Bay Mill Community College, a tribal college, to develop the Anishinaabemowin Teaching Certificate, the first of its kind in Michigan. Partnering the the MI Dept of Ed, it was evident that no program existed to meet this expressed need of our tribal communities. Data clearly show that students perform better when they see themselves represented in the curriculum and by those who teach the curriculum. The program involved the NMU Charter Schools Office who charters two tribal schools in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan representing communities of the Anishinaabe Three Fires Confederacy. This plan will prepare individuals to teach the language and culture and will solidify partnerships with a tribal community college. A copy of the accepted and approved MI Dept of Education Program is attached. The plan demonstrates the standards and how results will be collected and tracked. The new certificate will report to the MI Dept of Ed in five years and internally reporting will occur through established university processes.

SPECIAL EDUCATION SHORTAGE AREA - LEARNING DISABILITIES

Employer data, employer focus group feedback, and shortage lists clearly demonstrate that the need for special educators clearly outpaces the pool of qualified candidates available for special education learning disabilities. The clinical partners/employers in the Upper Peninsula have been frustrated in the lack of candidates due to shortages. Over a two month period, individual meetings and the use of the bi-monthly meeting of Upper Peninsula superintendents were utilized to brainstorm and develop a strategy to address this shortage. Districts and ISDs determined that they could use school board approved title funds to subsidize tuition dollars for general education teachers willing to obtain a year-long permit in learning disabilities and enroll in an accredited program. The current graduation tuition rate was not attractive to our clinical partners, so we collaboratively proposed a discounted rate equivalent to lower division undergraduate tuition to the NMU administration with the rationale that this was an initial license in special education and institutional support of the LEAs and ISDs met the mission of the university and its origin as a normal school. The NMU administration accepted the proposal and LEA/ISD school board MOUs were developed and approved with the LEA/ISD determining which educators would be eligible for the tuition support. Some LEA/ISD entities have chosen to limit the tuition support to those on the year-long permit while others have determined the tuition support would be used for those on a year-long permit and those the institution wishes to develop for future potential employment in learning disabilities. The discounted tuition rate is applicable only to coursework that leads to licensure. Data collection and review will occur through the coursework implemented for this accredited program. Data outcomes are reviewed on an annual basis with program faculty and clinical partners in addition to the annual academic outcomes report required by the university. Examples of two MOUs for this strategy are attached. See CCISD and MCISD Special Education Certification Grant.

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

- 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
- 4.3 Employer 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.
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- x.1 Diversity
- x.2 Technology
- x.4 Previous AFI / Weaknesses
- x.5 State Standards (if applicable)

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **CCISD_Special_Education_Certification_Grant_.pdf**
-  **MCISD_Special_Education_Certification_Grant_.pdf**
-  **NMU_Anishinaabemowin_FN_New_Prep_Program_App_41021.pdf**
-  **NMU_FN_Anishinaabe_Initial_Approval_April_2021.pdf**

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or 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:

Position:

Phone:

E-mail:

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**