AAQEP Annual Report for 2020

Provider/Program: American InterContinental University (AIU) School of Education

End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term: 1 June 30, 2026

Please enter the appropriate information in the shaded text boxes and return this form to AAQEP by December 31, 2020. Accredited members, please complete all sections below; unaccredited members, please complete at least sections 1 and 2 (feel free to complete additional sections). Per AAQEP policy, each accredited member must also post Part I of the report (or a link to the data reported in Part I) on its website.

PART I: Publicly available program performance and student achievement data

1. Overview and Context

Provide an overview of your institution and a brief explanation of the accredited educator preparation programs. Provide readers with a clear understanding of the provider, its mission, and its context. Four or so brief paragraphs should suffice.

American InterContinental University (AIU), Chandler, Arizona, offers associate, bachelor’s, and master’s degree programs, as well as short-term certificates to students/candidates who attend online and at ground campuses in Atlanta, Georgia and Houston, Texas. The University is divided into five schools: Business, Criminal Justice, Design, Education, and Information Technology. The AIU Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree program is part of the School of Education.

The M.Ed. degree program was created in 2002 with a focus on education technology and a mission to open access to graduate coursework opportunities for a diverse candidate base. The first courses launched in 2003 in a fully online delivery format. Concentrations were introduced in 2005 and 2006 to allow candidates to explore specific theories and practices associated with innovations in education subject areas. In 2011, the structure was modified to include core courses and “specializations,” which replaced the “concentrations.” While the specializations maintained the original intent of providing candidates with common core skills and knowledge, they expanded beyond the original set of concentration areas and branched into areas of professional interest. The additional depth and breadth enabled the M.Ed. degree program to better address the diverse audience demographic that mirrored what was evolving in academic institutions throughout the nation. In 2013, the program adopted its current structure of 48 quarter credit hours divided into eight six-credit hour graduate courses (four core and four specialization) delivered in 10-week sessions. The typical candidate
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demographic is a non-traditional female adult learner (55%) with 43% of the candidates self-identified as Black or African American. 13% of the candidates have a military affiliation. *

The program offers a fully online academic experience that embeds technology at every level of the candidates’ programmatic journey. From a curriculum perspective, the program requires candidates to design educational programs that effectively address objectives integrating the appropriate use of various instructional media and technologies for learning. The program is designed to help candidates utilize authentic tools and assessment in the application of learning outcomes implemented for P-20 student success, as well as other educational settings. Candidates explore how to collaborate in a community of learners to practice the professional application of skills and to study the importance of asking the right questions in order to prompt efficient and effective answers.

The program provides a standard core curriculum with six specialization options designed to provide candidates the in-depth, specialized knowledge they need and the skills necessary for the field of education. Each specialization presents an opportunity to focus on advanced-level and innovative educator preparation areas that align with the demographic and needs shift of P-20 students, as well as adult learners. The specializations are listed below:

1. Leadership of Educational Organizations
   http://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education/masters-educational-leadership
2. Curriculum and Instruction for Educators
   http://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education/masters-curriculum-and-instruction
3. Instructional Design and Technology
   http://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education/masters-instructional-design-and-technology
4. Adult Education and Training
   http://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education/masters-adult-education
5. Elementary Education
   http://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education/masters-elementary-education
6. Secondary Education
   http://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education/masters-secondary-education

The AIU M.Ed. course management and delivery technology is a critical resource provided by AIU in support of candidate, faculty, and programmatic success. Candidates and faculty use University resources that provide access to a virtual campus, an electronic library, the M.U.S.E. (My Unique Student Experience) portal, Practice (a web-based discussion tool), intellipath® (AIU’s adaptive learning platform), mobile applications, and linked access to technical and academic support services.

*Data represents candidates enrolled between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019,

Please enter the url for the location on the program website that includes a statement of its AAQEP accreditation status and access to this publicly reported data.

https://www.aiuniv.edu/degrees/education
2. Enrollment and Completion Data
In the table below, provide enrollment and completer data for each of your AAQEP-accredited programs for the most recently completed academic year:

Table 1. Program Specification: Number between 7/1/2018 and 6/30/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree/Program Name and Level</th>
<th>Corresponding State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential</th>
<th>Number of Candidates (currently enrolled—identify year in title line above)</th>
<th>Number of Completers (most recently completed academic year—identify year above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL - 357</td>
<td>TOTAL - 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Program Performance Indicators
Enter program performance information as indicated for the academic year indicated in Table 1 above.

Table 2: Program Performance Indicators

1. **Total enrollment** in your educator preparation programs for most recently completed academic year, or annual cycle defined by provider (unduplicated count, i.e., count individuals who may be counted in multiple lines above only once here).

Master's Degree in Education Program - Candidates enrolled between 7/1/18 and 6/30/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education and Training</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction for Educators</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design and Technology</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of Educational Organizations</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Total** number of unique completers (across all programs) in most recently completed academic year, or annual cycle defined by provider. This will usually match the total in the Program Specification Table; please explain any discrepancies (if, for example, some individuals complete more than one program).

Completers between 7/1/18 and 6/30/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree in Education</td>
<td>Adult Education and Training</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction for Educators</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Design and Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Number** of completers **recommended** for certification or licensure in most recently completed academic year, or annual cycle defined by provider. Please note numbers, if any, that are recommended for more than one certificate or license.

Not applicable. The AIU M.Ed. does not lead to licensure, certification, or endorsement.

4. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs in their respective program’s expected timeframe and in 1.5 times their respective program’s expected timeframes.

**Master of Education 100% and 150% Graduation Rates**

**Total Program Entrants from 7/1/17 to 6/30/18**

This data is for the most recent academic year cohort that has reached the 150% mark of the program (as of March 2020).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Program Entrants</th>
<th>100% Total</th>
<th>100% Graduation Rate</th>
<th>150% Total</th>
<th>150% Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Summary of State license examination results, including teacher performance assessments (you may include link to publicly available external reporting sites). Please specify any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) were below 80%.

Not applicable

6. Narrative explanation of evidence available from program completers, with characterization of findings. One to two paragraphs should be sufficient.

AIU previously partnered with a third-party vendor to conduct separate **Completer Interview** calls. On a rolling basis and aligning with a six-month time frame following graduation dates between 2016 and 2018, Career Services obtained a list of completers and employers from the AIU database which was verified and then sent to the vendor. The vendor called the completers two times per week for three weeks, or until the coordinating interview period was completed. By using a third-party evaluator asking educator-preparation-specific questions through interviews (instead of surveys), it was anticipated the program would receive more robust and appropriate data. The data was shared with stakeholders and used to inform progression, curriculum, and faculty skill-set decisions.

**Graduate Survey Question 1** - Are you satisfied that AIU’s Masters of Education program provided relevant and effective preparation for your job?

Of the 47 graduates who were reached, 41 indicated that they agreed reflecting an 87% satisfaction rate with 6 indicating that they were unable to respond. There were no disagrees indicated.*

*Data as of 4/18/19. Reflects feedback from candidates who completed between 7/10/16 and 8/7/18.
7. Narrative explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers, with characterization of findings. One to two paragraphs should be sufficient.

AIU previously partnered with a third-party vendor to conduct separate Employer Interview calls. On a rolling basis and aligning with a six-month time frame following graduation dates between 2016 and 2018, Career Services obtained a list of completers and employers from the AIU database which was verified and then sent to the vendor. The vendor called the completers two times per week for three weeks, or until the coordinating interview period was completed. By using a third-party evaluator asking educator-preparation-specific questions through interviews (instead of surveys), it was anticipated the program would receive more robust and appropriate data. The data was shared with stakeholders and used to inform progression, curriculum, and faculty skill-set decisions.

Employer Survey Question 1 - Do you agree or disagree that the graduate's Masters of Education program from AIU provided relevant and effective preparation for their job?

Of the 32 employers that were able to be reached, 15 were classified as “unable to respond” to this question. Of the remaining 17 who did provide a response, 15 (or 90%) agreed that the candidate was prepared and 2 disagreed*.

Employer Survey Question 2 - Has AIU’s Masters of Education program assisted the graduate in accomplishing any of the following employment milestones: promotion, change in employment trajectory, retention with the organization, none of the above.

Of the 22 employers who responded to this question, 9 indicated at least one of the milestones was reached and 13 indicated none of the options were applicable. One of those employers specifically chose the “none” option because the graduate actually met all three milestones.

*Data as of 4/18/19. Reflects feedback about candidates who completed between 7/10/16 and 8/7/18.

8. Employment (and/or more schooling) rates for immediate prior year’s completers, if known

The AIU School of Education does not collect this data.

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

This section seeks your own expectations for candidate/completer performance and indicators of their success in meeting those expectations. For each of AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, please specify 3 to 5 expectations in Table 4.1 and:

- List your chosen measures of performance (these may be taken from your Quality Assurance Report)
- Indicate the performance expectations for each measure (i.e. your definition of minimally adequate performance, though you may also specify other levels of expectation)
- Summarize candidate/completer success in relation to those expectations
Table 3. Expectations and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>Provider-Selected Measures</th>
<th>Explanation of Performance Expectation</th>
<th>Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Common Assessment Workbook (CAW) | The basis for scoring is defined by adapting to and aligning with an industry-proven skills acquisition model – the Dreyfus Model (category definitions defined below). Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined with specific criteria described. There is a developmental sequence that includes the categories of Novice, Competent, Proficient, and Expert. Raters use an even numeric system that enables identification of actionable, performance-based feedback. Raters participate in assessment administration training and inter-rater reliability debriefs throughout the program. Specific rank score averages expected for progression mastery are as follows:  
  Core Courses (EDU602 or EDU605): Score of 2 by 70% of candidates  
  Specialization Courses (ED641, EDU643, EDU654, EDU662, EDU672, or EDU677): Score of 2-3 by 70% of candidates  
  Capstone Experience (EDU624 or EDU625): Score of 3-4 by 70% of candidates | Met and exceeded.  
  CA#=Program Outcome#  
  **Introductory Course Data Breakdown**  
  CA criteria 1 (AAQEP standards 2 and 3): 86.15%  
  CA criteria 2 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 87.7%  
  CA criteria 3 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 95.38%  
  CA criteria 4 (AAQEP standards 1, 2 and 4): 90.77%  
  CA criteria 5 (AAQEP standard 1): 95.38%  
  CA criteria 6 (AAQEP standard 2): 87.7%  
  CA criteria 7 (AAQEP standards 1 and 2): 93.85%  
  **Specialization Course Breakdown**  
  CA criteria 1 (AAQEP standards 2 and 3): 93.22%  
  CA criteria 2 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 91.53%  
  CA criteria 3 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 93.22%  
  CA criteria 4 (AAQEP standards 1, 2 and 4): 93.22%  
  CA criteria 5 (AAQEP standard 1): 91.53%  
  CA criteria 6 (AAQEP standard 2): 83.05%  
  CA criteria 7 (AAQEP standards 1 and 2): 93.22%  
  **Capstone Course Breakdown**  
  CA criteria 1 (AAQEP standards 2 and 3): 80.33%  
  CA criteria 2 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 73.78%  
  CA criteria 3 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 75.41%  
  CA criteria 4 (AAQEP standards 1, 2 and 4): 78.69%  
  CA criteria 5 (AAQEP standard 1): 78.61%  
  CA criteria 6 (AAQEP standard 2): 86.89% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria Met and Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intellipath Knowledge State/Knowledge Growth SuperUsers Report</td>
<td>The report provides data such as total lessons offered and completed, average time, average score, and growth percentages. For triangulation purposes, data is pulled at the end of sessions two, three, and four to align with the CAW process. Expected scoring range of 80% reflects the cut score for this instrument. Currently, intellipath is not present in the capstone.</td>
<td>Met and exceeded with a programmatic average score for the Introductory level of 98.46% and the Specialization level of 100%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Common Assessment (CA) Artifact Grades</td>
<td>The CA assignments are tagged to AAQEP standards, program outcomes, national professional standards, specialization standards, and aligned with diversity and technology cross-cutting themes. Grading is carried out by faculty, using established standard rubrics for each CA assignment artifact. The rubrics assigned to each assignment carry relative weight percentages and points are achieved based on a maximum number of points allocated to an assignment. Grade data is captured as points scored, percent of points possible, and the equivalent letter grade for an assignment. Since the grade represents the candidate’s abilities in the criteria indicated in the rubrics, it also serves as a measure of the candidate’s ability as aligned with the quality principles and cross-cutting themes. Industry standard final CGPA of 3.0 for graduation expected at 80%</td>
<td>Expectation met and exceeded. 98.46% of Introductory course candidates passed the CA assignment in their respective courses. 88.16% of Specialization course candidates passed the CA assignment in their respective courses. 86.89% of Capstone candidates passed the CA assignment in their respective courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) Policy</td>
<td>The primary purpose of the policy is to provide measurable evidence that a candidate is progressing towards graduation from their program at a reasonable rate. Candidates</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cannot attempt more than 150% of the required credits for their program before reaching graduation. If a candidate cannot graduate before exceeding the 150% threshold, they will be administratively dismissed.

The basis for scoring is defined by adapting to and aligning with an industry-proven skills acquisition model – the Dreyfus Model (category definitions defined below). Each proficiency level is qualitatively defined with specific criteria described. There is a developmental sequence that includes the categories of Novice, Competent, Proficient, and Expert. Raters use an even numeric system that enables identification of actionable, performance-based feedback. Raters participate in assessment administration training and inter-rater reliability debriefs throughout the program.

Specific rank score averages expected for progression mastery are as follows:

- Core Courses (EDU602 or EDU605): Score of 2
- Specialization Courses (ED641, EDU643, EDU654, EDU662, EDU672, or EDU677): Score of 2-3
- Capstone Experience (EDU624 or EDU625): Score of 3-4

Met and exceeded.

CA#=Program Outcome

Introductory Course Data Breakdown
CA criteria 1 (AAQEP standards 2 and 3): 86.15%
CA criteria 2 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 87.7%
CA criteria 3 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 95.38%
CA criteria 4 (AAQEP standards 1, 2 and 4): 90.77%
CA criteria 5 (AAQEP standard 1): 95.38%
CA criteria 6 (AAQEP standard 2): 87.7%
CA criteria 7 (AAQEP standards 1 and 2): 93.85%

Specialization Course Breakdown
CA criteria 1 (AAQEP standards 2 and 3): 93.22%
CA criteria 2 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 91.53%
CA criteria 3 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 93.22%
CA criteria 4 (AAQEP standards 1, 2 and 4): 93.22%
CA criteria 5 (AAQEP standard 1): 91.53%
CA criteria 6 (AAQEP standard 2): 83.05%
CA criteria 7 (AAQEP standards 1 and 2): 93.22%

Capstone Course Breakdown
CA criteria 1 (AAQEP standards 2 and 3): 80.33%
CA criteria 2 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 73.78%
CA criteria 3 (AAQEP standards 1 and 3): 75.41%
CA criteria 4 (AAQEP standards 1, 2 and 4): 78.69%
| 2 | **Intellipath Knowledge State/Knowledge Growth SuperUsers Report** | The report provides data such as total lessons offered and completed, average time, average score, and growth percentages. For triangulation purposes, data is pulled at the end of sessions two, three, and four to align with the CAW process. Expected scoring range of 80% reflects the cut score for this instrument. | Met and exceeded with a programmatic average score for the Introductory level of 98.46% and the Specialization level of 100%. |
| 2 | **Common Assessment (CA) Artifact Grades** | The CA assignments are tagged to AAQEP standards, program outcomes, national professional standards, specialization standards, and aligned with diversity and technology cross-cutting themes. Grading is carried out by faculty, using established standard rubrics for each CA assignment artifact. The rubrics assigned to each assignment carry relative weight percentages and points are achieved based on a maximum number of points allocated to an assignment. Grade data is captured as points scored, percent of points possible, and the equivalent letter grade for an assignment. Since the grade represents the candidate’s abilities in the criteria indicated in the rubrics, it also serves as a measure of the candidate’s ability as aligned with the quality principles and cross-cutting themes. Industry standard final CGPA of 3.0 for graduation expected. | Expectation met and exceeded. 98.46% of Introductory course candidates passed the CA assignment in their respective courses. 88.16% of Specialization course candidates passed the CA assignment in their respective courses 86.89% of Capstone candidates passed the CA assignment in their respective courses |
| 2 | **Completer and Employer Satisfaction Interviews** | A third-party evaluator asking educator-preparation-specific questions through interviews with completers and employers. | Met and exceeded. 87% of completers who responded indicated they were satisfied. |
and expectation benchmark of 80% satisfied respondents. satisfied that the program provided relevant and effective preparation for their job.

90% of employers who responded agreed that the completer’s M.Ed. program from AIU provided relevant and effective preparation for their job.

*Data as of 4/18/19. Reflects feedback from candidates who completed between 7/10/16 and 8/7/18 and their employers.*

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

Describe recent program accomplishments, efforts to address challenges, priorities in your current agenda, and innovations that are on the horizon. Please limit comments to no more than two pages.

The AIU School of Education’s M.Ed. degree program has a considerable track record and robust history of embracing quality metrics and continuous improvement processes. Findings indicate that the program has a strong data-driven decision-making base and is responsive to engagement and innovative needs. Based on the analysis of 2019 data, the School of Education developed a two year audit plan for reviewing the intellipath content base of all 33 courses in inventory and identified a need for intellipath to be incorporated into the Capstone experience. Faculty subject matter experts have established content specific cohorts and have completed the review of four courses at the time of the annual report. The MED500C admissions assessment intellipath experience is currently under faculty audit to ensure continued alignment with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

An industry challenge impacting the AIU School of Education is the historically low completer and employer interview response rates. Since the AIU M.Ed. does not lead to licensure, endorsement, or certification, using performance data or ratings provided by state systems is not an available option. Therefore, in 2020 the School of Education will work with a team to develop an innovative approach for gathering completer, employer, and stakeholder data for continuous improvement and to inspire innovations. Initial discussions include the use of focus groups, an alumni cohort approach, and an automated survey option.

Based on qualitative data provided by faculty, candidates, and completers, a unique graduate-level orientation was developed during the fourth quarter of 2019. This orientation program incorporated new technology tools, providing a robust set of resources and a direct connection with faculty. The orientation program was piloted on February 26, 2020.

In November 2019, the School of Education completed an industry research project as a result of Standard 4 needs. The research was shared with the Industry Advisory Board, strategic partners, candidates, and completers as part of the School’s 2020 strategic plan to strengthen practices in the education industry based on local and regional needs.