

2019 EPP Annual Report

| | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------|
| CAEP ID: | 10527 | AACTE SID: | 1975 |
| Institution: | James Madison University | | |
| Unit: | College of Education | | |

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...

| | 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"/> |

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 ¹ | 291 |
| 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 | 94 |

Total number of program completers 385

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 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: <http://www.jmu.edu/oir/affordability.shtml>

Description of data accessible via link: The university's official data on cost of attendance, financial aid, student debt, and post-completion wages.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

2

Link: <http://www.jmu.edu/coe/assessment/>

Description of data accessible via link: Title II reports

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3

Link: http://www.jmu.edu/oir/oir-research/statsum/2018-19/T2-25_2018.pdf

Description of data accessible via link: University graduation rates

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4

Link: <http://www.jmu.edu/coe/assessment/>
 Description of data accessible via link: Survey data

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5

Link: <http://www.jmu.edu/coe/assessment/>
 Description of data accessible via link: Biennial Measures

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

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

Seven of the 8 required reporting measures (Impact on P-12 learning and development, results of completer surveys, graduation rates, ability of completers to meet state requirements, indicators of teaching effectiveness, employer survey data, and ability of completers to be hired) will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Consumer information is not used by CAEP for accreditation decision making and will therefore not be included in this discussion (CAEP Accreditation Handbook, 2018, p. 27). Impact on Student Learning is addressed throughout each program, with data about Impact on Student Learning being captured by University Supervisors (US) and Cooperating Teachers (CT) during each student-teaching placement. The Student Teaching Performance assessment data contains findings of how candidates perform. Additionally, the EPP has been working hard to capture information about Impact on Student Learning once our completers are teaching in schools. In Virginia, Standard 7 of the Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment Standards is the specific standard on which practicing teachers are evaluated on Impact on Student Learning. Administrators must base their ratings of practicing teachers on the results of in class observations of teaching effectiveness. We are using various measures to capture employer data to ensure that principals and administrators are satisfied with the performance of individuals who completed their teacher education preparation at James Madison University. Additionally, we solicit completer feedback about how well JMU prepared them for working in a P-12 classroom in Virginia. Evidence indicates a high candidate completion rate across all programs in EPP. Our 2017 Virginia Biennial Measures report shows no one exiting from initial programs in the biennium 9/1/15 through 8/31/17. Note that for this report, the definition of "exiter" is limited to individuals who have completed coursework but not state required assessments. Looking at EPP data of all applicants since January 1, 2015, (three cohorts of accepted candidates -- October 2014 cohort, January 2015 cohort, and April 2015 cohort), we noted that the retention rate is quite high: Fifty percent of the members of the October 2014 and January 2015 cohorts have successfully completed their programs (within the anticipated time frame of five years), and the other 50% remain active. Of the 141 candidates in the April 2015 cohort, 96% (N=135) remain active in or have successfully completed their programs. Because all initial licensure programs require candidates to complete licensure requirements in order to successfully complete their programs, 100% of initial candidates are eligible for licensure at the time of completion. Employment rate is more difficult to determine. Each summer, the Virginia Department of Education is able to provide the EPP with a list of which of our completers are employed within the state. This list does not reflect employment out of state or with private institutions. As of Fall 2016, 70% of 2014 graduates were employed with the state; 77% of 2015 graduates were employed with the state, and 72% of 2016 graduates (Spring semester only) were employed with the state. As mentioned above, these employment rates are a low estimate of the actual employment of our graduates, as the data reflect only Virginia public P-12 public school employment on a census date (October 1, 2016). At this point, we have not established benchmarks for comparison. however, in Virginia, EPPs are forming alliances to work together to develop this kind of information. For instance, during a recent Virginia Association for Colleges of Teacher Education meeting, a subcommittee was formed with the purpose of developing unified assessment tools to address CAEP Standard 4 requirements. In addition, our EPP held a meeting in March 2019 during which we shared processes for collecting Standard 4 data

with the three other EPPs in our consortium. Our aim is to develop benchmarks to begin using in advance of our next CAEP visit (2026).

The EPP shares information and measures with both external stakeholders and internal stakeholders. The Student Teaching Assessment revision involved four institutions and representatives from P-12 partners in the developments, piloting, and revisions. Programs solicit feedback from University Supervisors about field placement policies, candidate work and quality, and assessments. In preparing for CAEP accreditation, stakeholders have been invited to participate at many junctures. Most recently, faculty, other state EPPs, and P-12 partners reviewed drafts of the Self Study Report in a day-long session and answered the following prompts: Was anything difficult to understand? Were there any errors/inaccuracies? Was anything presented in the narrative that was not supported by evidence? Also, participants were provided with CAEP evaluation rubrics so that they could evaluate each section. We believe this not only provided feedback to the team putting the report together, but also provided exposure to the CAEP visit process and encouraged greater familiarity with the contents of the SSR.

Within the EPP, there is one unit-wide committee, the Professional Education Coordinating Council (PECC), that includes representation from the four departments within the college that house licensure programs. PECC also has representation from teacher-education programs that are not housed within the College of Education, such as Health and Physical Education, Music, Art, Dance, Theatre, and Foreign Languages. It is in this committee that unit-wide data is reviewed periodically, and changes made based on the findings (CAEP 5.1).

In reviewing the PECC minutes in recent years, several examples of program modifications and changes are noted (CAEP 5.3). First, to address candidate quality (CAEP Standard 3), the dispositions assessment was improved and the data collection points reinforced to facilitate regular collection and review of data. Second, to address candidate quality, teacher education admissions requirements were reviewed and adjusted: for example, PECC decided that the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA) should be used as an entry examination. This was done as a way to improve our administrative functioning. The VCLA is required for teacher licensure in Virginia. However, some candidates who were not planning to remain in the Commonwealth decided to save time and money by not completing the assessment. By moving it to an entry requirement, we are able to guarantee that all candidates have completed this assessment. Third, based on feedback from Pk-12 school partners, an initiative was undertaken to prepare candidates to work in challenged schools with underrepresented students. Over the last three years, the EPP has had focused conversations with partner school systems, resulting in the incorporation of specific curricular and extracurricular opportunities such as poverty simulations, diversity symposia, and curriculum changes that focus on differentiation and diversity. Finally, the student teaching performance assessment was revised as a result of data review, when program and partner stakeholders recognized that the data provided by the former instrument were not aligned to InTASC, CAEP, and current professional standards.

Besides PECC, data are shared at the department and program level as well. For university accreditation purposes, every degree-bearing program is required to submit an Assessment Progress Template (APT) annually on June 1. These reports provide structure to our process; program coordinators gather data from the previous calendar year during the spring semester each year, allowing for timely report completion and reflection upon the data in advance of the start of the fall semester. If any changes need to be made, or a program decides to test new ideas, plans can be developed during the summer, then data collected again during fall semester. For example, MSME program faculty members reviewed aggregate scores from the Student Teaching Performance assessment to determine potential ways to improve the Secondary Education program. During this review and subsequent discussion, the department noted a need to mandate a "planning for diversity" section in all departmental lesson plans and add differentiation to weekly student teaching reflection prompts in order to address challenges noted by completers with respect to differentiation of instruction.

Based on the above narrative, the EPP shows that it maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures. Evidence of candidates' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development has been discussed, and completer's impact as well, to the extent possible, given that this information is not available in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The EPP supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based and uses data to establish priorities, enhance programs and test innovations.

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Amy D. Theik

Position: Director of Assessment and Accreditation; Interim Assistant to the Dean

Phone: (540)568-3171

E-mail: thelkad@jmu.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