2021 EPP Annual Report

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

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	◉	○
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).

https://www.jmu.edu/coe/academics.shtml

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[1]

285

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]

111

Total number of program completers   396

---

[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

TESOL undergraduate major approved in fall 2019.

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.jmu.edu/coe/assessment/index.shtml
>
> **Description of data accessible via link:** CAEP and state approval letters; list of programs reviewed at last CAEP site visit; data and results; surveys; 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	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Advanced-Level Programs			✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔

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?*

We are in the process of discussing whether to make changes to our entry assessment requirements and the assessment data plays a big role in the conversation. In the summer of 2021 we plan on conducting a through investigation about costs of entry assessments, in terms of money and time, but also whether attrition and the emotional stress of testing is offset by the information we receive from the scores. This will be a major provider wide change based on data. In recent years we conducted a similar analysis to determine whether to change the timing of the VCLA exam.

Survey work has transitioned from being based only at the JMU College of Education to the Virginia Education Assessment Collaborative (VEAC) survey project, being headed up with neither funds nor support by a set of Virginia EPPs in need of state-wide data. Now we are able to benchmark and collaborate, look to find solutions based on data trends across the state, and investigate differences among regions and institutions. As this project is in its nascent stages, trends are yet to be determined but it is a major aim to have the information gathered to situate ourselves to take on that inquiry.

Although we make the measures public (web link is fully accessible and the data are identified), the number of requests for this available data serves as a reminder that we have further work to do to consider these findings widely shared. Starting in 2021 we will gather stakeholders for each program and conduct focus groups to determine whether the programs are aligned with the P-12 landscape, to inform stakeholders of our work and findings, and to extend opportunities for ongoing collaboration. Additionally, our development of new teacher support programs will establish connections among programs, alumni and community.

From reviewing the data about the 8 CAEP Annual reporting Measures, we have determined the following:

Measure 1: Impact on Student Learning. In the Commonwealth of Virginia, there is no clear mechanism for collecting and sharing data across the state education agency, EPPs, and P-12 school divisions. Stakeholders in Virginia consistently identify CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact as the most challenging standard to meet based on current data practices. Several members of the 36 Virginia EPPs formed the Virginia Education Assessment Collaborative (VEAC) in a collaborative effort to create a state-wide system for data collection; in particular, to build a common set of assessment measures, tools, and activities that all Virginia EPPs may use in response to CAEP requirements. One of the first developments of VEAC was the creation and implementation of completer and employer surveys in response to CAEP standard components 4.4 and 4.3, respectively. VEAC worked with 17 piloting EPPs to create these state-wide surveys. This group also created the VEAC Instruction Guide which outlined how these surveys met sufficiency on the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, and how these surveys assessed both the InTASC Standards and the Virginia Uniform Performance Standards. In AY 19-20, VEAC launched the pilot completer survey and employer surveys. For this pilot, a total of 2,375 completers from these 17 participating EPPs were contacted, with 832 full and partial responses. Based on the completer survey responses, a total of 1,902 employers were contacted, 488 full and partial responses. Based on this state-wide collection, VEAC then provided individual EPP and benchmarking results on completer and employer satisfaction to each EPP in a series of reports. All EPPs were also provided access to their EPP raw data through a password-protected website.

Measure 2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness. While this continues to challenge us due to the lack of a state-coordinated effort, in Spring 2020 James Madison University participated in the Virginia Education Assessment Collaborative pilot initiative to administer a common Completer and Employer Survey aligned to CAEP, InTASC, and Virginia Performance Standards. The VEAC pilot project included approximately 13 EPPs across Virginia, both public and private. Self-report data about Teaching Effectiveness is found in the VEAC Completer survey. On a 4 point scale, with 4 being highest rating of their own performance, 50 completers who took the survey had a mean score of over 3 for the following items: uses assessment results to inform and adjust practice (3.26); work results in acceptable, measurable and appropriate student academic progress (3.18), and systematically[…] uses relevant data that measures student academic progress (3.06). Completer satisfaction (on a 5-point scale, with 5 indicating highest satisfaction) was 4.68 for JMU completers (n=50) as compared to 4.58 from the entire state dataset (n=682).

Measure 3: Satisfaction of Employers.
On the 2019-20 VEAC employer survey, an item asks employers, "Based on your experiences with this teacher, what best describes the extent to which they were ready to meet the needs of students in your school?" Respondent employers could respond "Fully ready (able to have an immediate impact on student learning), Mostly ready (able to successfully meet the needs of most students," "Moderately ready (in order to be successful, needed additional training, support, and coaching beyond what is typically provided to beginning teachers)," "Minimally ready (limited success meeting the needs of students and improving outcomes even with additional supports)" or "Not ready (unable to meet the needs of students even with additional supports)." On this overall satisfaction item, there were 457 responses collected.
To find the average overall satisfaction, responses are coded, from 1 to 5. Higher values indicate more satisfaction, and lower values indicate more dissatisfaction. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on this scaled version of the overall satisfaction item. JMU's completers were rated 4.57 (n=47) on a 5-point scale, slightly higher than the overall state average of 4.49 (n=457)

Measure 4: Satisfaction of Completers.
Completer Satisfaction Data
On the 2019-20 VEAC completer survey, the last of the 15 satisfaction asks "Overall, how satisfied are you with your preparation from ${e://Field/Institution}?" Note that each respondent's institution of higher education (IHE) is embedded in their unique survey. Respondents could respond "extremely dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, or extremely satisfied." On this overall satisfaction item, there were 682 responses.

To find the average overall satisfaction, responses are coded, from 1 to 5. Higher values indicate more satisfaction, and lower values indicate more dissatisfaction. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on this scaled version of the overall satisfaction item.

JMU's completers rated satisfaction as 4.68(n=50) on a 5-point scale, slightly higher than the overall state average of 4.58 (n=682).

Measure 5: graduation Rates
JMU publishes a graduation rate of 82% within 6 years. We know that we retain education students at a higher rate. In the 2021 state EPP Profile report, we indicated that alongside a group of 396 2019-20 completers, there were 6 individuals who chose not to continue in teacher education; therefore if we make the assumption that these people did not graduate the institution (which is not necessarily the case) the graduation rate is close to 99%.

Measure 6: Ability of Completers to Meet Licensure Requirements. Our Praxis Subject assessment first-time pass rates vary by program. The EPP goal is to achieve and maintain an 80% pass rate for first-time test takers. As all of our programs require passing the licensure assessments for graduation, we achieve an eventual 100% pass rate for all completers. The Commonwealth of Virginia does not require certain programs (e.g. Special Education) to take Praxis subject assessments for licensure; faculty members affiliated with those programs will focus on reviewing other state testing requirements (Virginia Communication Literacy Assessment and Reading for Virginia Educators) for further understanding of difficulties that may be encountered by students. The pass rate on VCLA-Writing continues to trail the pass rate for the other VCLA subtest, reading. Through our Professional Education Coordinating Council we are discussing alignment between that assessment and our language requirements to determine why this discrepancy might be occurring.
In terms of benchmarks, we generally compare to state pass rates for licensure assessments and seek to improve within our own EPP the first time pass rate, checking for ongoing increases.

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.

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?

2019. Having robust cohorts in each of these programs facilitated newly imagined efforts to assess, evaluate and track our students. In response, one of the first changes planned is developing a centralized academic advising center. In Fall 2019 an additional 4-year major was approved in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages; the program started accepting students for the Fall 2020 semester.

The onset of five new majors allows for greater comparison across programs: each cohort is in a brand-new program, receives newly developed advising services, and is otherwise progressing in tandem with other program cohorts. Again, this allows for a systematic and intense look at the effectiveness of our programs.

We found based on 3 surveys administered to students in our new majors during 2019-20, there was confusion about requirements, assessments, and resources. We used these data points as rationale for shoring up advising services, improving the website and adding advisors. In 2021-22 we will add an advising center and increase peer advising support.

The EPP is reexamining its priorities against the needs of the state and the region, taking into consideration available offerings across the slate of public universities. A graduate (M.Ed.) program in Teacher Leadership, in response to the lack of such a program, commenced in the fall of 2020. An add-on Special Education endorsement is being considered for 2021 submission to the state. Increased new teacher support around the state is being developed at our EPP.

We are at the beginning of an investigation of state licensing requirements and the validity of these requirements. For example, the Virginia Communication Literacy Assessment (VCLA) in recent years was recast as an entry-level assessment (yet it is also required for licensure). Paradoxically, the cohort averages increased as the placement of the exam was made earlier in the candidates' programs. This led to an investigation of the skills that were actually being measured (covered in our Self Study Report in depth). Then, in an attempt to improve access to teacher education programs, our state eliminated the need for entry assessments. Our EPP still requires VCLA as an entry level requirement; this meets the CAEP requirement and the VCLA is ultimately required for educators to get licensed. However, there was a concern about continuing to require Praxis Core Math; it is no longer required by the state, but a nationally normed assessment is required for CAEP accreditation. A closer look at state requirements, accreditation requirements and the needs of our students continues; our involvement with legislative action takes on greater urgency; our priorities change from simple, inwardly focused examination to a greater national conversation that could shape the future of the profession. These important issues have catalyzed our relationships across Virginia Public Universities.

Socially, the zeitgeist of the Commonwealth has increasingly rotated towards greater awareness and investigation into cultural competence, understanding equity and improving our educators' dispositions around teaching all learners. In response to incidents in recent years around cultural disagreements (for example, how to intervene when a student wears clothing displaying potentially offensive messages) has led our EPP to implement a new process to report incidents in field placements. We are partnering with schools more directly when issues arise. To prepare our students better, we are developing the cultural competence/ cultural relevance lens in mentorship training/curriculum for mentors working with student teachers and beginning, new teachers. Addressing the cultural competence of our cooperating teachers is being achieved in part through training modules for P-12 professionals involved with candidates' early field placements.

To meet the needs of our increasingly diverse P-12 population with greater intention, the EPP is seeking to diversify the pipeline by reaching out to low SES and predominately African American and minority communities.

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

1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
3.2 Sets selective admission requirements
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
3.4 Creates and monitors candidate progress
3.5 Candidate positive impacts on P-12 students
3.6 Candidates understand the expectation of the profession
4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys
4.3 Employer satisfaction
4.4 Completer satisfaction
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures
5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used
5.4 Measures of completer impact are analyzed, shared and used in decision-making
5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation

A.1.1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.2 Professional Responsibilities
A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
A.3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.3.4 Selection at Completion
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
A.5.1 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.2 Quality and Strategic Evaluation
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement
A.5.4 Continuous Improvement
A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

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

Position: Assistant Dean for Accreditation, Assessment, and Accountability

Phone: 5405683171

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 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**