2020 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 EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditationâ€"applies to CAEP eligible EPPs] Please provide a link to your webpage that demonstrates accurate representation of your Initial Licensure and/or Advanced Level programs as reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC).

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2018-2019 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure[1]	295
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]	93

Total number of program completers 388

---

[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 2018-2019 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

AA to BIS Early Childhood program (started 2018) -- fully online
VA legislation changed in 2018-19 permitting Education Majors; EPP added 5 new Undergraduate Ed Majors -- Elementary Ed, Secondary Ed, Inclusive Early Childhood Ed, Special Ed, and Middle Ed (these 5 majors lead to 16 licenses: Elementar P-6, Early P-3, Middle Ed 6-8 (4 areas Science, History/Social Sci, Math, Eng), SPED General Curriculum K-12, SPED Adapted Curriculum K-12, Early Childhood Special Ed (age 0-8), Biology 6-12, Chemistry 6-12, Earth Sci 6-12, Physics 6-12

Mathematics 6-12, English 6-12 and Social Studies 6-12.

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: Followup data for initial and advanced programs; biennial measures; 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	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐
Advanced-Level Programs	▓	▓	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐

2

Link: https://www.jmu.edu/oir/issues.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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Advanced-Level Programs	▓	▓	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

3

Link: https://www.jmu.edu/oir/degrees-conferred.shtml

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
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?*

Having recently gone through our CAEP accreditation reporting (2017-18) and visit (fall 2018) our EPP has established strong and regular habits of reviewing and acting upon our outcome measures, including the CAEP EPP annual reporting measures. Data review is conducted in a variety of ways. First, the EPP's Professional Education Coordinating Council meets monthly. This group includes representatives from each licensure program at the university as well as from local school districts. Second, the EPP is part of a consortium of seven partner P-12 public school districts and four area EPPs (all CAEP accredited). At these meetings, data trends, alignment to state and professional standards, and ongoing concerns are discussed. This group, the MidValley Consortium, meets 5-6 times per year and includes representation from all affiliated institutions.

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. We are in the process of having faculty volunteers rotate through taking Praxis Subject assessments in order to gather insight about whether the programs adequately address the competencies covered in the subject assessments. 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.

An ongoing focus of our EPP as it is poised within the state landscape is improving access to our programs for all learners, especially considering financial and emotional barriers posed by fees and entry requirements. As is the case nationally, Virginia faces a severe teacher shortage and retention in the field for longer than three years. By allowing greater access to the profession we hope to begin ameliorating the dearth of qualified licensed P-12 educators. By improving first-time pass rates, we then minimize one of the expenses associated with entering the profession.

By making program changes, we are now requiring graduates of two of our CAEP Advanced programs (Reading Specialist and Educational Leadership) to complete all licensure assessments prior to graduation. This will improve our Virginia Biennial Measures completion rates as calculated for that report.

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.

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, in spring 2020. The VEAC pilot project included approximately 13 EPPs across Virginia, both public and private. The revised forms and associated data will be presented and discussed in the 2021 CAEP Annual Report.

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?

The EPP went through CAEP accreditation recently, having finished a visit in the Fall of 2018. We were pleased with the overall outcome of the visit; the EPP was accredited with no Areas for Improvement or Stipulations. Despite that positive outcome, we know that we have areas that can be improved upon, especially in light of recent changes in our state and at our institution. For example, the EPP is streamlining and centralizing to a greater degree.

One year ago (Spring 2019) the EPP worked diligently in response to a Commonwealth of Virginia legislative change. Virginia brought back the option of offering education majors, allowing for a candidate to become a licensed educator at the end of a four-year program (Bachelor's degree). Prior to that in Virginia, a minor in teacher education was only option, and for students in Special, Elementary, Early Childhood and Middle Education programs, a major in Interdisciplinary Liberal Studies was required along with the minor in the respective education program.

The EPP developed five education majors in Spring 2019: Elementary, Middle, Secondary, Special and Inclusive Early Childhood; all five were approved by the State Council for Higher Education in Virginia. Students started in each of these programs in Fall 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.

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. These findings will be reported in 2021.

Additionally, our EPP is under new leadership now, following the retirement of a long-serving dean and turnover of much of the administration. This is leading to some streamlining of offerings. 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, is under development; the first students will begin in Fall 2020.

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
1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
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
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
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.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
A.2.2 Clinical Experiences
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
x.1 Diversity

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 2020 EPP Annual Report.*

☑ **I am authorized to complete this report.**

Report Preparer's Information

Name:	Amy D. Thelk
Position:	Assistant 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**