## Employer Teacher Performance Data of JMU Graduates 2013-14

## Methodology

During summer 2014, the following letter was developed and sent:

Dear [name of HR director/LEA contact],

Thank you so much for your willingness to assist our teacher education programs in their program improvement initiatives and our accreditation processes. As we discussed, we are being asked by our accrediting agency, CAEP, (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) to gather feedback from employers on our graduates' performance, specifically the impact our graduates have on the learning of students in their classrooms. This information will be aggregated and used for reporting purposes and will be disaggregated and shared with our different teacher licensure programs to provide timely and valuable feedback to our programs for program review and improvement.

We are asking if you could annually, in the summer, provide the results of JMU graduates' teacher performance evaluations; specifically, the numbers of JMU alums and corresponding percentages who scored at the different evaluation levels on each of the 7 standards used in the teacher evaluation process. In order to provide data for program improvement purposes, it would be most useful if you could also provide us with the same information disaggregated by licensure areas (early childhood, elementary, special education, ESL, foreign language, secondary education, middle grades, PE, art, music, dance and theater). We are mindful of privacy and Virginia regulations, so in cases where the numbers are too small (5 or fewer) to ensure anonymity at the licensure level we would certainly understand if those scores are included only in the school system aggregate or, if they are included, that you have shared with the teachers involved the reasons for our request and have received permission from them to share the pertinent data.

It takes a village to raise a child and it takes a community to prepare a teacher. Thank you and all your teachers and administrators for being part of our community. We look forward to working with you both now and in the future.

#### Results

Staunton City Schools (n=5)		
Contact – Jon Venn		
VA Teacher Performance Standard	Rating	Notes
1 – Professional Knowledge	4 Proficient, 1 Exceeds	Did not
	Expectations	provide data
2 – Instructional Planning	4 Proficient, 1 Developing/ Needs	by licensure
	Improvement	area due to
3 – Instructional Delivery	5 Proficient	small <i>n</i> .

# 13-14 Employer Teacher Performance Data Aligns with CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3

4 – Assessment of and for Student	4 Proficient, 1 Developing/ Needs	
Learning	Improvement	
5 – Learning Environment	4 Proficient, 1 Exceeds	
	Expectations	
6 Professionalism	3 Proficient, 2 Exceeds	
	Expectations	
7 – Student Academic Progress	5 Proficient	
Summative	5 Proficient	

Rockingham County Schools		
Contact: Michelle Judd		
VA Teacher Performance Standard	Rating	Notes
1 – Professional Knowledge	7 Proficient	Given that there
2 – Instructional Planning	6 Proficient, 1 Developing/ Needs	was not enough
	Improvement	data to be reported
3 – Instructional Delivery	5 Proficient, 2 Developing/ Needs	at the program
	Improvement	level for most
4 – Assessment of and for Student	7 Proficient	licensure areas,
Learning		data below reflect
5 – Learning Environment	7 Proficient	only that of
6 Professionalism	7 Proficient	Elementary
7 – Student Academic Progress	6 Proficient, 1 Developing/ Needs	Education PreK-6
_	Improvement	licensed teachers.

**Harrisonburg City Schools** n=6 (there are 119 JMU grads employed in the district; 22% of entire teacher workforce)

## Contact – Andrew Ansorian

The Division-wide overall performance rating was: 3.12 (Proficient is 2.5 to 3.4). The 6 JMU grad average was 2.98.

Obviously, the sample size is too small to draw any conclusions. However, after we completed over 650 observations this year, the performance areas that stood out as hot spots and areas that "needed improvement" were: Planning 11%, Delivery 12% and Assessment 8%