Section I - Completer
The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs) during the 2010-2011 academic year?

341

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2010-2011 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor’s, post-bachelor’s, master’s, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section II. Substantive Changes
Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. Changes in program delivery from traditional to distance learning programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.

   In 2010-11, the Educational Technology M.Ed. program all-online format was initiated.

2. Change in control of institution. Please indicate any changes in control or ownership of the institution such as a merger with another institution, separation from an institution, purchase of an institution, etc.

   No Change / Not Applicable

3. Increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals at off-campus sites and outside the United States.

   No Change / Not Applicable

4. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in budget

   No Change / Not Applicable

5. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in candidate enrollment

   No Change / Not Applicable

6. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in size of the full-time faculty

   No Change / Not Applicable

7. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in significant changes as the result of a natural disaster

   No Change / Not Applicable

8. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in delivery of a program in whole or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner

   No Change / Not Applicable

9. Addition or removal of a level of preparation(e.g., a master's degree).

   No Change / Not Applicable

Section III. Areas for Improvement
Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The English and physical education programs have not been recognized by their respective specialized professional associations. (ITP)
## Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. Graduate and employer surveys are not administered for all professional education programs.  
   - (ITP)  
   - (ADV)

2. Limited data are aggregated, summarized, and reported at the transition points/gates identified in the unit's assessment system.  
   - (ADV)

3. The unit is not testing its performance assessments for fairness, accuracy, and consistency.  
   - (ITP)  
   - (ADV)

## Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. Unit programs inconsistently address the knowledge and skills necessary to work effectively with culturally and linguistically diverse children.  
   - (ITP)  
   - (ADV)

2. Candidates enrolled in the unit represent limited cultural diversity.  
   - (ITP)  
   - (ADV)

3. The composition of the faculty represents limited cultural diversity.  
   - (ITP)  
   - (ADV)

### II.1 Summarize activities, assessments and outcomes toward correcting AFI(s) cited in the last Accreditation Action Report, if applicable.

All licensure programs have been reviewed and approved by the state. Programs in School Counseling, Speech Pathology, Dance, Theater, Music (initial and advanced) and Art (initial and advanced) have also been reviewed and approved through professional accrediting organizations. All other licensure programs have been approved through the NCATE-State of Virginia Partnership Agreement that went into effect January 2010 (January 2010-2016). This Agreement acknowledges that NCATE defers to the State’s review of the unit’s programs if the teacher education program standards or licensing standards and the State’s review processes are sufficiently similar to NCATE’s, as determined by the State Partnership Board (SPB). Included among the tenets of the Agreement is the fact that SPA review of programs in Virginia is optional. Institutions that elect not to submit program reports are reviewed using the state process outlined in the NCATE-Virginia state partnership protocol.

Graduate and employer survey data are being regularly collected. Graduates are surveyed the semester they are scheduled to graduate. For example, surveys of graduating candidates were conducted in December 2010 and May 2011. Three-year-out graduates (2008 graduates) were surveyed in summer 2011. A less-than-satisfactory response rate precluded us from reporting these findings in our recent NCATE institutional report. During summer 2011, principals at Virginia public schools were surveyed to provide feedback on graduates employed in their schools. Educational Technology and Educational Leadership worked on developing a survey for the employers of their graduates, as well as their graduates, in the 2010-11 academic year.

Advanced and other school professional programs have been refining their processes to include data collection at the transition points identified in the assessment system. During the 2010-11 academic year, a committee (which was formed in 2009-10) addressed assessment of advanced programs. The work of this group included identifying the core courses in which NBPTS competencies were addressed, and assessment tasks were identified to measure candidate achievement in these areas.

Fairness: Assessments are fair when they assess what has been taught. To ensure the fairness of its assessments, the unit has carefully aligned its curriculum with its candidate proficiencies, state licensure regulations, P-12 standards, and national professional standards. These alignments map courses in the curriculum where candidates have had the opportunity to learn and practice the material being assessed. The alignments with national professional standards are regularly reviewed and updated.

Fairness also means that candidates understand what is expected of them on the assessments. To that end, all courses clearly state the timing and structure of key assessments, how they are scored, and how they contribute toward program completion. This information is also included in such documents as program handbooks or other course materials. Students are informed about the nature and purpose of each assessment at the beginning of the course and/or through program advisors. For course based assessments, students have opportunities to revise and resubmit assignments after conferring with the course instructor about their work. Student privacy is of great importance to the unit. Scores are not publicly shared or visible to other students.

Accuracy: Construct validity is addressed through outcome alignment with the unit conceptual framework and program goals. Faculty use their experience, expertise and research to select best practices that would build competence in the intended outcomes through a convergence of perspectives, including PK-12 partners and higher education partner institutions, to produce highly defensible assessments. Assessment results are regularly reviewed in light of related external assessments such as grades, Praxis testing, GPAs, and program retention/completion. Assessments are developed by teams of departmental faculty.

Assessments are reviewed continually and adjustments are made based on the utility of collected data and any curricular changes since the last revision. The Assessment Director meets with faculty and department heads throughout the academic year.
to discuss assessments, alignment and results. Ongoing review of instruments ensures that best practices in assessment are being followed and that the most current content is being addressed.

Consistency: The unit measures the extent to which internal consistency and rater agreement are present once an assessment is in place and being administered. Several of the unit’s key assessments are scored by multiple raters. The unit provides appropriate training for raters, and rater agreement data are regularly collected and analyzed. For example, at the initial level, the unit’s Student Teaching Evaluation Form (ST-9) is scored by both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Both groups receive training during regularly scheduled support meetings, clinical faculty training or refresher sessions, or as part of web-based training modules.

We continue to participate in activities designed to recruit and retain candidates representing cultural diversity (e.g. Take a Look Day, Choices, CyberCity). Our initiatives to recruit diverse faculty have resulted in modest increases. Details on how we addressed the diversity of candidates and faculty in 2010-11 are integrated in our Institutional Report (submitted October 2011).

In 2010-11, the Unit developed two diversity competencies for initial and advanced candidates. All programs reviewed these competencies and took measures to ensure these competencies were addressed and assessed within the curriculum.

Section IV: Units with Regular/Continuous Improvement Accreditation Option

C.1. Summarize evidence indicating progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected by the unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Std. 1</th>
<th>Std. 2</th>
<th>Std. 3</th>
<th>Std. 4</th>
<th>Std. 5</th>
<th>Std. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The following are some of the highlights from our unit during 2010-11 that indicate progress toward target level on std 3.

•The Field Exp Ad Hoc Comte recommended piloting a capacity model of placement & implementing a focused supervision model on a broader scale during the 11-12 AY. Two small pilot progs were conducted fall 2010, in Waynesboro City and in Fairfax County, with middle ed faculty serving as the field exp supervisors. Feedback from the university supervisors (US), candidates, and school partners was gathered & used to revise this model. In spring 11, a cluster of candidates was again placed in Fairfax County with a single US. Concurrently, a modified cluster model for the middle and secondary ed program was also undertaken, utilizing the same placement for a 16-week practicum, & an 8-week subsequent student teaching placement. This model had been used in the past for some elementary ed and special ed field experiences. As reported by candidates, USs and cooperating teachers, this sustained model of placement had the benefit of socializing candidates to the school & classroom culture, and enabling them to “hit the ground running” during their student teaching placement.

•In reviewing Teacher Efficacy Survey results and gathering feedback on the pilots, school partners have shared that the advent of a statewide tool for evaluating teachers based on student performances may create a problem if veteran teachers do not want student teachers in their classrooms because the classroom teacher wants to maximize instructional efforts. This has led to wider discussions among all partners on how to best address these concerns while continuing to provide needed professional field experiences for our candidates. In collaboration with the School Partners Advisory Council, modification of the proposed cluster pilots to include a long-term capacity model is under discussion. This would mean that the Professional Education Unit and school partner representatives would jointly determine the number and placements of all levels of candidate field experiences throughout a system. School partners have expressed that having long-term projections of the number of candidates and the types of needed field and clinical experiences would be of great benefit and lead to more deliberate and planned placement processes. Implementation of such a changed process will be based on success of previous collaborative initiatives.

•School diversity data was updated to reflect changes in demographics to ensure candidates have a variety of field exps. Increased opportunities for partnerships with H’burg City Schools continued to be explored to provide candidates with access to this diverse school system.

•Conversations with school partners and unit members focused attention on the ST9, the tool used to assess candidate performance in the field. Discussions on the tool’s measurement of candidate growth over time suggest we need to examine the ST9 design & application.

C.2. Summarize data that demonstrate continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality in the area of content knowledge

Standardized test scores are one measure of content knowledge in initial programs. Passing Praxis I scores are required at admission. Passing Praxis II (P2) is a licensing requirement for most programs. As reflected in our Title II report, our 100% pass rate suggests that candidates possess the knowledge required to teach all students. For programs that don’t have it as a licensure requirement, passing P2 is a program requirement. Thus all completers have passed the P2.

Starting in 2010-11 our Unit has been dedicating time to discussing P2 pass rates, what patterns of scores tell us about how our students are prepared, and how students can be remediated.

P2 Pass Rates (attached) shows the number of candidates that didn’t pass on their first attempt over the last three years, including 2010-11. Candidates may take P2 multiple times, often during their undergraduate content coursework. Note that not passing the P2 may have different ramifications depending on what stage of the program the candidate is in and the precise nature of the difficulties. Remediation is individualized to candidates’ specific needs. Faculty work with candidates to provide advice, direction,
and individual tutoring, for example:
• Art Education candidates take a mock Praxis Test in ARED 400. Study guides are archived for candidates to use as resources.
• Dr. Purcell, Head of Middle, Secondary, and Mathematics Education (MSME), meets with candidates who have had sustained difficulty passing P2 to access their needs and provide guidance. For example, a candidate who had taken the Spanish P2 repeatedly (7 attempts) was encouraged at the end of 2010-11 to get more experience speaking Spanish. She went to live and work in Spain and has since successfully passed the P2. She plans to resume at JMU in Secondary Education during 2012. Thus all candidates seeking assistance with retaking Praxis II are afforded appropriate individual or group remediation.

MSME faculty addressed continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality in the area of content knowledge; faculty discussed three years’ worth of P2 subtest scores for 6 tests taken by students in MSME programs. They first reviewed subscale scores without student IDs and were asked to respond to prompts (see MSME P2 discussion comments, attached). Then they reviewed a dataset including IDs and were asked to respond to more prompts. Some key findings from the discussion included:
• some students who are poor performers in the program do well on P2 exam, and high program performers sometimes do poorly on P2
• faculty who teach in content area courses should review test data as well
• tests may not align with field
• initial non-passers tend to have problems with basic principles on the Middle School science test.

This discussion was successful in that it provided clear direction for that department regarding next steps. We will encourage other programs to follow suit in upcoming department retreats.

**Exhibits that support the narrative:**
- Praxis II rates of passing on first attempt
- Department use of data discussion results

Notes on C.2: Standard 1 will be the focus of the 2010-2011 Annual Report. Please submit sample data/evidence/exhibit(s) - no more than two - that demonstrate continuing to meet standard 1 related to content knowledge only. The sample can be from a single program but should be representative of the unit as whole. For selection of exhibits, please use NCATE’s Exhibit List provided as a guide.
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