**Section 4: Display of Annual Reporting Measures**

**1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)**

*In 2012, the VDOE established the Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers. There are seven standards included in the Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment Standards (VTPAS): (1) Professional Knowledge (2) Instructional Planning (3) Instructional Delivery (4) Assessment of and for Student Learning (5) Learning Environment (6) Professionalism (7) Student Academic Progress. Ratings on the VTPAS are based on a building administrator's review of multiple pieces of evidence provided by the teacher, including evidence of students' academic progress and classroom observations by one or more building administrators. We have asked a sample of our completers to share their VTPAS ratings, beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, in order to document our completer’s contribution to an expected level of student-learning growth (CAEP 4.1). VTPAS #7: Student Academic Progress directly relates to student-learning growth. All completers in the sample will also be asked to provide their SOL scores from the current year. SOL data will be compared across the grade level or subject in the school the completer teachers within the sample, as well as compared across the other schools in the division and to the state average. If the completer is not teaching a grade/subject which requires a SOL assessment, they are asked to provide summative assessment data, such as benchmark assessments, to document student-learning growth. All completers within the sample are also asked to provide information about their classroom dynamics, technology use, and how they used ongoing data and will continue to use the summative data to improve their instruction. Data will be analyzed across completers in the sample within the same endorsement area as well as all completers within the same program. (The first round of data collection is summer 2018 to allow for three cycles of data collection prior to a Fall 2021 site visit and January 2021 EPP anticipated report due date.)*

**2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)**

*In 2012, the VDOE established the Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers. There are seven standards included in the Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment Standards (VTPAS): (1) Professional Knowledge (2) Instructional Planning (3) Instructional Delivery (4) Assessment of and for Student Learning (5) Learning Environment (6) Professionalism (7) Student Academic Progress. Ratings on the VTPAS are based on a building administrator's review of multiple pieces of evidence provided by the teacher, including evidence of students' academic progress and classroom observations by one or more building administrators. We have asked a sample of our completers to share their VTPAS ratings, beginning with the 2017-2018 school year. This will provide data to demonstrate that our completers with the sample effectively apply the professional knowledge/ skills and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve (CAEP 4.2). Data will be analyzed to determine our completer’s effectiveness including areas of strength and growth within the sample. Data will be analyzed across completers in the sample within the same endorsement area as well as all completers within the same program. (The first round of data collection is summer 2018 to allow for three cycles of data collection prior to a Fall 2021 site visit and January 2021 EPP anticipated report due date.)*

**3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3/A.4.1)**

*In May/June of 2017, employers of completers from the 2015-2016 academic year (initial and advanced programs) were surveyed (to evaluate those who were nearing completion of at least their first full year post-completion). Total response rate across all programs was 32% (n=11). We were only able to send surveys to employers in cases where we knew where the completer was employed; 34 employers were sent survey links.*

*Summary of the data: Overall employer satisfaction is satisfactory or higher in all domains with the exception of “integrating technology” in two disaggregated areas (though this was rated as satisfactory in the overall/aggregate data). Those two subsets were among our post-baccalaureate teacher licensure completers (score of 2.75 with a target of 3) and among completers in the endorsement area of special education (2.67 with a target of 3). Low N’s are noted in both cases (PBTL N=4, Special Education N=2). The employer survey also asked employers to rate each assessed domain on a scale of importance to the teacher’s role; interestingly, the area of “integrating technology” was also rated as the least important of the skills among all other domains assessed.*

*EPP Response to the data: The EPP has made adjustments to undergraduate and graduate assessment courses to include additional components on the integration of instructional technology. Additionally, a new instructor has been hired to teach a graduate course on instructional technology. Furthermore, our initial meeting checklist for student teachers has been revised to include an instructional technology orientation component to their host classroom/school.*

*Employment Milestones (initial licensure only): In June of 2017, the EPP reached out to as many completers as possible who had completed in 2013-2014 and were now three years post-completion. Of 137 completers, we were able to contact 101; 73% of the ones we reached are still teaching after three years. By program, the percentage of those we were able to reach who are still teaching: MAT 83%, PBTL 67%, Undergraduate 73%. By endorsement, the percentage of those we were able to reach who are still teaching: Elementary PK-6 74%, Special Ed 69%, Middle School 70%, Secondary 73%.*

**4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4/A.4.2)**

*In May/June of 2017, completers from the 2015-2016 academic year (initial and advanced programs) were surveyed (to evaluate those who were nearing completion of at least their first full year post-completion). Total response rate across all programs was 28% (N=24). 87 surveys were sent.*

*Summary of the data: In the aggregate, completers perceived preparation of all areas to be satisfactory or higher; all areas exceeded the threshold rating of 3.0. The weakest area, though still satisfactory, was “integrating technology,” (score of 3.22) consistent with employer survey data.*

*EPP response to the data: The EPP has made adjustments to undergraduate and graduate assessment courses to include additional components on the integration of instructional technology. Additionally, a new instructor has been hired to teach a graduate course on instructional technology. Furthermore, our initial meeting checklist for student teachers has been revised to include an instructional technology orientation component to their host classroom/school.*

**5. Graduation Rates (initial and advanced levels)**

* *56%*

**6. Ability of completers to meeting licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)**

* *100% of the completers of our initial licensure programs obtain passing scores on the applicable Praxis II assessments (does not apply to Special Education)*
* *100% of the completers of our initial licensure programs obtain passing scores on Virginia Communication Literacy Assessment*
* *100% of the completers of our initial licensure programs obtain passing scores on the Reading for Virginia Educators Assessment (applies to Elementary Education and Special Education only)*

*Please see links on our Student Performance webpage to our 2017 Standards for Biennial Approval of Education Programs (2015-2017) and 2018 Title II Institutional and Program Report Card (2016-2017).*

**7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)**

* *All completers receive endorsement area preparation and are eligible to be hired upon completion.*

**8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)**

* *0%. We have no students in default.*

**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.**

*https://go.marybaldwin.edu/education/student-performance-data/*

**4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.**

A) 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?

*Over the course of the last three years, the EPP has worked as a collaborative team to develop a process for ongoing improvement that is data centered and that involves all teacher education faculty and staff, as well as external stakeholders. We have started a process of semester review of data, standard by standard to discuss trends, celebrations, and concerns. As part of this process, the faculty are able to generate ideas for curricular, programmatic or policy change that can improve our program.*

*The area of instructional technology seems to re-emerge as an area of relative weakness, though overall is seen as satisfactory. While we have put some changes in place in our curriculum to try and better prepare students, and we have also worked to embed some more instructional technology orientation activities into the student teaching onboarding process, as we talk with our student teachers and recent completers, they report some level of frustration with the variance of access that they have to related resources in schools. For example, we may prepare them to use particular hardware and software (ex. interactive whiteboards, Chromebooks, Google Classroom) and then they may find themselves in a placement that does not actually have any of these resources for them to use or practice with in the field due to limited finances/budget constraints. Students placed in lower grade levels or in special education settings sometimes report that these resources are often less utilized in their classrooms than they may be in other grades or classes. Anecdotal conversations with completers also suggest that as first year teachers, when they do have access, they are also nervous about using some of the more expensive equipment for fear of damage. As we improve our addressing of instructional technology in our curriculum, we will work to have some of these conversations with students and preemptively address some of their hesitations and fears.*

*Specific changes to address this area include changing our undergraduate assessment course from a 3 credit course to a 4 credit course and adding a significant component in instructional technology integration; adding a parallel component to the graduate level course equivalent (though not changing the credit hour value), hiring a new instructor for our advanced level instructional technology course, and adding an instructional technology classroom/school orientation component to our student teaching onboarding/initial meeting process.*

*Aside from the technology integration component, our EPP has also learned that we have struggled internally to find the most appropriate way to effectively assess completer effectiveness. Since we are in a state that does not provide access to the performance data of their students, we have struggled with developing the right process for this given the small size of our program and the limitations of having to ask completers to share information with us (understanding they may choose not to). This barrier is a tremendous one for our state. We have changed our mind a few times on how to best approach this, and have had conversations with other similarly-sized institutions in Virginia, and now have a plan to move forward with our first cycle of data collection (we will have three full cycles of data for our Fall 2021 CAEP onsite visit). Indeed, it has taken us quite some time to arrive at a plan that we feel is valid and reasonable, within the limitations of what we have access to.*

*We continue to monitor graduation and completion rates of our students, noting that the term “graduation” is not an appropriate measure for all of our students as many are seeking licensure, but not degrees and are therefore not “graduating.” These have been fairly consistent over time, as have our pass rates on state assessments.*

*Once all of the data for this current year (2017-2018, not the reporting year for this annual report) has been collected and recorded, and reviewed by our faculty, the data will be compiled into a video format with explanation where it will be made available to a variety of stakeholders (schools, school divisions, peer institutions, liberal arts faculty peers, etc). We will seek and welcome any comments and questions as we share this information and encourage any feedback. Our intent is to do this annually, each fall, with the previous year’s data. The EPP faculty will then review any outside comments and feedback, discuss, and take any related necessary action.*

**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?

*For this Annual Report, the EPP would like to highlight one program modification and one set of program changes made in the last year that are directly in response to our need for continuous improvement in addressing CAEP Standards.*

*First, as referenced several times in earlier sections of this report, our EPP noticed a need to address concerns related to student/completer integration of technology into lesson planning and delivery (and assessment).*

*Specific changes to address this area include (for the next academic year, 2017-2018) changing our undergraduate assessment course from a 3 credit course to a 4 credit course and adding a significant component in instructional technology integration; adding a parallel component to the graduate level course equivalent (though not changing the credit hour value), hiring a new instructor for our advanced level instructional technology course, and adding an instructional technology classroom/school orientation component to our student teaching onboarding/initial meeting process.*

*We will be tracking student performance in this area in terms of cumulative assessment on the student teaching final evaluation form, however, students will have ongoing instruction (more so than in previous years) in their preparation coursework (initial and advanced programs). In terms of completers, which is where we first noticed the concern, we will continue to track this data field through the completer and employer survey. The employer survey allows us to directly incorporate stakeholder feedback.*

*To secure additional outside input, following each academic year cycle, after data are reviewed by the EPP faculty, the data will be compiled into a video format with explanation where it will be made available to a variety of stakeholders (schools, school divisions, peer institutions, liberal arts faculty peers, etc). We will seek and welcome any comments and questions as we share this information and encourage any feedback. Our intent is to do this annually, each fall, with the previous year’s data. The EPP faculty will then review any outside comments and feedback, discuss, and take any related necessary action. This will allow us to glean any additional outside feedback on any domain, including this area.*

*While not a replacement for the data we are collecting, we will continue to have ongoing informal conversations with our students regarding their successes and barriers in this area.*

*The second area that the EPP would like to highlight is our development and implementation of an Ethics and Professionalism module. The faculty in the EPP determined that the current assessment instruments minimally assess these domains, but do not do so comprehensively enough in a way that we can proudly demonstrate that our completers confidently meet necessary standards in this area.*

*Using appropriate guiding documents (the 2011 Virginia Standards for the Professional Practice of Teachers, the Research Base for the Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers, and the NEA Code of Ethics of the Education Profession), the EPP developed a module based assessment draft.*

*The draft assessment document was sent to 36 subject matter experts for review to establish content validity using Lawshe’s Content Validity Ratio. Of the 36, 25 responded for a 69.4% response rate. Questions for the assessment were finalized based on the data and a pass score of 84% was set based on input from the subject matter experts.*

*Two pilot groups completed the assessment (one group of teacher education students and one group of first year teachers) to examine test-retest reliability. They completed an online version of the assessment and a paper version two weeks apart. 94% of the student group obtained the same pass/fail outcome. 100% of the teacher group obtained the same pass/fail outcome. It was determined that this exceeded the 80% standard for test-retest reliability.*

*This preparation work was initiated in 2016-2017 in response to the identified need, but the assessment will be implemented for 2017-2018 (this annual report is for 2016-2017). It is the response and preparation that we wish to highlight for this report.*

*The EPP continues to use data to shape its modifications and changes to any programs. We have an ongoing process to review data each semester with the EPP faculty each year, and with a wider audience on an annual basis. As we make any changes, we monitor data and adjust procedures, curricula, and policies as necessary.*