

2020 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID: 18015

Institution: Liberty University

Unit: School of Education

AACTE SID: 15407

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 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 1.1.2 EPP characteristics | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 1.1.3 Program listings | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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).

NCATE page: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/ncate-accreditation/> Direct link to Programs Reviewed by NCATE: https://www.liberty.edu/education/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2020/04/CAEP_SOE-Comprehensive-List-of-Degree-Programs.pdf

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 licensure¹

443

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

244

Total number of program completers 687

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

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.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: Based upon our recent employer survey (47% response rate), program completers received a 5.6 out of 6 from employers on their preparation for assigned responsibilities when working with P-12 students.

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: Based upon our recent employer survey (47% response rate), employers ranked our program completers with a 5.3 out of 6 on classroom management, 5.5 out of 6 on content knowledge, 5.4 out of 6 on instructional practice, and 5.6 out of 6 on professional responsibility as indicators of teaching effectiveness in the field.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Based upon recent alumni (13% response rate) and employer (47% response rate) surveys from graduates in both our initial and advanced licensure programs, 50% of our program completers reported their Liberty University degree resulted in a raise or promotion. Employers reported a 5.5

Description of data accessible via link: out of 6 on their satisfaction of our program completers' employment retention. Employers reported a 5.6 out of 6 on their likelihood of contacting Liberty University's School of Education for hiring needs. Employers reported a 5.5 out of 6 on recommending completers for employment milestones, such as promotions. Employers reported a 5.6 out of 6 on our advanced program completers' (School Counseling, Reading Specialist, Math Specialist, Administration and Supervision) proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their field.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: Based upon a recent alumni survey (13% response rate) of graduates in both our initial and advanced licensure programs, 95% of our program completers agreed that their education program was relevant to their responsibilities as an educator. 89% of our program completers agreed their education program was effective in preparing them for their responsibilities as an educator.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: Based upon institutional data, enrollment rates for candidates in the EPP licensure programs are as follows: 2017-2018 enrollment at 462 (initial) and 353 (advanced), 2018-2019 enrollment at 622 (initial) and 488 (advanced). The graduate/completer rates are as follows: 2017-2018 graduate/completer at 509 (initial) and 361 (advanced), 2018-2019 graduate/completer at 443 (initial) and 244 (advanced).

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

6

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: All Liberty University program completers are eligible for a Virginia state licensure (initial and advanced). Program completers seeking initial licensure are required to pass several exams and complete state-mandated requirements which include the following: Praxis Core Math, Praxis Subject Assessment, RVE (Reading for Virginia Educators), and VCLA (Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment). Initial licensure candidates must also complete the following state-mandated requirements: First Aid/CPR/AED, Dyslexia, Child Abuse and Neglect, VA State and Local Civic Education Module, and Industry Certification Credential Program. Completers seeking advanced licensure are required to pass specific exams which may include the following exams: Praxis Subject Assessment, RVE (Reading for Virginia Educators), SLLA (School Leaders Licensure Assessment), and Professional School Counselor test. A total of 397 licensure applications were processed in over 36 states and 3 countries outside of the US.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

7

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: Based upon a recent alumni survey (13% response rate) of graduates in both the initial and advanced licensure programs, 94% of our program completers stated their current position was related to their education degree received from Liberty University.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8

Link: <https://www.liberty.edu/education/teacher-licensure/caep-annual-reporting/>

Description of data accessible via link: Based upon institutional data and information from the U.S. Department of Education, the national FY 2016 average for student loan default rates is 10.1%. Liberty University School of Education program completers (both initial and advanced licensure) student loan default rate is 3.87%. Initial licensure completers is 3.63% and advanced licensure completers is 4.72%. Additional consumer information on Liberty University can be found on the link provided above.

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Advanced-Level Programs | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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?

INTRODUCTION

Data on the links above are based on the 2018-19 academic year, with the exception of Title II, which includes the past three years. Links at the bottom of the webpage provide access to the annual measures from 2018 and 2019 allowing for a three year trend analysis. In comparing the 2020 Annual Report with the 2018 and 2019 Annual Reports, some change in response rates and completer numbers were observed. However, other scores on impact/outcome measures remained consistent. This information provides evidence that completers have a positive impact on P-12 learners, and both completers and employers are satisfied with the preparation provided in initial and advanced programs. The Annual Reporting Measures are available for all interested parties to review on the EPP website. They are also shared yearly with the Community and Global Advisory Councils. Additionally, the Annual Reporting Measures are linked to the SOE Partners website.

IMPACT MEASURES

1. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development: As the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) does not provide P-12 impact measures, such as student-growth percentiles, student learning and development objectives, or completers' success in effectively applying knowledge, skills and dispositions, the EPP uses results of the SOE Employer Satisfaction Survey for Measure #1. The results indicate employers feel completers are well prepared for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students. In the 2019 annual report, employers rated completers at 5.5 out of 6. This year, employers rated completers at 5.6 out of 6. There is a steady trend on this measure. In addition to the survey mentioned above, the EPP collected information on completers' impact on P-12 learning through the SOE Impact Study. This study was piloted in 2017-2018 with three participants and was fully launched in

2018-2019. While there was initially high interest in participation in the study, only 13 individuals from the elementary and special education programs completed parts of the study with only 8 persevering in all required tasks despite stipends being offered. In regards to impact on P-12 learning, participants completed the student achievement goal setting activity (VDOE Teacher Performance & Evaluation, Standard 7) and an assessment task similar to edTPA Task 3. As not all programs were represented in the study, the results were not included in the annual reporting measures. Revisions have been made to the requirements of the Impact Study with plans to recruit participants from all initial licensure programs.

2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: As mentioned, VDOE does not provide teacher evaluation information to EPPs. Thus, the EPP uses results from the SOE Employer Satisfaction Survey as evidence of Measure #2. The results indicate employers feel completers demonstrate teaching effectiveness. In the area of classroom management, employers ranked completers at 5.3 out of 6 this year and 5.5 out of 6 last year. In the area of content knowledge, employers rated completers at 5.5 out of 6 this year and 5.7 last year. For instructional practice, employers rated completers at 5.4 out of 6 this year and 5.6 last year. For professional responsibility, employers rated completers at 5.6 out of 6 this year and 5.7 last year. While each score slightly dropped, the differences are not significant. Employers continue to rate completer teaching effectiveness as high. The SOE Impact Study also collects data in regards to Measure 2. Participants in the study collect student survey data. The surveys teacher effectiveness in the classroom. While there were only survey responses from 13 participants in two programs, the overwhelming majority of teachers (n=12) were rated as proficient or exemplary by their students. As previously mentioned, plans are in place to expand the SOE Impact Study to include participants from each initial licensure program.

3. Satisfaction of Employers and Employment Milestones: The EPP utilizes the results from the SOE Employer Satisfaction Survey as the main evidence for Measure #3. The survey had a 47% response rate which is a significant increase from the 2019 report with a response rate of 25%. Launching the survey at two different times during the year instead of once may have positively impacted the response rate. Even with the increase in response rate, the scores are relatively the same this year when compared with the scores on the 2019 report. Employers' satisfaction with completers' employment retention rose from 5.4 to 5.5 on a 6 point scale. Employers' likelihood of contacting the EPP for hiring needs rose from 5.4 to 5.6. Employers' satisfaction with advanced program completers dropped slightly from 5.7 to 5.6. The trend noted here is employers are very satisfied with completers. Employers rated their likelihood of recommending completers for employment milestones as 5.5 out of 6 for two consecutive years. The university Alumni Survey asks completers to self-report employment milestones. 50% of alumni reported their degree resulted in a raise or promotion. This is an increase from last year where only 43% reported employment milestones as a result of their degree. The EPP is very pleased with the increased response rate on the employer survey. For the past two years, the EPP also utilized the Skyfactor Teacher Education Employer Assessment for initial program completers. The response rate for employers was 33%, but it only represented 8 employers. For this reason, the results were not included in the annual measures. However, employer satisfaction on this survey is comparable to the results of the SOE Employer Satisfaction Survey. For example, employers rated their satisfaction with the performance of recent completers as 6.25 on a 7 point scale with 7 being extremely satisfied.

4. Satisfaction of Completers: The EPP utilizes the results from the Alumni Survey as the main source of data for Measure #4. The survey is sent to both initial and advanced completers. The survey had a 13% response rate, a drop from last year's response rate of 23%. It is to be noted that response rates from alumni in all programs across the institution were lower on this year's Alumni Survey. Despite the drop in response rate, the scores are relatively stable. 95% of completers agreed their program was relevant to their responsibilities. This is up from 94% in the previous report. 89% of completers agreed their program was effective. This was down slightly from the previous report at 91%. The EPP also utilized the Skyfactor Teacher Education Alumni Assessment for initial program completers. However, there was only a 6% response rate for two consecutive years. Scores on this assessment are solid with the EPP scoring above external benchmarks. For example, alumni rated the overall program effectiveness at 6.05 on a 7.0 scale. This instrument allows the EPP to select 6 comparable institutions for benchmarking. On this same question, the mean score of the benchmark group was 5.90. The mean score for all institutions utilizing the survey was 5.86. On another question related to alumni overall satisfaction with the program, the EPP had a score of 6.11 out of 7.0. The benchmark mean score was 6.08. The mean score of all institutions was 5.99. While the response rate is low, these examples provide evidence of comparison benchmarks. As neither of the surveys above met the CAEP benchmark of a 20% response rate, the Accreditation Team continues to pursue other options for collecting data on alumni satisfaction. A collaborative group of institutions across the state has been formed to develop uniform survey instruments. The EPP is a part of this initiative and plans to participate in the pilot next year. Some benefits of the new survey are fewer questions, benchmarking with other state EPPs, and no cost. Funds currently used for Skyfactor may be repurposed for incentives to boost response rates.

OUTCOME MEASURES

5. Graduation Rates: In comparing the data from 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, two trends emerge. First, the number of enrolled candidates increased in both initial and advanced programs. Second, the number of completers dropped in both programs. Despite the differences noted here, there are no emerging trends in the numbers when comparing the results with the 2016-2017 data. Enrollment and completer numbers fluctuate from year to year.

6. Ability of Completers to Meet Licensing Requirements/Title II: The number of licensure applications processed dropped from 460 last year to 397 this year. The EPP continues to recommend hundreds of candidates each year for licensure in over 30 states.

7. Ability of Completers to be Hired: The EPP utilizes results from the Alumni Survey as the main source of data for Measure #7. 94% of program completers indicated their current position is related to the degree received from the EPP. This is an increase from last year's score of 86%. Data from the Skyfactor alumni survey shows only 11% of recent completers have not yet found employment in education.

8. Student Loan Default Rates: An analysis of student loan default rates shows an increase in the percentage of loan default from the 2018 and 2019 annual reports to this report. The default rate for this report was 3.87% for all licensure programs. The EPP reported a default rate of 0.008% in 2019 and a default rate of 1% in 2018. Even with the increase this year, the default rate is still far below the national average of 10.1%. The wide gap between the student loan default rates of the EPP and the national average is viewed as an indication of the success of the institution's preparation programs and the success of completers to obtain jobs and remain employed.

CONCLUSION

The findings presented above demonstrate the EPP's strong, consistent performance on the eight Annual Reporting Measures.

While numbers shift slightly from year to year, the data from the past three years shows little change.

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.

NCATE: Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last CAEP review:

1. The unit lacks adequate resources to consistently support an online program. (ITP) (ADV)

In the previous annual report, the EPP shared that its online organizational structure was both successful and sustainable. This continues to remain true during the 2018-2019 academic year. The online chairs, instructional mentors (IMs), subject matter experts (SMEs), faculty support coordinators, online faculty, and deans are functioning in an organized and efficient manner to fully support the robust online programs at the initial and advanced licensure levels.

There has been a significant change at the university level which further enables the EPP to ensure adequate resources are available to support online programs. In the spring semester of 2019, the university announced the appointment of an Online Provost and Online Vice Provost to provide specific administrative and leadership support for all online programs. This appointment confirms the university's commitment to guaranteeing all online programs have the resources needed to function effectively and efficiently. It is anticipated that additional positive changes will be forthcoming as the EPP, and the university as a whole, adapt to the new senior level administrative structure with both a Provost and Online Provost.

An internal dashboard that was implemented in 2017-2018 continues to enable the online administration to monitor and support faculty and student success in online courses. Since that time, additional online resources have been developed to include the Faculty Resource Center Homepage. This online resource center was specifically designed to be both a repository and a launching point for resources and training which are relevant for online faculty. Another exciting resource that was recently launched is the Subject Matter Expert (SME) Resource Center. It was designed to be both a living repository and launching point for relevant forms, reports, resources and training for course Subject Matter Experts. There is a comprehensive repository of dashboards that address faculty compliance such as the posting of course announcements, timely grading of assignments, regular course check-in, and careful monitoring of student attendance. Additionally, the Student Success Dashboard provides benchmark scores for undergraduate and graduate programs that can be used by administration and faculty to compare student success across sections of the same course, across courses, and across programs. The availability of this data and the ability to triangulate data allows faculty and administration to make informed decisions regarding both the student and faculty success, professional development training, resources and future initiatives.

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?

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the 2018-2019 academic year, the Accreditation Team met on a weekly basis to monitor the EPP's compliance with CAEP standards and to prepare for the 2022 CAEP Site Visit. The following sections highlight the key initiatives for the 2018-2019 year: formation of the quality assurance (QAS) model, development of the suite of measures, compliance with updated state regulations, and the creation of new PLOs.

QAS MODEL [Standards 5.1, A.5.1, 5.3, A.5.3, 5.4, A.5.4, 5.5, A.5.5]

Throughout the 2018-2019 academic year, the EPP has continued to develop its quality assurance system (QAS) and articulate the operation and implementation of the system. At the conclusion of the year during the faculty retreat, the EPP launched the new QAS model. The model is cyclical in nature and consists of standards assessments, data analysis, annual reports, and evidence-based action plans. This cycle of continuous improvement is further defined by semester events to monitor progress such as faculty in-service days focused on accreditation, standard committee meetings, assessment and accreditation semester retreats, and advisory council meetings. The QAS model will guide the EPP in its preparation for the CAEP Site Visit in 2022. After the model was launched, the faculty were asked to indicate on which CAEP standard committee they would like to serve. Faculty were divided into five committees and a leader of each standard committee was appointed. Over the summer of 2019, the faculty began identifying areas related to their standard in need of improvement. Each committee began to develop a plan related to their standard or to a CAEP cross-cutting theme. The committee meetings and the plan development will continue into the 2019-2020 academic year. Also for next year, online faculty and student representatives will be invited to join the CAEP standard committees. In addition, the drafted plans will be shared with faculty and administration along with an anticipated timeline for completing identified action items. The plans will bring the EPP into further compliance with CAEP standards and cross-cutting themes.

SUITE OF MEASURES [Standards 1.4, 1.5, A.1.1, 3.3, A.3.4, 5.1, A.5.1, 5.2, A.5.2]

During the 2018-2019 academic year, the EPP's Accreditation Team, continued to identify and refine its suite of measures to effectively tell its story. The Accreditation Team mapped out evidence for each standard. The evidences ranged from assessment data, survey data, and report data. While some of the evidences are proprietary instruments, others are EPP-created. For the EPP-created instruments, the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments was consulted to ensure assessments and surveys met the established criteria. After the formation of the CAEP standard committees, each committee was given a list of the instruments for which the committee will hold oversight. In the fall of 2019, the standard committees will review their assigned instruments and write descriptions of the validity and reliability of each instrument.

One of the EPP-created instruments which was developed during the 2018-2019 academic year was the Advanced Internship Assessment (AIA). The AIA assesses advanced candidates during the final internship. It uses a 3 point scale and is completed by the onsite mentor. As the AIA is aligned with the standards of the profession, there is an AIA for each of the four advanced programs (reading specialist, math specialist, administration & supervision, and school counseling). The instruments were developed by the program director and then reviewed by an expert panel to ensure compliance with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments and to verify alignment with CAEP standards as well as other national standards such as the Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE), the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), and the Common Core College and Career Readiness Standards (CCR). During the summer of 2019, the instruments were validated using the Lawshe's Method. Surveys were sent to P-12 partner to determine the relevancy of the rubric indicators. Indicators with an 80% agreement on relevancy were included in the instrument. Content Validity Ratio (CVR) scores were also calculated for each rubric indicator and the scores were evaluated. The instruments will be piloted in the Fall 2019 semester. Future plans in regards to the AIA include: a) developing a scorer training video for the onsite mentors who assess candidates with the AIA to ensure data reliability and b) creating a Pre-AIA instrument which can be used in field experiences prior to the final internship for advanced programs.

Another new instrument which developed at the end of the 2019 spring semester was the SCRIP Dispositions & Diversity Assessment for initial and advanced programs. The instrument was developed from the EPP's existing dispositional statement SCRIP which stands for Social Responsibility, Commitment, Reflective Practice, Integrity, and Professionalism. The instrument was aligned with relevant standards such as CAEP, InTASC, ISTE, MCEE, and CRC. This instrument was piloted in the summer of 2019 and sent to P-12 partners for validation. As described above, the Lawshe's Method was used to determine content validity. The instrument will be launched in the Fall 2019 semester. For the initial programs, the SCRIP Dispositions & Diversity Assessment will be used in student teaching along with the CPAST instrument. It will be scored by the host teacher, university supervisor, and the candidate. For advanced programs, the SCRIP Dispositions & Diversity Assessment will be used in the final internship with the AIA instrument. It will be scored by the onsite mentor. For early field experiences, the SCRIP instrument will be modified to a Pre-SCRIP format which uses a two point scale instead of a three point scale. The EPP plans to launch the Pre-SCRIP with the Pre-CPAST in Fall 2019 and with the Pre-AIA in Fall 2020. The EPP also plans to develop a scorer training video for the SCRIP Dispositions & Diversity Assessment in the near future.

At the conclusion of 2018-2019, the EPP had an extensive suite of measures in place to meet each of the CAEP standards. The suite of measures comply with the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-created assessments. Fall 2019 will begin the EPP's first of three cycles of semester data for the Self-Study Report (SSR). Annual data cycles for the SSR include 2017-2018; 2018-2019; and 2019-2020. Each spring and each fall, the EPP holds the Global Advisory Council meeting and the Community Advisory Council meeting. These meetings provide opportunities for the EPP to collaborate with partners about the suite of measures and the resulting data cycles.

STATE REGULATIONS FOR APPROVED PROGRAMS [Standards 1.3, A.1.2]

In Spring 2019, the VDOE launched new regulations for EPPs offering approved programs. EPPs were required to submit matrices showing compliance with each of the program regulations. The new requirements initiated much discussion and collaboration at the program level to ensure that all of the state regulations were covered through courses in the program. While most requirements were already covered in existing courses, some courses needed to adapt learning outcomes, text resources, and course assignments to further align with the regulations. To a lesser scale, a few courses needed to cover competencies which were not previously covered leading to a wider-scale course revision. The EPP was able to submit compliance with the new state requirements for the elementary, middle grades, and special education initial licensure programs by the end of the spring 2019 semester. Next year, the EPP will focus on the secondary initial licensure programs and the advanced programs.

NEW PLOs [Standard 1.1]

As the programs were reviewed to comply with the new state regulations, the EPP decided to revise the program learning outcomes (PLOs) to better align with state requirements as well as CAEP standards. Deans, chairs, and faculty collaborated to create five succinct statements to guide the learning outcomes of the initial licensure programs. The PLOs align with the four InTASC domains and CAEP Standard 1. The PLOs for advanced licensure programs will be revised next year.

CONCLUSION

The EPP's continuous improvement efforts in 2018-2019 focused on preparing the EPP for writing the CAEP self-study and demonstrating compliance with new state regulations. With the QAS model and the suite of measures in place, the EPP is positioned to review and analyze data from a variety of instruments. The suite of measures will yield a wealth of data to determine the success of the initial and advanced licensure programs and to identify areas in need of improvement.

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.
1.5 Model and apply technology standards
3.3 Monitors attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability
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.3.4 Selection at Completion
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

The EPP would be willing to share about any of its accreditation initiatives.

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

☐ No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

INTRODUCTION

The EPP has an Accreditation Team, which met twice a week during the 2018-2019 year to guide the EPP through the CAEP accreditation process. The Accreditation Team is comprised of the dean emeritus, two associate deans, the accreditation director, and the assessment director. The dean attends meetings when possible. The Accreditation Team regularly reviewed the CAEP handbooks for initial and advanced programs to ensure the EPP is able to fully meet the standards and policies of the accrediting agency. Members of the Accreditation Team attended the fall and spring CAEP Conferences to receive the latest CAEP updates and changes.

The Accreditation Team conducted an internal audit in the spring of 2019 to determine not only standard compliance but also potential gap areas in the transition from the NCATE legacy standard to the CAEP standards. Based on the audit, the EPP has identified one new gap area and three continuing gap areas. The new gap area is stakeholder/partner involvement [Standards 2.1, A.2.1, 2.2, 5.5, A5.5]. The three continuing gap areas are the recruitment plan [Standards 3.1/A.3.1], the satisfaction of employers and completers [Standards 4.3, 4.4, A.4.1, A.4.2], and the impact of candidates on P-12 students [Standards 4.1, 4.2]. Descriptions of the gap areas are provided below.

STAKEHOLDER/PARTNER INVOLVEMENT [Standards 2.1, A.2.1, 2.2, 5.5, A5.5]

The EPP has strong stakeholder/partner involvement with the local school districts in the areas surrounding the EPP. The EPP continues to brainstorm ways to establish parallel partnerships with partners in other states and countries where initial and advanced candidates may complete early field experiences, student teaching, or the internship. The Global Advisory Council (GAC) was created in the previous academic year and is meeting virtually each semester. The EPP would like to move from an information dissemination meeting model to a more collaborative format. How to do this in a virtual format is still not completely understood. In addition to engaging global partners in discussions about program evaluation, the EPP would like to develop partnerships which are co-constructed and mutually beneficial. While this has been done with the local school districts, global partners may only host a student teacher or intern once or twice making the co-constructed partnerships or mutually beneficial partnerships challenging for the ever-evolving pool of global partners.

RECRUITMENT PLAN [Standards 3.1/A.3.1]

The Recruitment Plan was identified as a gap area in the 2017-2018 academic year. It continues to be an area of concern for the EPP. At the end of 2018-2019 year, the EPP formed Standard Committees to expand the CAEP process beyond the Accreditation Team to involve all residential faculty. The committee for Standard Three has been charged with developing the Recruitment Plan. In addition, one member of the committee has been provided special release to commit focused attention to the creation of the plan. Development of the Recruitment and Retention Plan began in the summer of 2019 and will continue into the 2019-2020 academic year.

SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYERS AND COMPLETERS [Standards 4.3, 4.4, A.4.1, A.4.2]

Collecting adequate response rates to demonstrate the satisfaction of employers and completers has been a challenge for the EPP.

for the past few years. The survey response rates continued to fluctuate as noted in the data provided in Section 4.

In this year's data, the response rates from the SOE Employer Satisfaction Survey surpassed the response rates of the two previous years. This was largely due to a change in distribution format. The surveys were distributed in person on campus during two teacher recruitment events. While the survey has provided adequate data from the employers of initial licensure completers, the survey only has one question geared to the employers of advanced licensure completers. Additional data is needed to determine the satisfaction of employers of advanced program completers. The EPP is considering the use of focus groups for the supervisors of advanced program completers. Plans are being developed to launch focus groups for the spring of 2020.

While the response rates of employers rose this year, the response rates from completers dropped this year. The EPP's Alumni Survey had a 13% response rate from licensure completers. As mentioned in Section 4, the EPP also utilizes the Skyfactor Benchmarks Teacher Education Alumni Assessment. The response rate for this survey was 6%. Neither survey response rate meets the 20% CAEP response rate placing the EPP in jeopardy of not meeting CAEP 4.4 for initial completers or A.4.2 for advanced completers. The EPP is considering additional survey options to replace the Skyfactor instrument for initial licensure completers. However, a parallel instrument for advanced completers has not been discovered. As a result the EPP is considering holding focus groups in 2019-2020 to supplement survey data for advanced completers. Focus groups for initial completers are also being discussed as a way to enhance survey data with low response rates.

IMPACT ON P-12 STUDENTS [Standards 4.1, 4.2]

Since the 2018 CAEP Annual Report, the EPP has identified standard indicators 4.1 and 4.2 as potential gap areas. As state-provided impact data are not available in Virginia, the EPP has initiated an action research project to show program impact. The SOE Impact Study was developed to provide evidence for meeting indicators 4.1 and 4.2. In 2016-2017, the instruments were selected. In 2017-2018, faculty were recruited to lead project, and completers were invited to participate. In addition, a pilot study was conducted with 3 participants to help refine and improve the EPP's model for the study. In 2018-2019, fifty program completers across various initial programs initially agreed to participate in the SOE Impact Study, but that number dwindled. In actuality, only 13 completers from the elementary and special education programs completed some of the tasks in the study despite a stipend being offered for their participation. Only 8 completers finished all of the tasks in the study. As a result of this low number, the faculty leading the SOE Impact Study have proposed reducing the requirements of the study. Many first year teachers are overwhelmed with surviving their first year and have minimal extra time for participating in projects such as The Impact Study. The study will continue in the 2019-2020 academic year with modified data collection instruments.

CONCLUSION

With the transition to the CAEP standard from the NCATE legacy standards, there are several areas which the EPP has identified through internal audits as potential gap areas. The descriptions above describe the gaps and the EPP's plans to bridge the gaps prior the next accreditation visit. The EPP is fully committed to fully meeting all of the CAEP standards.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

- 2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 partnerships
- 2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators
- 3.1 Recruits and supports high-quality and diverse candidate pool
- 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
- 5.5 Relevant stakeholders are involved in program evaluation
- A.2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation
- A.3.1 Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs
- A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers
- A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers
- A.5.5 Continuous Improvement

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Principles, as applicable.

☒ Yes ☐ No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Stand

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: Dr. Stacey Bose

Position: Director of Accreditation

Phone: 4345827348

E-mail: slbose@liberty.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 completion 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**