

Unit Missions

TELR Mission Statement

Mission statement

The purpose of the Teacher Education Programs is to prepare highly qualified and confident teachers who will provide effective instruction that will positively impact the learning of a diverse student population. The Educational Leadership Program prepares educational leaders who can address the unique challenges of the Mississippi Delta region by providing the knowledge necessary to improve leadership effectiveness, teacher quality, and thus, student achievement.

Related Items

There are no related items.

Learning Outcomes

≡ BSE-ELE 01: LO Mastery of the appropriate content and skills.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate mastery of the appropriate content and skills.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Institutional reports and individual score reports for the Praxis II Subject Area Test in Elementary Education and the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) were the assessment tools used. In addition, all Praxis attempts have been captured in Banner to provide a more detailed analysis of first-time pass rates.
2. These assessments are norm-referenced measures, the passage of which is required to receive a teaching license in Mississippi. The assessments are taken by all candidates prior to admission to the teaching internship.
3. The assessment results were analyzed using Task Stream reports. Data results were compared with those of past years to identify trends in strengths and weaknesses in candidates' knowledge of content and pedagogy

Results of Evaluation

Praxis II Subject Area Test

Spring 2013 – Campus – N = 14

These results are for interns (Campus group) from spring 2013. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 168.36, with a median score of 168; the minimum passing score is 158. One candidate failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, and one candidate failed on two more attempts. This indicates an 86% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Spring 2013 – Hinds – N = 16

These results are for interns (Hinds group) from spring 2013. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 174.88, with a median score of 174.50; the minimum passing score is 158. All candidates passed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt. This indicates a 100% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Fall 2013 – Campus – N = 16

These results are for interns (Campus group) from spring 2013. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 167.00, with a median score of 162.50; the minimum passing score is 158. Two candidates failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, and four candidates failed on two or more attempts. This indicates a 63% first-

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Fall 2013 – Hinds – N = 11

These results are for interns (Hinds group) from spring 2013. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 174.64, with a median score of 173; the minimum passing score is 158. One candidate failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, and two candidates failed on two or more attempts. This indicates a 73% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT) Test

Spring 2013 – Campus – N = 4

These results are for interns (Campus group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in spring 2013. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 177 and the median 177; the minimum passing score is 160. All candidates successfully passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on the first attempt which indicates a 100% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Spring 2013 – Hinds – N = 5

These results are for interns (Hinds group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in spring 2013. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 168 and the median 165; the minimum passing score is 160. One candidate failed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test on the first attempt, which indicates an 80% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Fall 2013 – Campus – N = 6

These results are for interns (Campus group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in fall 2013. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 170.5 and the median 169; the minimum passing score is 160. Two candidates failed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test on the first attempt, which indicates a 67% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Fall 2013 – Hinds – N = 1

These results are for interns (Hinds group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in fall 2013. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 178 and the median 178; the minimum passing score is 160. All candidates successfully passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on the first attempt,

which indicates a 100% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Use of Evaluation Results

Continue to track the Praxis II Subject Area Test scores and Principles of Learning and Teaching test scores. Track first-time pass rates for the Praxis I. Provide for interventions prior to the first test administration for all teacher education candidates.

First-time pass rates on the Praxis II Tests ranged from 63% to 100%. Workshops prior to test taking have been implemented and will continue as support for teaching candidates.

Related Items

There are no related items.

BSE-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate mastery of content knowledge

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate mastery of content knowledge.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. College BASE (C-Base), a criterion-referenced academic achievement exam (covering mathematics, social studies, science, and English) was administered. The C-Base was developed at the University of Missouri and is used across the U.S. as an assessment of content knowledge for pre-service elementary education teacher candidates. Scores range from 40 – 560, with a mean score of 300. Reports provide mean scores and standard deviations for each tested group.
2. The assessment was administered to all candidates in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*, as a measure of students' content knowledge.
3. An institutional summary and individual score reports provided descriptive data. Data results were compared with those of past years to identify trends in strengths and weaknesses in candidates' knowledge of content.

Results of Evaluation

This summary reports on four groups of candidates. Group one consists of on-campus students taking the C-Base test in Spring 2013. Group two consists of candidates enrolled in the Hinds 2 + 2 Program who took the test in Spring 2013. Group three consists of on-campus candidates taking the C-Base test in Fall 2013. Group four consists of candidates enrolled in the Hinds 2 + 2 Program who took the test in Fall 2013.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Spring 2013 – Campus Group

(N=25) In the spring 2013 testing of on-campus candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 229 and 43; mathematics, 256 and 35; science 216 and 49; and social studies, 214 and 39. The composite score for candidates was 232.

The highest average performance was in the area of Math (Average = 256). The math score is 24 points higher than the composite score of 232, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-Base. The second highest average performance was in the area of English (Average = 229). The English score is 3 points lower than the composite score of 232. Because this group of candidates' math score exceeds the composite score, they have demonstrated a relative strength in math as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in math is 35. While the math scores are the highest of this group of candidates, the standard deviation indicates that English had greater variance of student scores than math.

For this group of candidates, social studies scores were the lowest at an average of 214, which is 18 points lower than the group composite score of 232. Eighteen points represents a meaningful difference, thus this group of candidates shows a relative weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for social studies scores is 40. It indicates a smaller variance in scores compared to English with a standard deviation of 42.

Spring 2013- Hinds Group

(N=20) In the spring testing of Hinds 2 + 2 candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 255 and 49; mathematics, 294 and 47; science 255 and 40; and social studies, 224 and 48. The composite score for candidates was 243.

The highest average performance for these candidates was in the area of math (Average = 294). However, the math score is 51 points higher than the composite score of 243, indicating a difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-BASE. The science score and the English score also exceed the composite score, by 12 points. Because this group of candidates' math scores, science scores, and English scores exceed the composite score, they have demonstrated a slight strength in these areas as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in math is 47, the standard deviation in science is 40, and the standard deviation in English is 49.

For this group of candidates, social studies scores were the lowest at an average of 224, which is 19 points lower than the group composite score of 243. This represents a meaningful difference and indicates a relative weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Fall 2013 – Campus Group

(N=36) In the fall testing of on-campus candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 246 and 47; mathematics, 283 and 51; science 206 and 61; and social studies, 220 and 58. The composite score for candidates was 236.

The highest average performance was in the areas of math (Average = 283). The math score is 47 points higher than the composite score of 236, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-BASE. The second highest average performance was in the area of English (Average = 246). The English score is 10 point higher than the composite score of 229. Because this group of candidates' math score and English score exceeds the composite score, they have demonstrated a relative strength in math and a slight strength in English as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in math is 51. While the math scores are the highest of this group of candidates, the standard deviation indicates that Science and Social Studies had greater variance of student scores than math.

For this group of candidates, Science scores were the lowest at an average of 206, which is 30 points lower than the group composite score of 236. Thirty points represents a meaningful difference, thus this group of candidates shows a weakness in Science as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for Science scores is 61. This group of candidates also shows a slight weakness in Social Studies. The average for Social Studies was 220, which is 16 points lower than the composite score of 236. The standard deviation for Social Studies was 58.

Fall 2013 – Hinds Group

(N=17) In the fall testing of Hinds candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 240 and 48; mathematics, 288 and 35; science 241 and 50; and social studies, 255 and 42. The composite score for candidates was 249.

The highest average performance was in the areas of mathematics (Average = 288). The math scores are 39 points higher than the composite score of 249, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in mathematics and their overall performance on the C-BASE. Because this group of candidates' mathematics scores exceed the composite score, they have demonstrated a relative strength in mathematics as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in mathematics is 35.

Social Studies scores were at an average of 255, which is 6 points higher than the group composite score of 249. A score must be at least 17 points higher or lower than the composite score to make a meaningful relationship and to determine strengths and weaknesses.

For this group of candidates, English and science scores were the lowest. English scores were at an average of 240, which is 9 points lower than the group composite score of 249.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Science scores were at an average of 241, which is 8 points lower than the group composite score of 249. This represents a meaningful difference and indicates a slight weakness in English and science as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for English scores is 48. The standard deviation for science scores is 50. The scores indicate that the smallest variance for this group is in the area of mathematics.

Trends noted

Social Studies has been an area where the candidates consistently average the lowest score each year. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2013, Social Studies is the lowest area (221). The second lowest area is English (240). After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2013, Mathematics is the highest area (279). The second highest area is Science (256). Overall, the candidates' average composite score is 239, which indicates that math and science are relative strengths for the candidates.

Use of Evaluation Results

Candidates began taking the C-Base in 2006. The results for each group of candidates taking the test have been low to marginal and this trend continues.

Social Studies has been an area where the candidates consistently average the lowest score each year.

After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2013, Social Studies is the lowest area (221). The second lowest area is English (240).

After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2013, Mathematics is the highest area (279). The second highest area is Science (256).

Overall, the candidates' average composite score is 239, which indicates that math and science are relative strengths for the candidates.

The 2012-2013 scores are beginning to show that we have students at a variety of different achievement levels in English, Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies. The candidates range in ability from high performers to medium performers to low performers. Actions based upon these trends have been to conference with candidates regarding their individual scores.

Faculty will continue to meet with candidates and offer tutoring advice. Faculty can now offer specific sites for candidates to receive help in the different content areas.

Candidates may use the writing lab and the Office of Academic Support Services. The departments of science and social studies are working on tutorials for candidates who score low in these areas.

The campus program and the Hinds program are measured on standards related to the Association for Childhood Education International Standards 2.1 (Reading, Writing, and Oral Language); 2.2 (Science); and 2.3 (Mathematics); and 2.4 (Social Studies).

The scores are consistent with data provided by ACT composite averages for students entering the Elementary Education Program at this institution.

Elementary faculty will continue to use this test data to establish a baseline reference upon which to determine how best to direct students in their efforts to compensate for content area weaknesses. Even though candidates take the C-Base test upon entering the elementary education program, the test is not used as an admission requirement. The instructor for the introductory course in which the C-Base is given, meets with each candidate individually after scores are received. The instructor, along with the candidate's advisor, discusses the score report with the candidate. Low scores provide a basis for the advisor to devise an action plan with the candidate to improve his/her content knowledge.

Faculty members will continue to review courses of action for improving the content preparation of candidates entering the elementary education program with content area deficits.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 BSE-ELE 03: LO Plan an integrated unit of instruction for a diverse student population.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to plan an integrated unit of instruction for a diverse student population.

Data Collection (Evidence)

- 1a. The Integrated Units are scored with grading rubrics developed by the faculty; the grading rubrics are linked to the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards, the international professional association that guides Elementary Education teacher preparation programs. The grading rubrics contain the following components: Contextual Factors and Class Description, Learning Goals: Objectives, Concepts, and Skills, Lesson Planning Structure and Content, Assessment Plan, Subject Area Integration, Assessment Plan, Home/School/Community Connection, and Reflection and Self-Evaluation.
- 2a. Data was collected in TaskStream, the online information technology system used by the College of Education.
- 3a. TaskStream reports I provided means and score distributions.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 1 for the Integrated Lesson Plan scoring guide.)

- 1b. The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument Indicators 1 – 9 were used to assess the candidates' ability to plan instruction.
- 2b. Data were collected during CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*, as well as in the teaching intern experience.
- 3b. A 4-point rubric was used. TaskStream reports provided descriptive data.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 2 for the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument scoring guide.)

-  [Appendix A, Instrument 1](#)
-  [Appendix A, Instrument 2](#)

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N=19) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 – Principles and Techniques of Early Childhood demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of differentiated instruction in language arts (62.5%), social studies (68.75%), and science (68.75%). Other areas of concern are integration of the arts (62.50%), physical education (50%), and health (50%). In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Spring 2013- Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N=9) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 – Principles and Techniques of Early Childhood demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of social studies assessments (66.67%) and integrated content in health (66.67%). In spring 2013, these two areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2013- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N=11) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 – Principles and Techniques of Early Childhood demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of science instruction in activities (81.25%) and assessments (81.25%). Other areas of concern are integrating of health content (81.25%), building relationships with community agents (81.25%), and making adaptations based on individual needs of students. In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2013- Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N=6) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 – Principles and Techniques of Early Childhood demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in

most categories of the Integrated Unit. Areas of concern are integration of the arts (71.43%), physical education (71.43%), and health (42.86%). In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Spring 2013 - Campus Group – CEL 318 Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades

(N=19) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 – Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of social studies instruction with materials (68.42%) and assessments (68.42%). Other areas are science instruction with materials (68.43% and assessments (63.16%). Organization of time and materials was also an area of concern with only 68.42% of the candidates scoring at the acceptable or target levels. Another area of concern is integration of the arts (52.63%). In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Spring 2013 - Hinds Group – CEL 318 Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades

(N=9) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 – Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of differentiated instruction in language arts (44.44%), social studies (33.33%), math (33.33%), and science (44.44%). Another area of concern is integration of health (66.67%). In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2013 - Campus Group – CEL 318 Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades

(N=12) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 – Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of integrating health content (58.33%). Other areas of concern are social studies instruction with instructional activities (66.67%) and science instruction with assessments (66.67%). In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2013 - Hinds Group – CEL 318 Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades

(N=9) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 – Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. One area of concern is that of social studies instruction in instructional activities (44.44%), materials (44.44%), assessment (44.44%) and research, analysis, evaluations, and equity (44.44%). Other areas of concern are integrated content is health (44.44%) and physical education (55.66%) and knowledge of curricular connections (55.66%). Language Arts content in reading was also

weak with only 33.33% of candidates scoring at the acceptable or target levels. In spring 2013, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Methods Courses

Spring 2013- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

Spring 2013 (Campus) (N=19) – Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.26/3 on prepares appropriate teaching techniques (# 4) to 2.79 on selects appropriate objectives (# 1). For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 2.26/3 on prepares appropriate assessments (# 5) to 2.79 on selects appropriate objectives (# 1).

Spring 2013- Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

Spring 2013 (Hinds) (N=9) – Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.22/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to 2.56 on plans appropriate procedures (#4) and prepares appropriate assessments (#5). For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 2.22/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to 2.56 on plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4) and prepares appropriate assessments (# 5).

Fall 2013- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

Fall 2013 (Campus) (N=11) - Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.73/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to 3.00 on selects appropriate objectives and integrates core content knowledge (#3). For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 2.17/3 on integrates core content knowledge from other subjects (# 3) and plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4) to 2.75 on selects appropriate objectives (#1).

Fall 2013- Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

Fall 2013 (Hinds) (N=6) - Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.17/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) and plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 3.00 on selects appropriate objectives and plans appropriate teaching procedures. For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 1.89/3 on prepares appropriate assessment (#5) to 2.33 on selects appropriate objectives (#1).

Teaching Internship

Spring 2013 (Campus) (N = 17) – On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.65/3 on prepares appropriate assessments (#5) to 2.82/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 1.88 /3 on integrates core content knowledge from subject areas (#3) to 2.47/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1) and plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4).

Spring 2012 (Hinds) (N = 17) – On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.71/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1) to 2.88/3 on integrates knowledge from

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

several subject areas (#3) and plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 1.88/3 on integrates core content knowledge from other subjects (#3) to 2.47/3 on plans appropriate teaching procedures (4).

Fall 2013 (Campus) (N = 16) – On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.75/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to 2.94/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1) and plans appropriate assessment and procedures (#4). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.19 /3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to 2.69/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1) and integrates core content knowledge from other subjects (#3).

Fall 2013 (Hinds) (N = 10) – On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.60/3 on plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 2.90/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1), incorporates diversity (#2), and plans appropriate teaching procedures knowledge from several subject areas (#3) and plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 2.70/3 on plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4) and prepares appropriate assessment and procedures (#5).

Trends Noted

In 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 differentiated instruction was identified as an area of concern. In 2013, this continues to be an area of concern regarding candidate performance in differentiating instruction, but candidates appear to be understanding differentiation more to some degree. There continues to be a slight decrease in abilities from semester to semester in differentiated instruction. Faculty will continue to closely monitor this area to determine any long-term trends. As the decrease has continued, workshops and a more intense focus on gearing field experiences to helping students implement differentiated instruction. Assessments were noted as a slight weakness as well as integration of the arts, physical education, and health.

Use of Evaluation Results

Faculty in all classes that require candidates to plan lessons will continue to emphasize each component of the planning process. A concentrated effort will be made to continue to teach candidates how to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. Seminars will be offered to candidates in the area of differentiated instruction. Special attention will also be given to variety of ways to assess students, to include using prior knowledge and a variety of instructional activities.

Data from 2009 and 2010 identified incorporating diversity into planning and teaching as a weakness and this seems to be improving with the 2013 data. Field trips to diverse settings and seminars regarding diversity are continuing to be implemented.

Candidates' performance in several areas showed an increase from 2012. Faculty will closely monitor these areas to determine any long term trends.

When viewed as a whole, data analysis for the Integrated Unit Plan is evidence that the majority of candidates meet the majority of the standards aligned with this assessment. The candidates' strengths lie in their abilities of developing and aligning appropriate learning goals and objectives [ACEI 3.1], making home/school/community connections [ACEI 5.2], and knowledge of students and learning theory [ACEI 1.0]. Fewer candidates scored at the **target** level in the areas of differentiating instruction [ACEI 3.2] and integrating content areas [ACEI 2.1-2.7], although many were at the acceptable level. However, it is important to note that with the intense focus of content area integration within the integrated unit, candidates should begin to perform better in these areas.

Program planners determined that more emphasis should be placed on candidates' understanding of how to appropriately and effectively differentiate instruction throughout the lesson planning process in all methods courses. Program planners also concluded that candidates' abilities to integrate content areas need to be strengthened throughout all courses requiring planning and instruction in small, group, or whole class settings. As faculty have been made aware of these needs, plans are in place to target these problem areas throughout the elementary candidates' program of study with more explanations, specific examples, individual conferencing and modeling.

Related Items

There are no related items.

≡ BSE-ELE 04: LO Demonstrate the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to successfully complete the teaching internship and be deemed safe to practice.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. During the teaching internship that comprises the candidate's final semester in the program, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) was used to assess pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, cross-referenced to Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards, is an instrument used statewide to measure teacher candidates' abilities within the following domains: planning and preparation, communication and interaction, teaching and learning, managing the learning environment, assessment of student learning, and professionalism and partnerships. The instrument has a 4-point scale (0 - 3) with a rating of 2 deemed Acceptable and safe to practice.
2. Observation data from the candidate's Cooperating Teacher and Delta State University Supervisor was collected.

3. Data were collected and analyzed in TaskStream. Analysis reports contain means, medians, and distribution of scores for each indicator. Aggregate ratings of cooperating teachers and Delta State University Supervisors were studied by the faculty to identify strengths and weaknesses in the performance of the interns and the results were compared with those of past years to identify trends.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 2 for the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument scoring guide.)

-  [Appendix A, Instrument 2](#)

Results of Evaluation

Domain II focuses on Assessment
Spring 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=19)

Mean ratings ranged from 1.74/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.00/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

36.84% of the students scored emerging and 63.16% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

15.79% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 68.42% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 318 (N= 19)

Mean ratings ranged from 1.74/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.00/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

36.84% of the students scored emerging and 63.16% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

15.79% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 68.42% scored acceptable or target.

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.59/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.65/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings on the final observation ranged from 2.06/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.24/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

29.41% of the students scored emerging and 70.58% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

29.41% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 70.59% scored acceptable or target.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.33/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.33/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 318 (N= 19)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.33/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.44/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.82/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.71/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings on the final observation ranged from 1.94/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 1.82/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

29.41% of the students scored emerging and 70.58% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

41.18% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 58.82% scored acceptable or target.

Fall 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=11)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.70/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

72.72% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

90.91 scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 318 (N= 12)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.58/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.50/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

8.33% of the students scored emerging and 91.67% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

8.33% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 91.67% scored acceptable or target.

Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 3.00/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.94/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 496 (N= 16)

Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 2.88/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.75 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=6)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.00/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to N/A on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.44/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.56/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.82/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.71/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings on the final observation ranged from 2.70/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.50/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

10% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 90% scored acceptable or target.

Domain III focuses on Instruction

Spring 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=19)

Mean ratings ranged from 1.17/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 2.47/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

26.31% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging and 5.26% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.

5.26% of the students scored emerging on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning while 94.74% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 318 (N= 19)

Mean ratings ranged from 1.17/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 2.47/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

26.31% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging and 5.26% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.

5.26% of the students scored emerging on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning while 94.74% scored acceptable or target.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.82/3 on demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject taught and uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to 2.47/3 on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject taught and uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies.

17.65% of the students scored emerging on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking while 82.36% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.76/3 on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction to 1.41/3 on uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning.

5.88% of the students scored emerging and 94.11% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction

58.82% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning while 41.17% scored acceptable or target.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.22/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners to 2.89/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.22/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners to 2.89/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.88/3 on uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, communicates high expectations for learning, and uses family and community resources to enhance student learning to 2.71/3 on demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject taught and provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates high expectations for learning, and uses family and community resources to enhance student learning.

5.88% of the students scored emerging on uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies while 94.12% scored at the target level.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject taught.

5.88% of the students scored emerging on and provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other while 94.12% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.88/3 on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction to 1.76/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction

35.29% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning while 64.71% scored acceptable or target.

Fall 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=11)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.45/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners to 3.00/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

CEL 318 (N= 19)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.92/3 on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction and communicates high expectations for learning to 2.09/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction and communicates high expectations for learning.

16.67% of the students scored emerging on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners while 75% scored acceptable or target.

Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 3.00/3 on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to 2.56/3 on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other.

6.25% of the students scored emerging on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning while 93.75% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 3.00/3 on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time to 2.69/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

100% of the candidates scored at the target level on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=6)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.17/3 on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking to 3.00/3 on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other, and demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

100% of the students scored at the target level on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other, and demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.00/3 on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking to 3.00/3 on on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

100% of the students scored at the target level on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

Internship (N=10) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to 2.70/3 on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning.

100% scored at the target level on provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning.

CEL 496 (N= 10)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.80/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching/learning and elicits input during the lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to respond to 2.50/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners and engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on conveys enthusiasm for teaching/learning and elicits input during the lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to respond.

10% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners and engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking while 90% scored acceptable or target.

Domain IV focuses on the Learning Environment

Spring 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=19)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.11/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 2.58/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

21.05% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 78.95% scored acceptable or target.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

CEL 318 (N= 19)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.11/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 2.58/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

21.05% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 78.95% scored acceptable or target.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.82/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks to 2.59/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks.

11.76% of the students scored emerging on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning while 88.24% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings on final observation ranged from 2.76/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.47/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks.

5.88% of the students scored emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 94.12% scored acceptable or target.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.44/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks to 2.89/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.44/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks to 2.89/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.94/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.76/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and attends to or delegates routine tasks.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and attends to or delegates routine tasks.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings on final observation ranged from 2.65/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.29/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

11.76% of the students scored emerging on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students while 88.23% scored acceptable or target.

11.76% of the students scored emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 88.23% scored acceptable or target.

Fall 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=11)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.36/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 3.00/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

9.09% of the students scored emerging on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 90.91% scored acceptable or target.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

CEL 318 (N= 12)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.58/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 3.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

8.33% of the students scored emerging on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 91.67% scored acceptable or target.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% of the students scored at the target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 3.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.81/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

100% scored at the target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

CEL 496 (N= 16)

Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 3.00/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.88/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks.

100% of the students scored target on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on attends to or delegates routine tasks.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=6)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.17/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 3.00/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

100% of the students scored at the target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 2.89/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

11.11% of the students scored emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 55.56% scored acceptable or target.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

Internship (N=10) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 2.90/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.81/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

CEL 496 (N= 10)

Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 2.80/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students and attends to or delegates routine tasks to 2.60/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students and attends to or delegates routine tasks.

10% of the students scored emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning while 90% scored acceptable or target.

Domain V focuses on Professional Responsibilities
Spring 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=19)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to N/A on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

21.05% of the students scored emerging and 78.95% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 318 (N= 19)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to N/A on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

21.05% of the students scored emerging and 78.95% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.71/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.65/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

5.88% of the students scored emerging and 94.12% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.47/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 1.88/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

11.76% of the students scored emerging and 88.23% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

41.18% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging and 58.82% scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.78/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.50/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

22.22% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues. The others score N/A.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.78/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.50/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

22.22% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues. The others score N/A.

Internship (N=17) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.82/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.76/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.65/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.12/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

11.76% of the students scored emerging and 88.23% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

23.53% of the students scored emerging and 76.47% scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Fall 2013 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=11)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.00/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.73/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

9.09% of the students scored acceptable on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues. The others scored N/A.

9.09% of the students scored emerging and 90.91% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 318 (N= 12)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.25/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 3.00/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

16.67% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging and 83.33% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

50% of the students scored target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues. The others scored N/A.

Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 3.00 /3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.88/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

100% of the students scored target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 496 (N= 17)

Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.88/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

100% of the students scored at the target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=6)

Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to N/A on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

100% of the students scored target on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.56/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

11.11% of the students scored acceptable on maximizes time available for instruction while 88.89% scored at the acceptable or target level.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

22.22% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues while the others scored N/A.

Internship (N=10) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.80 /3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.70/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 496 (N= 10)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.70 /3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.50/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.

10% of the students scored acceptable on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues while 90% scored at the acceptable or target level.

10% of the students scored acceptable on maximizes time available for instruction while 90% scored at the acceptable or target level.

Trends Noted

The areas the teaching candidates need additional instruction in are providing opportunities for students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; using higher-order thinking questions to engage students in analytical, creative, and critical thinking; adjusting lessons according to individual student cues, professional reflections, and group responses; and communicating assessment criteria and performance to students.

Enthusiasm for teaching and maximizing time available for instruction are two of our strengths.

Use of Evaluation Results

Continue to track, assess, and analyze data. Even though weaknesses were identified, those areas are not true weaknesses as scores were in the acceptable ranges. In these terms, weakness indicates an area where the scores were slightly lower than other areas. Those areas will be closely monitored.

Additional training and activities in planning for diversity, differentiation, and integration of all subject area content knowledge will be included in teacher education course work at DSU.

Workshops/seminars and field trips on diverse settings will be planned and implemented for students struggling in these areas.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 BSE-ELE 05: LO Demonstrate the ability to positively impact student learning.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to positively impact student learning.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Folio is a performance-based assessment that requires teacher candidates to assess their impact on student learning while simultaneously improving their ability to reflect upon practice and make needed improvements. In CEL 497 *Diagnosis and Evaluation of Student Achievement in the Elementary School*, taught the first semester of the senior year, candidates were required to complete the Teacher Work Sample. In the teaching internship, candidates developed and implemented a Teacher Work Sample in their internship classroom.
2. For each experience, the candidate completed a seven-day unit of integrated study and developed a corresponding Teacher Work Sample. In completing the Teacher Work Sample, candidates gathered data, assessed, and reflected upon the following eight dimensions related to teaching and learning: Contextual Information, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision Making, Analysis of Student Learning, Reflection and Self-Evaluation, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education.
3. Each component of the Teacher Work Sample was graded with its respective rubric. TaskStream reports provided means, medians, and distributions of scores for each indicator.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 3 for the Teacher Work Sample rubrics.)

-  [Appendix A, Instrument 3](#)

Results of Evaluation

Methods Courses

Spring 2013 (Campus)

(N = 17) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.65/3, Learning Goal 2.66/3, Assessment Plan 2.57/3, Design for Instruction 2.38/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.66/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.71/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.61/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.59/3.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

(N = 4) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.45/3, Learning Goal 2.30/3, Assessment Plan 2.58/3, Design for Instruction 2.39/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.75/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.19/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.40/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.78/3.

Fall 2013 (Campus)

(N = 12) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.72/3, Learning Goal 2.78/3, Assessment Plan 2.79/3, Design for Instruction 2.68/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.48/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.60/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.53/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.52/3.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

(N = 9) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.00/3, Learning Goal 2.27/3, Assessment Plan 2.31/3, Design for Instruction 2.37/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.42/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.39/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.42/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.52/3.

Internship

Spring 2013 (Campus)

(N = 17) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 3.00 /3, Learning Goals 2.94/3, Assessment Plan 2.97/3, Design for Instruction 2.98/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.99/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 3.00/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.98/3.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

(N = 17) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.95/3, Learning Goals 3.00/3, Assessment Plan 2.99/3, Design for Instruction 2.98/3, Instructional Decision Making 3.00/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 3.00/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.92/3.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Fall 2013 (Campus)

(N = 16) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.96/3, Learning Goals 3.00/3, Assessment Plan 2.99/3, Design for Instruction 2.92/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.97/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.73/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.98/3.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

(N = 10) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.94/3, Learning Goals 2.92/3, Assessment Plan 2.95/3, Design for Instruction 2.92/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.98/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.85/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.80/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.94/3.

Trends Noted

In Methods courses, there was a weakness in the Assessment Plan and Analysis of Student Learning and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education. The interpretation of data, requiring candidates to analyze pre and post data seems to be the biggest problem, as has been the trend. Of course, the assessment plan is tied directly into the analysis section. Scores increased in all areas from methods courses to internship, as is to be expected. Internship ratings varied from 2.73 – 3.00, with many of the ratings at 3.00. The lowest evaluation was in the area of Reflection and Self-Reflection for the Campus group. In addition, another weakness was Design for Instruction in Elementary Education for the Hinds Group.

Use of Evaluation Results

More emphasis will be placed upon integrating other subject areas due to the lower rating of that area in one of the internship semesters. Faculty will continue to emphasize analyzing data within appropriate courses.

Scores usually increase between methods and internship on the Teacher Work Sample. However, we are beginning to see a truer picture as supervisors of interns are now capturing first attempts on the Teacher Work Sample in Task Stream as well as final submission. The Teacher Work Sample has also been revised to more closely align with the rubrics.

Related Items

There are no related items.

➤BSE-ELE 06: LO Demonstrate the ability to diagnose and remediate deficits in reading skills.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to diagnose and remediate deficits in reading skills.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. A Reading Case Study (RCS) was used to collect data during CRD 326. The grading rubric is aligned with Association for Childhood Education International standards and contains components that cover the areas of background information, general observations of the elementary student with whom the candidate is working, accurate test administration, analysis of testing results, recommendations for remediation, and development and implementation of needs-based instruction. The grading rubric uses a 3-point scale (Unacceptable, Acceptable, and Target).

2. Each candidate in CRD 326 *Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties* completed the Reading Case Study while working with an assigned student in a local school.

3. The scores were analyzed in Excel.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 4 for the Reading Case Study Scoring Guide.)

-  [Appendix A, Instrument 4](#)

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013 – Campus Program

(N = 16)- In the spring semester of 2013, candidates scored 100% (target) in describing student data, describing background information, general observations, and tests administered/results. In the area of field experiences, 45% were at the target level, 50% were at the acceptable level, and 5% were at the unacceptable level. For the area of analysis, 69% were at the target level and 31% scored at the acceptable level. For summary and recommendations, 94% were at the target level and 6% were at the unacceptable level.

Spring 2013 – Hinds Program

(N = 7)- In the spring semester of 2013, candidates scored 100% (target) in describing background information, general observations, test administered/results, and summary/recommendations. For this group, 89% were at the target level and 11% were at the acceptable level for describing student data. In the area of field experiences, 43% were at the target level, and 57% were at the acceptable level. For the area of analysis, 43% were at the target level and 57% scored at the acceptable level.

Fall 2013 – Campus Program

(N = 11)- In the fall semester of 2013, candidates scored 100% (target) in describing student data, general observations, and tests administered/results. For the area of describing background information, 73% were at the target level and 27% were at the acceptable level. In the area of field experiences, 68% were at the target level, 27% were at the acceptable level, and 5% were at the unacceptable level. For the area of analysis, 27% were at the target level, 64% were at the acceptable level, and 9% scored at the acceptable level. For summary and recommendations, 91% were at the target level and 9% were at the acceptable level.

Fall 2013 – Hinds Program

(N = 9)- In the fall semester of 2013, candidates scored 100% (target) in describing background information, general observations, and test administered/results. For this group, 89% were at the target level and 11% were at the acceptable level for describing student data. In the area of field experiences, 67% were at the target level, and 34% were at the acceptable level. For summary and recommendations, 89% were at the target level and 11% were at the acceptable level. For the area of analysis, 33% were at the target level, 45% scored at the acceptable level, and 22% scored unacceptable.

Trends Noted

The data show strong evidence that the candidates used their understanding of assessment as it relates to planning instruction based on the developmental needs of students. While the candidates use critical thinking as they plan and summarize/reflect, they are challenged when they must use this level of thinking to analyze error patterns in students' reading. Possible explanations for this is the fact that analyzing reading errors is an advanced level reading instruction skill, and highly scientific in nature. Because the development of the RCS is closely supervised and candidates meet with the instructor to discuss their analyses, valuable insight is gained, and their growth is reflected in their ability to summarize and articulate relevant recommendations at the conclusion of the RCS.

Use of Evaluation Results

Analyzing data continues to be a low-scoring area. Faculty will continue to emphasize analyzing student data in all courses that incorporate pre-and/or post-testing.

Describing student data and background information, general observations, and test administered and results are strengths of the candidates.

The instructor of the course will continue to emphasize presentation of test data, summarizing case study findings, and making appropriate recommendations for further instruction. Particular attention will be given to analyzing results of data. Faculty will conference with instructor to inquire as to the nature of the low scores in field experiences/teaching for that group.

Related Items

There are no related items.

☛BSE-ELE 07: LO Exhibit professional dispositions associated with successful teaching.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Exhibit professional dispositions associated with successful teaching.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. The undergraduate version of the *Dispositions Rating Scale* (DRS) was developed by the College of Education faculty and is correlated with the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument and was used to assess students' dispositions in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*, and the teaching internship. The scale is also used throughout the program to document dispositional concerns and exemplary dispositions. The instrument uses a 4-point scale and assesses these professional dispositions: Fairness, Belief That All Students Can Learn, Professionalism, Resourcefulness, and Dependability.

3. Each disposition was analyzed for means, medians, and score distributions using TaskStream.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 5 for the *Dispositions Rating Scale* – Undergraduate Version.)

-  [Appendix A, Instrument 5](#)

Results of Evaluation

CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*

Spring 2013 – Campus Group

(N = 24) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 1.83 on Dependability to 2.17 on Resourcefulness to 2.21 on Professionalism and Fairness to 2.29 on the Belief that All Students Can Learn. The overall mean score was 2.14.

Spring 2013– Hinds Group

(N = 2) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.0 on Fairness, the Belief That All Students Can Learn, Resourcefulness, Professionalism, and Dependability. The overall mean score was 2.00.

Fall 2013 – Campus Group

(N = 36) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.00 on Dependability to 2.17 on Professionalism to 2.19 on Fairness and the Belief That All Students Can Learn to 2.22 on Resourcefulness. The overall mean score was 2.16.

Fall 2013 – Hinds Group

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

(N = 2) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.50 on Professionalism to 3.00 on Fairness, the Belief That All Students Can Learn, Resourcefulness, and Dependability. The overall mean score was 2.90.

Internship

Spring 2013 – Campus Group

(N = 17) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.71 on Resourcefulness, the Belief That All Students Can Learn, Professionalism, and Fairness to 2.82 on Dependability, with an overall mean of 2.73. DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.53 on Professionalism, Dependability, and Resourcefulness to 2.76 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn, to 2.82 on Fairness, with an overall mean of 2.64.

Spring 2013 – Hinds Group

(N= 17) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.71 on Resourcefulness to 2.82 on Professionalism to 2.88 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn and Dependability to 2.94 on Fairness, with an overall mean of 2.85. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.76 on Professionalism and Dependability to 2.82 on Fairness and Resourcefulness to 2.88 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn, with an overall mean of 2.83.

Fall 2013 – Campus Group

(N = 16) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.88 on Resourcefulness, The Belief That All Students Can Learn, and Professionalism to 2.94 on Dependability to 3.00 on Fairness. The overall mean score was 2.91. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.81 on Resourcefulness to 2.88 on The Belief That All Students Can Learn and Dependability to 2.94 on Professionalism to 3.00 on Fairness. The overall mean score was 2.90

Fall 2013 – Hinds Group

Hinds (N= 10) - Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.50 on Resourcefulness to 2.80 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn to 2.90 on Professionalism, Dependability, and Fairness. The overall mean score was 2.80. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.70 on Professionalism and Resourcefulness to 2.80 on Dependability, the Belief That All Students Can Learn, and Fairness. The overall mean score was 2.76.

Trends Noted

Data were collected at multiple points and from multiple perspectives using the *Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS)* to allow for analysis with respect to a number of dimensions. These data reflect responses on instructor ratings for CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* and CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* and cooperating teacher and supervisor ratings for CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship*. For the purposes of this report, data analysis focused on the following: 1) general patterns that emerged with respect to whether or not disposition evaluation results differ between the CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*, CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*, and CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship*, as well as 2) general patterns of candidate behavior with respect to professional dispositions.

The instructor's ratings for CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* and CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* over all semesters showed some distribution over the range of descriptors, as opposed to reflecting primarily ratings that fell exclusively in the target and acceptable ranges. Marginal and unacceptable behavior ratings were not given for any indicator for the CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* group. The CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* groups earned some marginal or unacceptable ratings on Professionalism, Dependability, and Resourcefulness. The indicators of Fairness and the Belief That All Children Can Learn were acceptable or on target.

Data summaries related to the evaluation of dispositions during CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship*, for the campus groups revealed that the percentages indicated that candidates performed at the target or acceptable levels according to results of Cooperating Teachers and Delta State University Supervisors on the indicators. For most indicators, Delta State University Supervisors rated fewer candidates at the outstanding level than did cooperating teachers.

In general, a much higher percentage of candidates were viewed by Delta State University Supervisors (faculty) as functioning at targeted professional levels during CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship* than during CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* or CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*.

Use of Evaluation Results

During CEL 496, *Directed Teaching Internship*, candidates consistently demonstrated target and acceptable behaviors associated with the teaching profession. Cooperating teachers appeared to view their dispositions more favorably, perhaps because they work with the candidates and have difficulty maintaining objectivity. However, they do interact with the candidates in the real world, so their ratings could reflect well-rounded opportunities to interact with and observe candidates, therefore making their perceptions quite valid. University faculty may, therefore, operate from a limited view of the candidate, though they do know the candidates longer and in many contexts. Clearly, the majority of teacher candidates enter the program exhibiting the professionalism associated with Association for Childhood Education International Standards 5.1 and 5.2. They exit the program with these values, commitments, and professional ethics more firmly entrenched according to ratings from the *Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS)*.

Related Items

There are no related items.

BSE-ELE 08: LO Demonstrate ability to synthesize views of education that are commensurate of best practices and professionalism.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate ability to synthesize views of education that are commensurate of best practices and professionalism.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Each semester, all teacher candidates in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* develop a brief position paper that synthesizes the candidate's views of education, providing rationale related to beliefs about the purposes of and influences upon education, personal goals, factors associated with the teaching/learning climate, content to be taught and influences upon it, and professional growth expectations and responsibilities. Candidates refine their philosophies during the teaching internship semester. The grading rubric contains a 4-point scale (Unacceptable, Emerging, Acceptable, and Target).
2. Both philosophies were graded with the same grading rubric. However, scores assigned to candidates in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* are given with the consideration that they are novices to education and have not yet had an opportunity to attain much of the knowledge and engage in key experiences that are necessary for synthesizing an appropriate view of the teaching/learning interaction.
3. Scores for each indicator were entered into TaskStream and analyzed for means, medians, and score distributions.

(See Appendix A, Instrument 6 for the Philosophy scoring guide.)

-  [Appendix A, Instrument 6](#)

Results of Evaluation

CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* and CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*

Spring 2013 (Campus)

(N= 24) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.04/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.33/3 on Professionalism. The overall mean rating was 2.21/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

(N= 14) Mean ratings ranged from 1.71/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content to 1.79/3 on Teaching Rationale, Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate, and Professionalism and Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 1.77/3. The means of all five areas were at the Emerging level.

Spring 2013 (Hinds) (CUR 302)

(N=2) Mean rating ranged from 1.50/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate and Professionalism to 2.00 on Teaching Rationale, Content, and Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 1.80/3. The means of all five areas were at the Emerging level or Target level.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Fall 2013 (Campus)

(N=36) – Mean rating ranged from 2.19/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.61 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.40/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

(N=13) – Mean rating ranged from 1.92/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.31 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.17/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Fall 2013 (Hinds) (CUR 302)

(N=2) – Mean rating ranged from 2.00/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Teaching Rationale , Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate, Content, and Professionalism to 3.00 on Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 2.20/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level or Target level.

Trends Noted

Composition/Mechanics has been an area where candidates consistently average the lowest score each year, but this analysis shows some improvement within recent semesters. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2013, Content is the lowest area (2.09). The second lowest area is Professionalism (2.14). After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2013, Teaching Rationale and Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate are the highest areas (2.17). Overall, the candidates are scoring at the acceptable level in each of the five areas. Areas to watch are Content and Professionalism.

Internship

Spring 2013 (Campus)

(N=17) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.29/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content & Composition/Mechanics to 2.59 on Teaching Rationale & Appropriate teaching/learning climate. The overall mean rating was 2.44/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Spring 2013 (Hinds)

(N=17) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.53/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.94 on Appropriate teaching/leaning climate. The overall mean rating was 2.81/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Fall 2013 (Campus)

(N=16) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.25/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content to 2.75 on Appropriate teaching/learning climate. The overall mean rating was 2.31/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Fall 2013 (Hinds)

(N=10) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.40/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.60 on Teaching Rationale, Appropriate teaching/learning climate, Content, & Professionalism. The overall mean rating was 2.50/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Trends Noted

Composition/Mechanics has been an area where the candidates consistently average the lowest score each year. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2011-2013, Composition/Mechanics is the lowest area. The second lowest area is Content. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2011-2013, Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate is the highest area. The second highest area is Teaching Rationale. Overall, the candidates are scoring at the acceptable to target level in each of the five areas.

Use of Evaluation Results

Continue to track Praxis CASE scores to identify first-attempt pass rates, as the writing subtest particularly links to the weakness in Composition/Mechanics.

Implement grammar/writing workshops with elementary education candidates.

Emphasize content and composition/mechanics in each of the elementary education courses.

Encourage students needing help to take advantage of the DSU writing labs and tutors.

Encourage students to attend the Praxis CASE writing workshops offered by the Elementary Education faculty.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 EDD 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge – Demonstrate mastery of the prior knowledge needed to be successful in the Doctor in Education program.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. A Doctoral Admission Portfolio will be used. The portfolio will include a professional resume/vita, writing samples, personal philosophy of education/theory of teaching and learning, self-evaluation aligned with personal and professional goals, evidence of leadership ability, and a statement of purpose for pursuing doctoral study. A 4-point rubric is used to evaluate the portfolio.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

2. The portfolio will be submitted within the first six hours in the program.
3. Average scores and pass rate percentages will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of Portfolio Results:

Semester	Average Score	Number Submitted	# Pass		# Marginal Pass		# Fail		# Repeaters
F'13	2.31	17	5	29%	9	53%	3	18%	0
Sum '13	2.44	9	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0
Spr '13	2.49	18	9	50%	9	50%	0	0	0
F '12	2.49	9	6	66%	3	33%	0	0	0
Spr '12	2.25	8	6	75%	1	12.50%	1	12.50%	0
F '11	1.97	11	4	36%	2	18%	5	45%	1 (F)
Spr '11	2.02	12	4	33%	5	42%	3	25%	1 (F)
F '10	2.14	8	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%	0
Spr '10	2.09	11	4	36%	2	18%	5	45%	4 (4 F)
F '09	1.89	15	6	40%	1	7%	8	53%	2 (2 P)
Spr '09	2.14	35	18	51%	7	20%	10	29%	1 (F)
F '08	1.88	10	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	1 (P)
Spr '08	2.19	11	7	64%	1	9%	3	27%	0
F '07	1.83	10	3	30%	4	40%	3	30%	1 (F)

When, Where, and with Whom Were Results Disseminated:

Educational Leadership faculty in spring faculty meeting and assessment committee in spring meeting.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

Program faculty reviewed the portfolio instructions, rubric, and tips for success. We discussed portfolio components and analysis with a DSU COEHS consultant and have a clearer understanding that evidence is a key component for each required section. The instructions, rubric, presentation, and tips remain on the EdD website.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):

We now accept portfolios three times each year (spring, summer, & fall); on average, applicants pass this phase of admission. There have been clear differences in how portfolio reviewers score portfolios, which has resulted in a notable amount of marginal passes; some reviewers consistently score portfolios as failing while others score the same

portfolios as passing. This means we need further communication regarding how to score portfolios. Scores for 2013 were comparable to average scores for 2012, which were higher than for the previous four years with a submission rate of approximately average with the other years. Additionally, applicants were stronger in both spring and fall semesters with zero failed attempts at the portfolio. Otherwise, submissions were stable except for the 2009 boom. The 2010 and 2011 failure rates are the same. The overall scores are slightly lower for 2011 (with such a small N, may be because of the 2 repeaters who were unsuccessful).

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDD 02: LO Program Specific Content

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Program Specific Content – Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Educational Leadership.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Comprehensive Examinations: Comprehensive examinations will be taken at the end of the program by all candidates and must be passed in order to register for ELR 888 *Dissertation Seminar*. They will be divided into 3 sections: research, curriculum, and supervision and based upon the core program courses and scored by program faculty.
2. Results will be compiled and analyzed by program faculty and reported to the Unit Assessment Director and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Coordinator annually.
3. Results will be analyzed by program faculty by section and overall scores and trends are identified.

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of Results:

There was a somewhat small group of students sitting for comprehensive exams in spring 2013. All performed satisfactorily and there were zero retakes necessary. See results below.

Analysis of Comprehensive Exam Results:

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

	Curriculum		Success Rate	Supervision		Success Rate	Research		Success Rate
	Pass	Fail		Pass	Fail		Pass	Fail	
Spring 2013	9	0	100%	9	0	100%	9	0	100%
Summer 2012	2	0	100%	1	0	100%	5	0	100%
Spring 2012	16	1	94%	17	0	100%	5	4	20%
Summer 2011	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Spring 2011	7	0	100%	7	0	100%	7	0	100%
Summer 2010	0	0	N/A	2	0	100%	3	0	100%
Spring 2010	17	0	100%	15	2	88%	14	3	82%
Summer 2009	0	0	N/A	3	0	100%	1	0	100%
Spring 2009	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	1	0	100%
Summer 2008	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	1	0	100%
Spring 2008	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	0	1	0%
Fall 2007	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	2	0	100%
Summer 2007	2	0	100%	2	0	100%	2	1	66%
Spring 2007	5	0	100%	5	0	100%	5	0	100%
Fall 2006	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	0	3	0%
Summer 2006	1	0	100%	2	0	100%	6	4	60%
Spring 2006	14	2	87.5%	15	5	75%	7	10	41%
Fall 2005	6	0	100%	4	2	66%	2	4	33%
Summer 2005	9	0	100%	9	0	100%	7	2	77%
Spring 2005	3	0	100%	3	0	100%	2	2	50%

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

Having revised comps only one time since the 2012 version, there are still improvements to be made for the comprehensive exam; changes have already been made for how students are evaluated, but a broader range (i.e., students may choose one of three questions offered) of questions & topics should now be offered. The most notable change to date was in each of the three sections that now require students to illustrate competency in NCATE standards by offering solutions via methods of application to address practical, field-based problems and issues; this is in strict opposition to a lengthy quiz of student knowledge as has been the standard in the past--simple facts without proper application are impertinent. Immediate changes include broadening the range of questions offered on the comprehensive exam and further tailoring the grading rubric.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):

In 2012, students struggled most with the research portion of comps, which was comprised of approximately 100 true-false and multiple choice questions about statistical facts. Entirely absent was any sort of interpretation of data or synthesis of findings with meaning. Since at least 2010, the research section was failed most often, resulting in retakes in summer. To better address critical thinking skills rather than rote memorization, all questions were revised for the 2013 comprehensive examination and students performed at satisfactory levels. Ongoing revisions will maintain focus on higher-order thinking skills through questions that require students to address scenarios by applying research concepts and skills.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDD 03: LO Ability to Plan

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

. Ability to Plan – Demonstrate the ability to develop a supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Needs Assessment Project: Candidates will use the knowledge they will gain about assessment, data interpretation, and data analysis to address a problem in their school or district. The goal will be to show the ability to design, align, and evaluate curriculum and to guide professional learning.
2. The CUR 812 *Comprehensive Assessment and Data Analysis* instructor will administer the project and grades it according to a rubric.
3. Mean scores and percent correct will be calculated for the total score and each section of the project.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of Results:

Overall, the candidates are performing well on this assessment and are continuing to improve over time. The highest scores for this group were the Identify the Problem (99%) and the Develop an action plan/implementation (96%), which increased by 20% in one year. The Describe Hunches & hypotheses section was the lowest (89%), along with Analyze political realities & root causes (86%). These results are overall consistent with those from previous years but are showing improvement that seems to be stabilizing

CUR 812

Area	Possible score	Average score 2008 N=22	% 2008	Average score 2009 N=19	% 2009	Average score 2010 N=14	% 2010	Average score 2011 N=15	% 2011	Average score 2012 N=14	% 2012	Average score 2013 N=24	% 2013
Identify the problem	15	13.5	90%	14.6	98%	14.5	97%	13.8	92%	14.36	96%	14.9	99%
Describe hunches & hypotheses	10	8.6	86%	9.1	91%	9.2	91%	8.7	87%	9.21	92%	8.9	89%
Identify questions & data	10	9.2	92%	9	90%	8.6	86%	8.7	87%	9.07	91%	9.0	90%
Analyze multiple measures	20	17.5	87.5%	17.7	89%	18.7	93.5%	17.6	88%	17.36	87%	18.42	92%
Analyze political realities & root causes	10	8.8	88%	9.3	93%	9.2	92%	8.7	87%	9.07	91%	8.6	86%
Develop an action plan/implementation	20	18.1	90.5%	18	90%	18.2	91%	17.7	89%	15.5	76%	19.2	96%

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Area	Possible score	Average score 2008 N=22	% 2008	Average score 2009 N=19	% 2009	Average score 2010 N=14	% 2010	Average score 2011 N=15	% 2011	Average score 2012 N=14	% 2012	Average score 2013 N=24	% 2013
Narrative (reflection)	15	14.6	97.3%	14.4	96%	14.3	95.3%	14.1	94%	12.71	85%	14.17	94%
Total	100	90.3	90.3%	92.1	92.1%	92.7	92.7%	89.4	89.4%	87.28	88%	93.19	93%

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

It seems students may not consistently understand how to describe hunches & hypotheses or how to analyze political realities & root causes, as indicated by the lower scores in 2013 data as compared with data from 2012. While these scores are not significantly lower than previous scores, it could benefit students to see appropriate examples of each of these elements required for the project. Additionally, continued effort toward describing these aspects could also help increase scores. In 2012, the largest change in scores occurred in the narrative section, with nearly a 10% drop in one year. The next largest change occurred in the developing an action plan/implementation section, with a 7% reduction. Suggestions for improvement include emphasizing all the elements of the needs analysis in which students score lowest, including the aforementioned as well as identifying questions & data, and analyzing political realities & root causes. Teaching additional mini-lessons and even pre-testing on these concepts would heighten students' awareness and understanding of their importance in the assignment.

Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):

The 2013 results for the Needs Analysis project were stronger overall than those for 2012, although there were two areas that lost a few percentage points; it's important to keep in mind that there were 10 more students in 2013 than in 2012, however. For 2012-2013, the same instructor has taught the course and has brought stability to results through increased understanding and communication for the assignment and assessment procedures. Scores from 2012 seem comparable to 2011 scores, and in most cases the newer scores exceed older scores. Over time, we will revise and make adjustments as we continue to learn how students respond to the assignment.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDD 04: LO Clinical Practice

Start: 7/1/2013
End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Clinical Practice – Demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for a school leader while in the field.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Mentor Evaluation Form: The mentors will complete evaluation forms of the intern’s work during the practicum projects in the field.

2. Data will be collected during AED 737 *Practicum III in School Administration*, which will be taught each fall and spring semester.

3. Mean scores and score distributions will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of Results:

There were ten candidates in the class. The candidates in the course had previously taken AED 636, so they were very familiar and comfortable with the format and nature of the course. There was one issue with candidates submitting mentor evaluations. Most evaluations were mailed to the instructor in a timely fashion. The mentors were directors and assistant superintendents for this course.

AED 737 student	Review of Literature		Project 1		Project 2		Project 3		Project 4		Final	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
1	95	95	98	99	98	98	96	100	96	98	A	A
2	I	100	I	100	I	100	I	100	I	100	I	A
3	96	98	97	99	90	98	95	100	95	99	A	A
4	99	99	100	99	99	98	89	96	93	96	A	A
5	92	91	96	94	95	96	98	98	90	99	A	A
6	92	90	I	93	I	95	I	89	I	98	I	B
7	94	97	100	96	98	100	98	98	99	99	A	A
8	95	97	95	100	75	100	75	99	76	99	C	A
9	93	100	98	98	90	100	92	100	99	99	A	A
10	89	94	97	99	96	99	99	94	99	97	A	A

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

Program faculty will discuss possible ways to improve consistent mentor feedback.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):

This course was revised in 2007. The changes made have been very positive and have allowed the instructor more control over projects candidates choose in the field. Candidates in AED 737 are much better prepared for the workload of this course if they were successful in AED 636. The average for the mentor evaluations remains consistently high; therefore, program faculty are pleased with the field supervisors' views of candidate performance. The quality of projects was outstanding. Candidates chose projects that were relevant to current issues and rated as highly applicable.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDD 05: LO Ability to Support Student Learning and Development

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Ability to Support Student Learning and Development –

Demonstrate ability to create and maintain a school culture which supports student learning and development.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Curriculum Resource Unit (CRU) is a compilation of activities and materials on a particular curriculum topic or problem. The Curriculum Resource Unit is typically developed by a curriculum leader as a resource for teachers who want to create their own learning units on the topic. Contains suggestions and information that assist the teacher in supplementing the basic textbook in a course. The Curriculum Resource Unit has five components: (1) Introduction, (2) Instructional Goals, (3) Learning Activities, (4) Evaluation Techniques, and (5) References and Resources.

2. The Curriculum Resource Unit is an assignment in CUR 819 *Curriculum Construction and Coordination*, which is taught each summer.

3. Averages for each component will be calculated in order to provide diagnostic information.

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of Results:

The program faculty are satisfied with the scores overall, though there are areas in which we will focus for improvement. It is positive that one of the highest scores has fluctuated in the past, so the change in scores was likely due to the change in faculty and will likely result in increased improvement over time due to instructor consistency and competence.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

N	Introduction 20 points	Instructional goals 20 points	Learning activities 20 points	Evaluation techniques 20 points	References list 20 points	Overall 100 points
2013 N=20	19.75/20 99%	19.70/20 99%	19.60/20 98%	19.90/20 100%	18.35/20 92%	97.3%
2012 N=8	19.1/20 96%	19.6/20 98%	18.6/20 93%	19.5/20 98%	18.6/20 93%	93.4 93.4%
2011 N=11	95%	87%	99%	98%	94%	91.5%
2010 N=10	96%	85%	100%	92.5%	97.5%	94.2%
2009 N=8	92.9%	95.1%	94.3%	94%	94%	94.3%

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

Due to better scores in all areas other than one that remained stable, the only recommendations for future sections of this course include clearly describing the assignment and assessment procedures as well as providing appropriate examples of the project. In 2012, scores indicated that direct instruction was needed on instructional goals, as students performed most poorly on this element of the curriculum resource unit. Since then, scores have increased and remained stable for two years. With continued effort and consistency among the instructor and his methods, we anticipate scores to remain stable.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):

For 2013, scores remained stable or increased in every area except the references section. This indicates much stronger results with more than twice the amount of students in 2013 than in 2012. This may be due to having the same professor (Watkins) teaching the course for two semesters prior, which likely enabled him to feel more comfortable and familiar with the assignment's requirements and what quality work looks like. Despite somewhat different group sizes, achievement is comparable across 2011 and 2012, with the only real change in two areas: instructional goals and learning activities. While the first of these areas' scores decreased in 2012, the latter increased. Otherwise, scores were stable regardless of the group size and are now clearly stronger.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-EAS 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge – Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge with both the content and pedagogy of the Specialist in Educational Leadership program

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Entrance scores on a nationally recognized, norm-referenced test of verbal ability will be required. Typically, candidates submit CAAP or GRE Writing scores.
2. Scores will be submitted to the Graduate Office and documented in Banner.
3. Mean scores will be calculated. Admission rubrics are used to determine admission status for the program.

Results of Evaluation

Candidates must receive a minimum score of 3.0 on the CAAP, a 172 on the Praxis Writing Exam, or 3.00 on the GRE Analytical Writing assessments in order to receive full admission in the Ed.S. Program.

Summary of Results:

- CAAP – No candidates submitted scores.
- GRE Analytic Writing – Five candidates submitted scores. The average was 330 and the scores ranged from 320 to 340.
- Praxis Writing I- Seventeen candidates submitted scores ranging from 172-186, and the average is 176.

The mean from the 2013 GRE was slightly lower than that of the past years. This year is the first year Praxis Writing Scores were presented. The average Praxis Writing Score is 176.

Analysis of Results of 2013:

- The results indicated that student GRE scores decreased from 333 in 2012 to 330 in 2013.
- The Praxis I Writing scores are overall higher than the required 172. The average score of 176 is higher than the state required average of 174.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

CAAP Scores 2011									
Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	2009 Calendar Year	2010 Calendar Year	2011 Calendar Year	2012	2013
3.75	3.5	3.25	4.0	3.5	4.00	3.75	4.75	4	0
3.0	3.5	5.5	3.5	4.5	5.00	3.50	3.5	4	
3.0	3.25	4.5		5.	3.00	4.00	3.75	4	
3.5	4.0	4.0		3.5	3.75	3.25		3	
3.75	4.5	3.0		4.0	3.25	3.75		4	
3.5	4.75			3.75	3.00	3.25			
	3.5				4.00				
	3.0				3.50				
					4.0				
					4.25				
					4.00				
					3.25				
					4.50				
					3.50				
					3.50				
					4.50				
					4.25				
					3.50				
					3.25				
					3.75				
3.42 (avg)	3.75 (avg)	4.05 (avg)	3.75 (avg)	4.04 (avg)	3.77 (avg)	3.58 (avg)	4.0 (avg)	3.8	0

GRE Analytical Writing				
2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
430	500	3.0	310	320
410	380	4.0	320	340
360	550	3.5	320	320
420	310	3.0	350	340
550	330		370	330
390	390		370	320
430			300	
290				
460				
670				
330				
430.91 (avg)	410 (avg)	3.375 (avg)	333	330

Praxis
2013= 17
Average 176

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The analysis in relationship to unit goals and areas of emphasis indicates that students who are meeting entry-level requirements are focused on education as a lifelong endeavor. Most of the students had average results.

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

No changes are recommended based upon the analysis of entry-level acceptance scores on the CAAP, GRE, or Praxis I Writing examinations.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-EAS 02: LO Program Specific Content

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Program Specific Content – Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Educational Leadership.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. Comprehensive Examinations: Essay-style comprehensive examinations will be taken at the end of the program by all candidates and must be passed in order to earn the degree. Items will be based upon the School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) and scored by program faculty.

3. Mean scores, score distributions, and pass rates will be compiled annually. A 3-point scale of 0 – 2 is used, with an average of 1 required to pass the exam.

Results of Evaluation

In 2013, 15 candidates took comprehensive examinations. The average score was 1.58. The average scores on each question ranged from 1.25 to 1.80.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Data have been collected by question to provide diagnostic information.

2009 Mean Scores (N = 17)	2010 N=17	2011	2012 N=11	2013 N= 15
1.64	.64		1.5	1.5
1.55	1.5		1.65	1.63
1.8	1.64		1.75	1.43
1.5	1.3		1.25	1.75
1.61	1.45		1.65	1.5
1.41	1.45		1.65	1.25
1.48	1.5		1.75	1.75
1.14	1.59		1.75	1.75
1.41	1.68		1.65	1.5
1.77	1.36		1.75	1.25
1.36	1.59		1.75	1.53
1.95	1.18			1.63
1.64	1.43			1.65
1.30	1.68			1.75
1.57	1.79			1.80
1.64	1.77			
1.75	1.86			
1.56 (avg)	1.50		1.65	1.58

Use of Evaluation Results

1. No specific trend was found when compared with scores from previous years. The range of scores from past years have remained within the same range.
2. Course content will be analyzed and emphasis will be placed in areas of weakness so that scores in all areas are in the acceptable range.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-EAS 03: LO Ability to Plan

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Ability to Plan – Demonstrate the ability to develop a supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Curriculum Alignment Project will provide the candidate with experience working with the district level administrator in charge of curriculum and instruction. The candidate will plan and conduct a curriculum audit of language arts at a designated grade level. The area to be addressed in the audit are :

- Alignment between the local curriculum and the state framework
- Alignment between the curriculum and instruction
- Alignment of assessment to curriculum and instruction

2. The project will be completed in AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration*, a practicum course. The course will be taught each Fall and Spring semester.

2. Range of scores and means will be calculated annually. The project is scored with a 5-point rubric: 5 – Exemplary 4 – Good, 3 – Acceptable, 2 – Fair, 1 – Poor.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results: The results of the CUR 703 Curriculum Project assignment resulted in student grades ranging from 90 to 100, with an overall average of 97. A total of 50 students were enrolled in the class during 2013.

Analysis of Results of 2013: The results indicate that students are successfully mastering the objectives:

1. Constructing investigative procedures targeted to specific educational programs and problems in the field.
2. Analyzing current leadership and management theory and research with field-based practices of experienced administrators.
3. Analyzing collected data pertaining to school/district programs and problems and drawing conclusions on best practice alternatives.
4. Compiling a professional development plan relative to the program and problem area under investigation.
5. Presenting a written and oral report justifying the conclusions and recommended best practices relative to the program and problem area.

Use of Evaluation Results

Overall, the trend has remained the same over the past few years. The average for the past few years is 94.

This assessment is aligned to focus on procedures, leadership and management theory, data collection, professional development, and recommendations and conclusions based on best practices.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-EAS 04: LO Clinical Practice

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Clinical Practice – Demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for a school leader while in the field.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Mentor Evaluation Form: The mentors will complete evaluation forms of the intern’s work during the practicum projects in the field.
2. Data will be collected during AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration*, which will be taught each fall and spring semester.
3. Mean scores and score distributions will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation

In 2013, Mentor Evaluation Forms were completed on 10 candidates in AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration*. Nine candidates received the grade of A (90%) and one received the grade of B (10%).

Grade Distributions for Mentor Evaluations

Grades 1 = A 2 = B 3 = C	Grade Distribution For 736		
	N	Grade	%
N = 12			
3	A	10	83
2	B	1	8.5
1	C		
0	I	1	8.5

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Consider disaggregating the mentor evaluation score for each of AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration* projects and link these to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards to obtain diagnostic information.
2. None at this time.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-EAS 05: LO Ability to Support Student Learning and Development

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Ability to Support Student Learning and Development – Demonstrate ability to create and maintain a school culture which supports student learning and development.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Curriculum Development Project: The project requires candidates to complete the following:
 - Purpose of curriculum design and delivery
 - Components and content of written curriculum
 - Curriculum and assessment development cycle
2. This project will be part of the requirements for CUR 703 *Dynamic Leadership for Curriculum and Assessment*.
3. Means and score distributions will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation

In 2013, 50 candidates completed the Curriculum Development Project. The scores ranged from 75 – 100, with a mean of 97.25 and a median and mode of 100.

2009 N = 43	2010 N = 22	2011 N = 20	2012 N=41	2013 N=50
Mean 75.12	Mean 93.7	Mean 97.25	Mean 93.3	Mean 97

Use of Evaluation Results

1. No changes recommended at this time.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-EAS 06: LO Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Dispositions – Demonstrate appropriate dispositions necessary for success as a school leader.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The graduate version of the Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS) will be administered to all candidates early in the program. Program faculty will use these to monitor candidate progress throughout the program. Any areas of weakness must be rectified before the candidate is eligible to sit for Comprehensive Examinations.

Dispositional characteristics assessed are as follows: fairness, the belief that all students can learn, professionalism, resourcefulness, dependability, commitment to inquiry.

The assessment uses a 4-point scale: 1 does not meet expectations; 2 meets a few expectations, but not sufficient; 3 meets expectations; and 4 exceeds expectations.

2. The DRS will be administered at full admission to the program. Faculty will review the DRS again when clearing the candidate to take the comprehensive examination.

3. Score ranges will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results of 2013: A small majority of candidates rated themselves a two in four of the six categories, A majority of the candidates received ratings of a three in six categories, and the remainder of the candidates received a four.

Analysis of Results of 2013: The results from past years have been an average of a three. The results from this year indicate that a small percentage fall into a score range of a two, while more than usual advance into the category of a four. Students indicated that they needed to grow in the area of inquiry. Specifically, data analysis was the focus of need. Student overall indicated an average for experience in this category. This is an area of focus for improvement for the program. The majority of the students who received a rating of a four indicated that fairness was an area they felt was being addressed in a positive way.

2013 Results	2	3	4	
1 Fairness		14	16	
2 All Students Can Learn		21	9	
3 Professionalism	1	19	10	
4 Resourcefulness	1	22	7	
5 Dependability	1	24	5	
6 Commitment to Inquiry	3	22	5	

Use of Evaluation Results

1. It is recommended that the Dispositions Rating Scale be administered as a self-assessment in AED 702 *Role of the Principal*. Faculty would review the self-assessment at application to the comprehensive examination, as well as reviewing any disposition flags for the student. Each student must be cleared before sitting for the comprehensive examination.
2. None at this time.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-ELE 01: LO Demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge and skills

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge and skills associated with the content of the Ed.S. degree program in Elementary Education.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. A comprehensive examination will be administered each semester to candidates in the final course work of the Educational Specialist degree program.

3. A rubric will be used to evaluate the examinations and scores will be analyzed to assess strengths and weaknesses in the program.

The assessment data are linked to both the National Board For Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) for the middle childhood/generalist (Standard II, knowledge of Content and Curriculum) and the early childhood generalist (Standard V, Knowledge of Integrated

Curriculum). These standards relate directly to knowledge/skills elementary teachers need in order to understand the content to be taught. Assessment data are also linked to Guiding Principle 1 of the College of Education Conceptual Framework.

Results of Evaluation

2013, a total of 7 EdS candidates took the comprehensive exam. One out of the seven failed the exams, thus yielding a pass rate of 86%. All of the candidates responded to items for CEL 705 & CEL 706, which is a requirement for Comps. Of the 7 responses for CEL 705, 3 received target ratings and 4 received acceptable ratings. Of the 7 responses for CEL 706, 2 received target ratings, 4 received acceptable ratings, and 1 received an unacceptable rating. Candidates had choices between CEL 711, CEL 712, CSP 616, and CSP 648. Six of the candidates responded to prompts for CEL 711 with three 4 receiving target ratings and 2 receiving an acceptable rating. Seven candidates responded to prompts from CEL 712 with 3 receiving a target rating and 4 receiving acceptable ratings. One of the candidates responded to the prompt for CSP 616 and received an acceptable rating. Six candidates responded to CSP 648. Three received target ratings and three received acceptable ratings.

Overall, the EDS candidates demonstrated comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the important concepts and topics encountered throughout the EDS program of study. The prompt that was attempted by all but failed by one was for CEL 706.

Trends Noted

Performance on the comps has remained consistent for the EDS students. Dissemination of a comps study guide began 2011 to mirror the support offered to the MED candidates. The pass rate for the 2011 candidates was slightly less than the 2010 candidates but the number of 2011 candidates was greater. CSP 648 was added to the comps Fall 2012 to accommodate candidates who took it instead of CSP 616; however, no online candidates chose to respond to the CSP 648 prompt. In 2013, six EDS candidates responded to the CSP 648 prompts and were successful.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The prompt for CSP 648 will be maintained; candidates attempted the prompt and were successful.
2. No changes will be made to the comps at this time.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate skill in verbal ability

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate skill in verbal ability adequate for success in a graduate program

Data Collection (Evidence)

A satisfactory writing proficiency score must be submitted by the student during the first 12 hours of coursework in order to receive full admission. Candidates may choose one of the following assessments:

CAAP – minimum score of 3

GRE Writing – minimum score of 4.0

MAT – minimum score of 30

Praxis I Writing (PPST or CBT) – minimum score of 174

NTE (Communication Skills) – minimum score of 653

Results of Evaluation

A total of 29 candidates gained full acceptance in the Ed.S. program in 2013 (21 online and 8 Tishomingo cohort). Their Praxis writing scores ranged from 174-179. CAAP writing scores ranged from 3-4. All candidates demonstrated acceptable verbal ability.

Trends Noted

No trends are apparent. All of the fully admitted candidates presented the required verbal proficiency scores.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty discussions explored the relevance of requiring a score of 174 as opposed to requiring the score of 172 that is acceptable for licensure with the State Department of Education.
2. The requirement for the 174 Praxis writing score will be maintained.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-ELE 03: LO Demonstrate the ability to plan and support planning

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to plan and support planning at a level commensurate with the Educational Specialist level of expertise.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. In order to show that candidates in the Educational Specialist degree program in Elementary Education can plan and support planning at an advanced level of expertise, candidates in CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* and CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum* will plan and teach lessons based on a modified Graduate Teacher Work Sample that incorporates a research component for this advanced level of preparation. The first nine indicators of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument will also be used. CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* is taught the first semester of each academic year.

3. These sections of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) will be used to show the ability to plan and support planning: Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision Making, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education.

The assessment data in this area are related to the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, Standard II (Knowledge of Content and Curriculum) and Standard VI (Meaningful Applications of Knowledge) for the middle childhood/generalist and Standard VI (Multiple Teaching Strategies of Meaningful Learning) for the early childhood generalist.

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013, all (100%) of the online candidates in CEL 706- Practicum in Intermediate Grades received acceptable or target ratings in all areas of the TIAI that relate to the ability to plan (indicators 1-9). The areas with the greatest number of acceptable ratings were noted in the candidates' ability to integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons (6 out of 10) and plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners (7 out of 10).

Fall 2013, all (100%) online candidates in CEL 705- Practicum in Early Childhood received target ratings in all areas of the TIAI. They demonstrated the ability to perform the following tasks: select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards; incorporate diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons; integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas; prepares appropriate assessments; communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students; and incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments.

Spring 2013, all (100%) of the Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 706- Practicum in Intermediate Grades received target ratings in all areas of the TIAI that relate to the ability to plan (indicators 1-9). Fall 2013, all (100%) candidates in CEL 705- Practicum in Early Childhood received target ratings in all areas of the TIAI that relate to the ability to plan (indicators 1-9).

Overall, all of the online candidates demonstrated the ability to plan appropriate lessons for K-6 students and received acceptable or target ratings. 2013 TIAI data for items 1-9 indicate that candidates can incorporate diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. They performed well on the ability to integrate knowledge from several subject areas in lessons and the ability to select a variety of appropriate materials and technology

for lessons. They noted strong abilities to communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. They also performed well on tasks that required them to use assessment information to plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. Finally, they demonstrated the ability to develop and use a variety of formal assessments (ex. – pretests, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. Overall, all of the Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 705 and CEL 706 demonstrated the ability to plan appropriate lessons for K-6 students and received target ratings

Trends Noted

A previous concern with the candidates' ability to explicitly align all lessons with learning goals, integrate physical education and health into the unit lessons, effectively use technology, and foster higher thinking skills was addressed with the following: more explicit and specific online discussions regarding planning effective lessons; targeted course readings; and research assignments that focused on specific aspects of the TIAI indicators. Instructor feedback while planning the unit was also implemented. Previous weak areas have seen improvement with most (at least 90%) candidates meeting all of the indicators.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Revisit course content and experiences that involve planning differentiated learning experiences. Course instructors will engage online candidates in discussions about differentiating instruction.

2. We will maintain an emphasis on technology use, differentiating instruction, and fostering higher order thinking skills. We will continue to monitor candidate performance of indicators 1-9 of the TIAI. We will also monitor adjunct perception of acceptable candidate performance.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-ELE 04: LO Demonstrate the ability to successfully teach in a field experience/clinical setting.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to successfully teach in a field experience/clinical setting.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. Candidates in CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* and CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum* will teach a lesson that will be videotaped and assessed using a scoring guide.

3. A modification of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample incorporating parts of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) (indicators 10-34) will be used to collect data.

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013, all (100%) online candidates in CEL 706- Practicum in Intermediate Grades received acceptable or target ratings for all indicators of the TIAI for teaching. All (100%) candidates communicated high expectations for learning to all students; provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught; used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies; provided learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners; used family and/or community resources; and created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. All (100%) online candidates earned acceptable or target ratings for the following indicators: provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities; engaged students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provided opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking; and maximized time available for instruction. Fall 2013, all (100%) online candidates in CEL 705-Practicum in Early Childhood received target ratings on all indicators. Strong performance was noted in the candidates' ability to convey enthusiasm for teaching and learning and provide opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning and engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning.

Spring 2013, all (100%) of the Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 706- Practicum in Intermediate Grades received target ratings in all areas of the TIAI that relate to clinical practices (indicators 10-25). Fall 2013, all (100%) Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 705- Practicum in Early Childhood received target ratings in all areas of the TIAI that relate to clinical practices (indicators 10-25).

Overall, all of the online and Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 705 and CEL 706 demonstrated the ability to plan appropriate lessons for K-6 students and received target ratings. 2013 TIAI data for items 10-25 indicate that candidates have improved in their abilities to provide learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners, provide opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking, use higher-order questions to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking, uses family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to enhance student learning, and establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, etc).

Trends Noted

Online candidates have consistently implemented sound instruction and have demonstrated content and pedagogical content knowledge. The TIAI was revised to present more explicit descriptions of expectations for each indicator. Candidates continued to perform well as indicated by the revised instrument. The graduate faculty will continue to emphasize effective planning and teaching techniques in the practicum course and all other courses that include planning and teaching. Special emphasis will be put on providing a consistent level of instruction and instructor-student interactions to counteract a lull in performance for either group. Communicating course expectations with adjunct faculty and modifying discussions, course readings, and other course activities to increase candidate engagement with sound teaching practices seems to have also benefited this practicum course. Though candidates have noted improvement with providing learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners, providing opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking, using higher-order questions to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking, and using family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to enhance student learning, these areas will continue to be monitored.

A previous concern with the Tishomingo Cohort candidates' ability to explicitly align all lessons with learning goals, integrate physical education and health into the unit lessons, effectively use technology, and foster higher thinking skills was addressed with the following: more explicit and specific online discussions regarding planning effective lessons; targeted course readings; and research assignments that focused on specific aspects of the TIAI indicators. Instructor feedback while planning the unit was also implemented. Previous weak areas have seen improvement. For 2013, all Tishomingo candidates demonstrated the ability to teach in an effective manner.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The graduate faculty will indicate specific course experiences and resources that will emphasize strategies and accommodations for diverse learners.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-ELE 05: LO Demonstrate that candidate's teaching has an impact on student learning and support of an environment that supports learning.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate that candidate's teaching has an impact on student learning and support of an environment that supports learning.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. Candidates in CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* and CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum* will use student data from the Teacher Work Sample to demonstrate impact on student learning.

3. The Analysis of Student Learning sections of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample will be used to collect this data. This area is directly related to Standard III (Learning Environment) of the middle childhood/generalist standards for the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards.

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013, online candidates in CEL 706-Practicum in Intermediate Grades demonstrated the ability to develop and implement instruction based on contextual factors, meaningfully interpret student data, and draw appropriate conclusions. Strengths were noted in the candidates' ability to display broad based, culturally sensitive, and specific understanding of student differences that may affect learning (9 out of 10 met indicator), develop significant and challenging learning objectives (8 out of 10 met indicator), present content that was accurate and of high integrity according to the national and state standards (9 out of 10 met indicator), make instructional decisions and modifications that were based upon sound professional practice (9 out of 10 met indicator), successfully integrate language arts (9 out of 10 met indicator), and describe the evaluation procedures and select the appropriateness of the reading and curriculum materials (10 out of 10 met indicator). Weaknesses were noted in the candidates' ability to display general & specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning specific to the unit planned (4 out of 10 partially met the indicator), explain how objectives promoted creativity and higher order thinking skills (5 out of 10 partially met indicator), address prompts in the narrative regarding the plan's design, including records of individual progress, and how assessments reflect a respect for student diversity (6 out of 10 partially met indicator), design instruction with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data (5 out of 10 partially met indicator), modify instructional plan to address individual student needs (5 out of 10 partially met indicator), and reflect on successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provide plausible, thorough reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof (6 out of 10 partially met indicator). Fall 2013, online candidates in CEL 705-Practicum in Early Childhood demonstrated proficiency in all areas of the TWS. All (100%) candidates scored 3/3 and fully met the indicators in all areas.

All (7 out of 7) Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 705-Practicum in Early Childhood demonstrated proficiency in all areas of the TWS. All (100%) candidates scored 3/3 in all areas and fully met the indicators in all areas. Most Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 706 scored 3/3 in most areas and fully met the indicators in most areas. However, 1 out of 7 candidates partially met the indicator that demonstrated knowledge of community, school and classroom factors and knowledge of student skills and prior learning. Some (3 out of 7) candidates partially met the indicator for utilizing multiple modes and approaches for assessing students. Finally, some (4 out of 7) of the candidates partially met the indicator for presenting data with accuracy and clarity and including evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning objective.

The online candidates in CEL 706 (spring) were able to display broad based, culturally sensitive, and specific understanding of student differences that may affect learning, develop significant and challenging learning objectives, present content that was accurate and of high integrity according to the national and state standards, make instructional decisions and modifications that were based upon sound professional practice, and successfully integrate language arts. However, they exhibited the greatest weaknesses in addressing prompts in the narrative regarding the plan's design, including records of individual progress, and how assessments reflect a respect for student diversity. Another weakness was the candidates' ability to reflect on successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provide plausible, thorough reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof. All online candidates in CEL 705 (fall) demonstrated mastery in all areas of the TWS.

All Tishomingo Cohort candidates in CEL 705 (fall) demonstrated mastery in all areas of the TWS. They were able to examine contextual factors and use the information to plan instruction, develop clear learning objectives that aligned with national, state, and/or local standards and represented variety in challenge levels. All candidates demonstrated the ability to develop an appropriate assessment plan, design differentiated instruction, design instruction and make sound instructional decisions, analyze student learning, and reflect on their instruction. They also demonstrated the ability to engage in topic-specific research that informed the development of their TWS. Candidates in CEL 706 presented weaknesses in using multiple modes and approaches for assessment as well as presenting data with accuracy and clarity and including evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning objective.

Trends Noted

Faculty discussed the rigor of this assessment in regards to the task that requires data analysis for subgroups. It was agreed that the EDS candidates needed to incorporate policies and community involvement and they needed to complete this task with more in-depth analysis of student learning. Beginning Spring 2011, the TWS was modified to include more in-depth exploration of the community's impact on contextual factors and task 6 of the TWS was modified to require candidates to analyze prescribed subgroups which reflect current classroom populations, assessments, and school district policies. Overall ratings for these areas were improved and remain strong. A 2012 review of Section 6 indicates candidates showed weaknesses in the ability to interpret the data and demonstrate evidence of their impact on student learning. This weakness was addressed with modifying the sample Section 6 of the TWS with an extended section on interpreting data and demonstrating evidence of impact on student learning. To further differentiate MED & EDS performance on the TWS, faculty agreed to enrich Section 3-Assessment to require the EDS candidates to self-design assessments and justify the appropriateness of those assessments with research annotations. 2013 data for both CEL 705 and CEL 706 showed candidates successfully self-designed and annotated the assessments. Data also revealed improvement in analyzing impact on student learning.

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. It appears the CEL 705 – Practicum in Early Childhood candidates’ instruction is sound. The modified Section 3-Assessment required candidates to self-design assessments and justify their designs with research annotations. All candidates performed this task well. Faculty will continue to monitor candidate performance with Section 3. Since candidate performance in CEL 706 – Practicum in Intermediate Grades was markedly lower, faculty will highlight instruction for the intermediate grades during synchronous class meetings that facilitate the candidates’ ability to translate research to classroom practices.

Related Items

There are no related items.

EDS-ELE 06: LO Demonstrate that candidate teaching reflects appropriate dispositions necessary for effective teaching.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate that candidate teaching reflects appropriate dispositions necessary for effective teaching.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Candidates complete a Dispositions Portfolio prior to taking the comprehensive examination. The portfolio includes (1) completing the Graduate Dispositions Rating Scale as a self-assessment, and (2) the submission of artifacts to provide a rationale for the self-ratings given. The program coordinator uses a 4-point scale (1 low – 4 high) to assess the candidate’s skill in providing a rationale for the self-ratings.

2. Data are collected in TaskStream.

3. TaskStream reports provide necessary statistical data for interpretation of the information.

National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, Standard II (Equity, Fairness, and Diversity) of the middle childhood/generalist area is directly related to dispositions.

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013, faculty ratings for EDS candidate dispositions revealed an average of 3.33/4 (83 %) for fairness, 3.33/4 (83 %) for the belief that all students can learn, 3.33/4 (83 %) for professionalism, 3.33/4 (83 %) for resourcefulness, 3.33/4 (83 %) for dependability, and 3.33/4 (83 %) for commitment to inquiry. Ratings were equal across the dispositions. Fall 2013, faculty ratings for EDS candidate dispositions revealed an average of 3.33/4 (83 %) for fairness, 3.67/4 (91.67%) for the belief that all students can learn, 3.67/4 (91.67%) for professionalism, 3.33/4 (83 %) for resourcefulness, 3.33/4 (83 %) for dependability, and 3.67/4 (91.67%) for commitment to inquiry. According to candidate’s self-ratings, most

(90%) gave themselves “exceeds expectations” for belief that all students can learn and dependability. No candidate submitted a self-rating less than “meets expectations” for any disposition.

All candidates met or exceeded expectations for all dispositions. However, fall candidates earned higher ratings for the belief that all students can learn, professionalism, and commitment to inquiry. Spring and fall candidates earned equal ratings on all other dispositions. The evidence suggested the candidates possessed the professional dispositions outlined in the assessment but demonstrated stronger evidence of the belief that all students could learn, professionalism, and commitment to inquiry.

Trends Noted

Fall 2010 was the first iteration of the Dispositions Portfolio. Data analysis for future iterations was analyzed for trends. According to faculty ratings, the following means were noted: Fairness- 2.83/4; belief that all students can learn-3.33/4; professionalism- 3.33/4; resourcefulness- 3.17/4; dependability-3.33/4; and commitment to inquiry- 3.17/4. Particular attention was paid to the Fairness category since this was a weakness before the electronic Disposition Portfolio was begun. In 2011, a weakness continued to be noted in the candidates’ ability to demonstrate fairness. The faculty developed a tips sheet for helping candidates identify and reflect upon their demonstrations of fairness. The tips were added to the Dispositions Portfolio directions document. The 2012 data revealed that candidates’ overall ability to demonstrate fairness improved. In 2013, fairness did not present as a weakness. All candidates met or exceeded expectations for all dispositions. However, fall candidates earned higher ratings for the belief that all students can learn, professionalism, and commitment to inquiry. Course instructors highlight professional dispositions and will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) aspects of course assignments and activities that exemplify fairness and resourcefulness. Course faculty will also emphasize the professional responsibility of being dependable as candidates engage in online group assignments and projects.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. No changes will be made to the instrument or process for assessing dispositions.
2. We will continue to work to improve candidate ratings with fairness, resourcefulness, and dependability. Course instructors will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) aspects of course assignments and activities that exemplify fairness and resourcefulness. Course faculty will also emphasize the professional responsibility of being dependable as candidates engage in online group assignments and projects.

Related Items

There are no related items.

➤ MAT 01: LO Demonstrate proficiency in basic pre-professional and content knowledge

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate proficiency in basic pre-professional and content knowledge the Mississippi Department of Education requires for Alternate - Route Teacher Education candidates through the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree Program.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. All MAT teacher candidates will be required to pass an essay-type comprehensive examination. The examination focuses on the planning, implementation, and assessment of teaching and learning. The examination will be administered during the spring semester of each academic year. Teacher candidates who do not pass all portions of the examination will be provided with study recommendations and will retake failed portions during the Summer I term of each academic year.

3. The rubric scoring criteria is represented by 1-Unacceptable, 2-Acceptable and 3-Target.

Results of Evaluation

100% of the Cohort VIII candidates passed the comprehensive examination during the Spring 2013 semester. The M.A.T. candidates answered 5 questions submitted by three of their professors. The questions were generated from the following courses: CUR/CEL 611 *Classroom Management*, CUR/CEL 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*, CSP 546 *Advanced Survey of Exceptional Children*, CUR/CEL 614 *Methods of Instruction*, CML 509 *Technology in Education*. Candidates must earn an average score of at least 2.00 to pass the exam. The overall average score for CUR/CEL 611 was 2.5, CSP 546 was 1.9, CEL/CSD 614 was 2.4, CUR/CEL 612 was 2.7, and CML 509 was 3.0.

Only one student had to retake two of the questions after the first administration of the exam. The student had to retake the questions from CSP 546 and CEL/CSD 614. The student passed the two questions successfully on the second administration.

There was a decline in scores for CEL/CUR 611, CSP 546 stayed the same, and the other three courses were fairly consistent in average scores.

Trends Noted

The results have remained steady except for CEL/CUR 611 *Classroom Management*. Changes were made in the course content by a new instructor so I would like to meet with the new instructor to review and/or revise the test items to match what is being taught. Content in CSP 546 was changed during the summer of 2013, therefore, results from Spring 2014 should show an increase during the next administration of the exam.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. This is the fifth year that the M.A.T. comprehensive examination has been given. Faculty will continue to analyze the results of the comprehensive examination by question to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the students and the program.
2. Since the students did show a decline in the classroom management exam item, the Director should meet with the instructor to review the test items to make sure they match what is being taught.

Related Items

There are no related items.

⇒ MAT 02: LO Demonstrate the ability to plan and implement instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners in the classroom setting.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to plan and implement instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners in the classroom setting.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. During the CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* candidates will be evaluated on their ability to plan instruction using Domain I: Planning and Preparation of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) for spring and fall 2011. The instrument is used statewide to measure teacher candidates' abilities. The Cohort VI and Cohort VII candidates were trained on this instrument during their first semester in the program.

Each candidate's skills are evaluated a minimum of three times in his/her classroom.

2. A 3-point rubric is used to assess Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (0 – 3) indicators.

3. TaskStream reports provide descriptive statistical analyses.

Results of Evaluation

The M.A.T. candidates were evaluated by two supervisors. The Spring candidates averaged 2.70 for indicator 2 and 2.63 for indicator 3 while the fall candidates averaged 2.1 for indicator 2 and 1.95 for indicator 3. Although individual candidates need additional help to score acceptable for these indicators, the overall cohort improves from the fall to the spring semesters. The fall semester is the first time that these students have been in the classroom and it shows that additional support is needed for them to learn how to incorporate other subjects into their lessons (especially the secondary candidates) and the importance of incorporating diversity into lessons. During 2013 there were more concrete

examples of how to incorporate diversity and how to teach across the curriculum were used in several courses in the program (CEL/CUR 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*, CEL/CSD 614 *Methods of Instruction*, CRD 628 *Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum*). As a result the data show an increase in the overall average from 2012 to 2013 for these two indicators. The M.A.T. methods course, CEL/CSD 614, specifically will continue to incorporate explicit instruction on incorporating diversity and teaching across the curriculum.

Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Indicators in Domain I: Planning and Preparation assess the candidate's ability to plan instruction. Each candidate (Cohort VIII) was evaluated three times during the Spring semester and each candidate (Cohort IX) was evaluated five times during the fall semester of their internship. The TIAI instrument shows a score of "0" as unacceptable, "1" as emerging, "2" as acceptable and a score of "3" as target. I looked at the distribution of scores across each evaluation when analyzing the indicators 1-6. Out of the 6 indicators, indicator #2: Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. Uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful and indicator #3: Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons were the two that were the weakest.

The overall average rating for the elementary candidates for indicator 2 for Spring 13 was 2.66 and for indicator 3 was 2.78 while the overall average rating for indicator 2 for fall 13 was 2.1 and indicator 3 was 2.3. All other indicators are consistently rated as acceptable or on target for each candidate. The overall average rating for the secondary candidates for indicator 2 for Spring 13 was 2.75 and for indicator 3 was 2.47 while the overall average rating for indicator 2 for fall 13 was 2.1 and indicator 3 was 1.6. \

Trends Noted

Last year, I reported a decline for three years consecutively for the indicator that focused on incorporating diversity in the lessons, but for 2013 the average showed an increase. The data for that indicator over the last 4 years is as follows: 2.30, 2.13, 1.20, 1.95. Explicit instruction modeling how to incorporate diversity in lesson planning will continue in the methods course for the M.A.T. Program.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Track candidate performance related to the ability to incorporate multiculturalism and diversity in lessons to determine if curricular changes are needed.
2. A recommendation would be to work with the secondary candidates more explicitly on how to incorporate diversity, prepare assessments and how to differentiate instruction.

Related Items

There are no related items.

⇒ MAT 03: LO Demonstrate the ability to complete a successful internship.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to complete a successful internship.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The MAT Program includes a year-long internship in the field. During the CEL/CUR 650* fall and spring courses candidates will be evaluated three times each semester by a university supervisor using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (Cohort VI during spring 2011 and Cohort VII during fall 2011)
2. A 3-point rubric is used to assess Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (0 – 3) indicators. Data are collected in TaskStream.
3. Descriptive statistics will be calculated in TaskStream.

Results of Evaluation

The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) from the Mississippi Department of Education is designed to assess the performance of teacher candidates within the following five domains associated with effective teaching practices: I) Planning and Preparation (Indicators 1-6 not included in this assessment); II) Assessment (Indicators 7-8); III) Instruction (Indicators 9-19); IV) Learning Environment (Indicators 20-24); and V) Professional Responsibilities (Indicator 25). It contains 25 indicators that are referenced to Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Principles. The TIAI is used to assess the candidates' performance during key field experiences in methods courses and during internship. Indicators 7-25 assess the candidate's knowledge of clinical practice in the domains 2-5 introduced above.

The weakest indicator continues to be #19: "Uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning". The only other two indicators that could use improvement are indicator #7: "Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance" and #17: "Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. Data show that the fall candidates range a little above emerging for indicator 19, but improve during the spring semester to acceptable.

The Elementary candidates during Spring 2013 were rated acceptable or target for each indicator by two different supervisors except for the one student that was rated emerging for indicator #7.

The Elementary candidates during Fall 2013 averaged emerging for indicator 19. TIAI 3 is the observation during the teachers planning unit assignment. I am sure that is why the average is an acceptable rating. Overall, the elementary teachers need to incorporate more family and community resources into their lessons. The other indicators were rated at acceptable or target. The Secondary candidates during Spring 2013 showed an average

rating of acceptable, but when analyzing the distribution of the ratings across each student, I found that one of the four was rated emerging each time. All other indicators were rated acceptable or target. The Fall Secondary candidates showed the greatest need of all 2013 M.A.T. candidates. Over the fall semester, the teachers improved, but still need additional instruction on how to communicate assessment criteria to their students, how to incorporate family and community resources and how to engage students in critical thinking. The fall semester is the first semester of internship and after various assignments, discussions, videos of effective instruction and their own experiences in the classroom, the spring semester shows improvement in these indicators.

Trends Noted:

Over the last four years, the weakest area for the M.A.T. candidates has been indicator #19: “Uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning”. (Previous version of TIAI was indicator 23.) The average ratings are in the “acceptable” range, but individual students struggle trying to implement family and community resources to enhance the lessons. The M.A.T. program has small numbers of candidates for both elementary and secondary tracks. It is important to address the needs of individual students when analyzing data from the TIAI.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Changes were made during 2013 to the assessment (CEL/CUR 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*) and methods (CEL/CSD 614 *Methods of Instruction*) courses to focus more on using a variety of assessments, teaching across the curriculum and including diversity in the lessons. The data show improvements in the student’s performance in the classroom, but these changes need to continue during 2014.
2. The M.A.T. coordinator will provide more opportunities in class to discuss and implement creative ways to use family and community resources in disadvantaged environments.

Related Items

There are no related items.

➤ MAT 04: LO Demonstrate the ability to measure student achievement, employ classroom management, and adjust instruction for maximum impact on student learning.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to measure student achievement, employ classroom management, and adjust instruction for maximum impact on student learning.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. All candidates in Cohort VI successfully completed the Graduate Teacher Work Sample in CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* during the Spring 2011 semester.

During the Fall 2010 CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* course, Cohort VI candidates were given an opportunity to discuss, implement, and reflect on the seven components of the Teacher Work Sample through blackboard assignments which provided a deeper understanding of how the components promote differentiated instruction and effective teaching practices. They completed the Graduate Teacher Work Sample folio in Spring 2011.

During the Fall 2011 CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* course, the candidates in Cohort VII were given an opportunity to discuss, implement, and reflect on the seven components of the Teacher Work Sample through blackboard assignments which provided a deeper understanding of how the components promote differentiated instruction and effective teaching practices.

The Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) folio contains the following components: Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, Reflection and Self-Evaluation, Design for Instruction in Elementary/Secondary Education, and Research-Based Practice.

2. A 3-point rubric is used (1 – indicator not met, 2 – indicator partially met, 3 – indicator met). Data are collected in TaskStream.

3. Descriptive statistics will be calculated using TaskStream.

Results of Evaluation

Since the beginning of the program, candidates in the M.A.T. Program were introduced to Teacher Work Sample (TWS) methodology during one of the first courses taken in the program, CEL/CUR 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*. During 2013 the TWS methodology was moved from Summer I course: CEL/CUR 612 to the Summer II course: CSD/CEL 614 *Methods of Instruction*. This change will be reflected in the Spring 2014 data. The candidates are required to complete the TWS assessment based on hypothetical data during the summer course which prepares them for implementation during CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship*. During the fall semester, the teacher candidate

must complete a teaching unit of integrated study according to the TIAI indicators, and develop a corresponding TWS during the spring semester. In completing the TWS, candidates address a total of eight components, seven of which deal with teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. TWS data is only collected during the Spring semester of the student's internship. In the past only the final submission of TWS was logged in TaskStream. Now, the first draft and final draft are uploaded into TaskStream. Because this information has not been very discriminating, the candidates will be required to upload the first submission and final submission after corrections. The students were very successful. Reflection and Evaluation was rated the lowest, but is still very close to target.

Trends Noted:

Trends over the last four years show that the students are demonstrating acceptable ratings for the components of TWS.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty will meet to discuss revisions of Teacher Work Sample (TWS) to reflect the teachers' ability to plan for diverse students.
2. The first time TWS is introduced is during the summer. That was moved from the assessment course to the methods course during 2013. After analyzing data for Spring 2014, we may find that TWS needs to be moved to the fall semester when the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) teaching unit is completed instead of waiting to complete it in the spring.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 MAT 05: LO Demonstrate the ability to identify and develop the professional dispositions of an effective educator.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to identify and develop the professional dispositions of an effective educator.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The graduate version of the Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS) will be used to assess candidates' professional dispositions in CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* for both fall and spring sections. The rating scale is based on six indicators: Fairness, The belief that all children can learn, Professionalism, Resourcefulness, Dependability, and Commitment to inquiry.

2. A 4-point rating scale is used (1 - Does not meet expectations, 2 - Meets a few expectations, but not sufficient, 3 - Meets expectations, 4 - Exceeds expectations). Data are collected in TaskStream.

3. TaskStream reports provided descriptive statistical analyses.

Results of Evaluation

The alternate route candidates already hold a non-teaching bachelor's degree and some are older than average traditional route candidates for initial teacher licensure. Most candidates have had experience in the workforce and understand the importance of being resourceful, fair, and dependable. The results of these data show those qualities throughout the Cohorts. In some instances, the candidates were more critical of themselves than the instructor was for each of these descriptors. A score of 3.00 was acceptable behavior, and a score of 4.00 is target.

Since we revised the Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS), our faculty members have been working to define what a score of “3” means and what a score of “2” means and so forth. Through our discussions and activities, I believe we are becoming more discriminating about the performance of our candidates. Although the scores show a decline from 2012 to 2013 for my M.A.T. students, I think this is an accurate rating of their teacher dispositions. The lowest ratings are found for indicator 3: Professionalism, 4: Resourcefulness, and 5: Dependability. The fall ratings are always lower because it is the first semester of internship. After the candidates have been teaching for a semester, they start to internalize the importance of these teacher characteristics and how they relate to effective teaching. This starts to show up in the ratings for the Spring semester.

Trends Noted

Trends over the last four years continue to show higher ratings during the Spring semester for all M.A.T. candidates. I believe it is a result of having a full semester of teaching in their own classroom. Throughout the program the students discuss contextual factors that affect their students and how they plan lesson to meet those student needs, strategies that meet diversity needs in their classrooms, and the importance of using a variety of assessments. More time needs to be spent on a commitment to inquiry and how to incorporate family and community resources.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. During 2013 our class discussions and some assignments, we focused on the first two Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS) indicators, fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Additional assignments need to be created this year stressing the importance of the other dispositions. The candidates weakest indicators were resourcefulness, professionalism, and dependability.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge – Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge with both the content and pedagogy of the Master’s in Educational Leadership program by passing the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).

Data Collection (Evidence)

- 1a. Institutional reports and individual reports for the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) will be used.
 This assessment is a national, norm-referenced examination and the passage of it is required to receive a license as a school administrator in the state of Mississippi. It is based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards that closely align with Educational Leadership Constituent Council.
- 2a. The School Leadership Licensure Assessment will be taken by all candidates near the end of their program.
- 3a. Scores are sent from Educational Testing Service to Delta State University each year. Overall mean and median scores and score distributions will be calculated, as well as percent correct on each section of the assessment.
- 3b. Mean scores and standard deviations will be calculated for the total and each section.

Results of Evaluation

Cohort XV School Leadership Licensure Assessment Performance
 Two of the Five members of Cohort XV passed the School Leadership Licensure Assessment examination on the first attempt; one who did not pass took the examination again and passed. The two who did not pass have not reported passing scores on the School Leadership Licensure Assessment.

A summary of results follows:

	Cohort XV
Mean Score	170.2
Median Score	178
Lowest score	154
Highest score	180
Number included	5
MS Passing score	169
First time pass rate	2/40%

After reviewing and comparing results of past cohorts, it should be noted that the mean score did drop this year. On average, scores have averaged around 177; however, the median score did decrease for Cohort XV which indicates more students scored lower.

It should be noted that Mississippi's passing scale score of 169 is the highest among all states in the nation that use the School Leadership Licensure Assessment as an exit and licensure exam for school principal/administration candidates. A three year average is still holding at 82%, so we are still about what the state indicates as not failing.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The content and format for the School Leadership Licensure Assessment has changed. The Delta State University Leadership Cohort curriculum was redesigned in May 2011 and is being used for during the current year for Cohort XV. However, it is recommended that program assessments be increased and that a multiple choice format test be administered for each unit or semester of content to align with the Educational Leadership Constituent Council / Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards. The faculty will continue to strive to keep the pass rate above 80%.

2. None at this time.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 02: LO Program Specific Content

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Program Specific Content –

Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Educational Leadership. Show mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Educational Leadership by responding to Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium/Educational Leadership Constituents Council standards, analyzing data, and constructed appropriate responses on the comprehensive exam.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. All candidates for the Master of Education degree in Educational Leadership take a Comprehensive Examination at the end of the spring semester each year. The examination was constructed by faculty and was formatted like the School Leadership Licensure Assessment requiring the candidate to construct written responses to stimulus materials. The comprehensive examination consisted of three sections: Five vignettes which required evaluation of actions (Section I), one case analysis which required synthesis and problem solving (Section II), and three documents which required analysis of information and decision making (Section III). The examination stimulus materials are developed to reflect situations and issues of current educational leadership practice and each item assesses multiple Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium/ Educational Leadership Constituent Council standards. A rubric for each item was developed collaboratively by the

faculty and used to score candidates' responses consistently. Each of the five vignettes and the three documents were scored 2, 1 or 0 based on the individual rubric for each. The case, which required synthesis of information from a scenario and five documents, was scored 3, 2, 1 or 0.

3. An Excel spreadsheet will be used to analyze the results.

Results of Evaluation

All five (5) candidates passed the comprehensive examination on the first try by scoring 70% or above.

The overall mean score for Cohort XV in May 2013. All candidates passed the exam during the first administration by scoring 70% or above.

Trends Noted

All candidates have passed the comprehensive examination on the first try for the past three years.

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. More emphasis will be placed on analyzing and synthesizing information and documents required for effective decision making. Ideally, the comprehensive exam should mirror and perhaps include multiple choice as well as constructed response. Educational Testing Services has revised School Leadership Licensure Assessment administration dates to mid-April and mid-July.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 03: LO Ability to Plan

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Ability to Plan –

Demonstrate the ability to develop a supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction.

Develop and implement a supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction utilizing the supervisory clinical cycle process.

Evaluate, discuss, present, and reflect on the process.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Ability to Plan: Data Analysis Project: Candidates will complete this multi-layer project during their program in phases using actual data from K-12 schools.

2. Data will be collected by program faculty.

3. A 4-point scale will be used to rate the project. Ratings will be aligned with appropriate Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) professional standards

Results of Evaluation

Cohort XV (2012-13)

Average= 92.5

Range= 80 to 100

N = 5

All five candidates demonstrated developing or above performance on the Educational Leadership Constituent Council standard elements assessed by this project. Additionally, all candidates presented their results to their respective school faculties and to the Educational Leadership Cohort. Each candidate was required to submit a follow-up to this project that recommended additional changes to improve the project. The developing scores did not pose an issue due to the fact this was the first major project for all the candidates and many of the components of the project depended on the expertise of the field experience mentor as well. All candidates to date have demonstrated proficient or exemplary on all Educational Leadership Constituent Council standards to date.

Trends Noted

This is the first major individual project for candidates. Due to the emphasis on data analysis for school improvement, this project is a first assessment, but several candidates usually need remediation and continued instruction. In past years we have increased the amount of direct instruction and practice in analysis of test scores prior to the project assignment and required remediation and resubmission of projects that did not meet proficiency on the Educational Leadership Constituent Council elements assessed by this project.

*Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research*

Average for Individual	Criteria: Data Collection and Analysis (ELCC 2.3)		Criteria: Plan of Action/Improvement Plan (ELCC 1.3,1.4,2.1,2.2,2.4)		Criteria: Organization		Criteria: Mechanics		Criteria: PowerPoint Presentation for Faculty (1.5,4.1,6.2)		Criteria: Oral Presentation Content & Delivery (ELCC 1.5,4.1,6.2)	
	Used in Folio Area: Data Analysis Project: Data Analysis Rubric		Used in Folio Area: Data Analysis Project: Data Analysis Rubric		Used in Folio Area: Data Analysis Project: Data Analysis Rubric		Used in Folio Area: Data Analysis Project: Data Analysis Rubric		Used in Folio Area: Data Analysis Project: Data Analysis Rubric		Used in Folio Area: Data Analysis Project: Data Analysis Rubric	
	DRF: Educational Leadership 2010-2011		DRF: Educational Leadership 2010-2011		DRF: Educational Leadership							
	Max. Rubric Points = 4		Max. Rubric Points = 4		Max. Rubric Points = 4		Max. Rubric Points = 4		Max. Rubric Points = 4		Max. Rubric Points = 4	
	Raw Score	Percentage	Raw Score	Percentage	Raw Score	Percentage	Raw Score	Percentage	Raw Score	Percentage	Raw Score	Percentage
3.83/4.00 (95.83)	3.5	87.5	3.5	87.5	4	100	4	100	4	100	4	100
3.25/4.00 (81.25)	3	75	3	75	3.5	87.5	4	100	3	75	3	75
3.75/4.00 (93.75)	3.5	87.5	3	75	4	100	4	100	4	100	4	100
3.83/4.00 (95.83)	3.5	87.5	3.5	87.5	4	100	4	100	4	100	4	100
3.83/4.00 (95.83)	4	100	3	75	4	100	4	100	4	100	4	100

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The faculty plans to continue the process of individual assistance and requiring resubmission of assessments that do not meet a proficient rating on Educational Leadership Constituent Council standard elements assessed by the project. Additionally, the program coordinator and teaching faculty should attempt to place candidates at internship sites where the mentor or lead teacher is skilled in data analysis and improvement planning to ensure more exposure to data and improvement planning.
2. Faculty continues to focus on the use of data analysis in decision making and improvement planning. Candidates tend to continue to grow in this area throughout the year.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 04: LO Clinical Practice

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Clinical Practice –

Demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for a school leader while in the field.

While in the field, demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for a school leader by engaging, analyzing, correlating, implementing standards in meaningful, realistic activities.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Clinical Practice: Intern Performance Assessment: Mentors in the field will evaluate interns during their three internships.
2. Mentors will submit assessments to program faculty during each of the internships. Data from Internship 1 will be considered formative in nature and are not reported.
3. The assessment will be based on a 4-point rating scale. Percents are calculated for each point of the scale and are aligned with appropriate Educational Leadership Constituent Council professional standards.

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of ratings by standard for all internship experiences revealed all of the candidates of Cohort XV were rated at or above expectations for each Educational Leadership Constituent Council standard assessed. At the end of Internship 3, all candidates were rated above expectations on all standards. Historically these items have been difficult to rate or rated lower than others by site mentors because it is difficult for interns to gain significant amounts of experiences during any one internship (12 weeks) in promoting community involvement in the community, managing fiscal, human and material resources, and mobilizing community resources. The overall mean scores (Internship 1, 2, & 3) for Cohort XV on each Educational Leadership Constituent Council standard across ranged between 3.56 to 4.0 indicating an above average performance as a group on the indicators. Summaries of performance on the Intern Performance Assessments are shown in tables below.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Continue to emphasize to the mentors the importance of fairness and consistency in rating the interns on their performance.
2. Examine the internship activities outlined for the internships to see if there are other specific activities that could be added to increase experiences related to Educational Leadership Constituent Council standards 1.5, 3.3, and 4.3.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 MED-EAS 05: LO Ability to Support Student Learning and Development

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Ability to Support Student Learning and Development –

Demonstrate ability to create and maintain a school culture which supports student learning and development.

Respond to Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium/Education Leadership Constituents Council standards by answering questions appropriately which identify and analyze the ability to create and maintain a school culture which supports student learning and development.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. The Educational Leadership Preparation Program Questionnaire (ELPPQ) is used as an exit survey. The questions are based upon the national standards for the Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards. Eight items are related with a 4-point scale; three items are open response.

3. Score distributions will be calculated for the eight items using the 4-point scale. Themes are identified in the open response items.

Results of Evaluation

Cohort XV members (n = 5)

In reviewing the eight items related to the Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership that comprise this assessment (see tables below), the mean ratings for Cohort XIII as a group ranged from 3.82 in management to 4.0 in ethics.

Cohort members also responded to three open-response questions, one identifying program strengths, a second identifying needed program improvements, and a third for additional comments. Strands across the responses included the following:

Strengths:

- The internships' greatest strengths are in providing valuable lessons and "on the job" training and observation, and ability to build a network of colleagues
- Opportunities provided in program to attend ASCD or national conference, and have outside speakers come into class to share in the instructional process

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

- Clinical correlations, required readings, various projects required provide experiences that connect theory and practice

Ways Program could be improved:

- Build in more content to prepare cohort members for job interviews.
- Have adequate faculty to facilitate courses and give feedback in a timely manner.
- Prepare students for School Leadership Licensure Assessment yearlong, not just weeks before the test.
- Help us develop a better understanding of research and statistics when that outside core course is taken.
- Have more outside experts come in to teach topics such as school finance, school law, etc.
- Improvements could also be made in the way the central office internship is organized.
- Continue formal mentoring with program graduates for a year or two after completion

Additional Comments - Most of the comments stated that the program had provided “excellent training”, is “vital to the Delta to address needs for effective school leaders,” and that graduates are “prepared when they leave with the necessary knowledge to be successful”.

Summary of ELPPQ Results by Overall Standard
Candidate Exit Survey- Cohort XV

Cohort XV (2012-13): N=5

	1. Vision	2. Culture	3. Management	4. Family and Community	5. Ethics	6. Larger Context
Mean	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Minimum	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Maximum	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

Masters of Education Leadership Program Exit Survey of Graduates(ELPPQ)
During Last Semester – Cohort XV

2012-13 N: 9 (100% response rate)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Questions: Please base response on your current amount of work experience.	Above expected at this level	Average for experience	Below expected at this level	Need Extreme Improvement	Unable to Answer
1. I believe I can					
1.1 facilitate the development of a school vision of learning	5				
1.2 articulate a school vision of learning	5				
1.3 implement a school vision of learning	5				
1.4 steward a school vision of learning	5				
1.5 promote community involvement in a school vision	5				
2. I believe I can:					
2.1 promote a positive school culture	5				
2.2 provide an effective instructional program	5				
2.3 apply best practice to student learning	5				
2.4 design comprehensive growth plans for staff	5				
3. I believe I can manage the:					
3.1 organization	5				

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

3.2 operations	5				
3.3 resources	5				
4. I believe I can:					
4.1 collaborate with families and other community members	5				
4.2 respond to community interests and needs	5				
4.3 mobilize community resources	5				
5. I believe I can act:					
5.1 with integrity	5				
5.2 fairly	5				
5.3 ethically	5				
6. I believe I can:					
6.1 understand the larger educational context	5				
6.2 respond to the larger educational context	5				
6.3 influence the larger educational context	5				

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. All activities included under strengths were continued as important components in the Program Redesign. Faculty have included more activities/scenarios similar to the School Leadership Licensure Assessment for candidates throughout the next program year. And, two school law experts

were used a resources to provide seminars for candidates in school law. And, the content taught related to personnel focused heavily on recruitment, hiring, and retention of teachers and also on interviewing for positions as principals.

Program faculty should consider how to assist candidates with research and statistics content as required as a core course by the College of Education and make it relevant in the program. Faculty should consider whether to continue the one-week Central Office Internship as part of the program since redesign has reduced the number of courses in the program and this time might be better spent in classwork.

Continue to use outside experts to teach specific units as funding allows and continue to investigate ways on-going mentoring can be provided to program graduates.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 06: LO Exit Portfolio

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Exit Portfolio –

Demonstrate the effective administrative content knowledge and skills expected of program completers.

Create a portfolio measuring and supporting effective administrative content knowledge and skills expected of program completers. The portfolio must incorporate activities demonstrating active engagement in all Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium/Education Leadership Constituents Council standards.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. The Exit Portfolio is the culminating assessment for candidates completing the program. The purpose of the assessment is to provide an opportunity for the candidate to reflect on his/her learning and growth across the program of study and produce a professional document that provides substantial evidence of the learning and growth. The Exit Portfolio contains five sections: I. Vita, II. Self-assessment related to ISLLIC Standards, III. Summary of field experiences, IV. Situational Analysis of learning obtained from completing clinical correlations, V. Samples and artifacts of other meaningful work.

3. A 4-point rubric is used: 1 – Rudimentary (poor), 2 – Developing (fair), 3 – Proficient, 4 – Exemplary

Results of Evaluation

For the 2012-13 program year, the class average was a score of three out of four on the portfolio.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

A summary of performance of candidates in Cohort XV shown in tables below

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Vita Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Self-Assessment ISLLC/ELCC1 Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.25/4 (81.25%)
Self-Assessment ILSSC/ELCC2 Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.50/4 (87.50%)
Self-Assessment ILSSC/ELCC3 Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.75/4 (68.75%)
Self-Assessment ILSSC/ELCC4 Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.75/4 (93.75%)
Self-Assessment ILSSC/ELCC5 Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.75/4 (93.75%)
Self-Assessment ILSSC/ELCC6 Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.25/4 (81.25%)
Field Experiences Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.50/4 (87.50%)
Situational Analysis Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.75/4 (93.75%)
Other Samples and Artifacts Folio Area: Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Average of 10 Criterion Averages	3.35/4 (83.75%)

Candidates showed a particularly strong performance in the areas of Self-Assessment ILSSC/ELCC 4, 5, and Situational Analysis. Candidates often show a strong trend in analysis of performance in field-based situations, but sometimes are inconsistent in their abilities to identify the connection between the theory or practice and the specific Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards and elements involved.

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. Continued emphasis will be placed on analyzing, synthesizing, and interpreting each Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standard so that candidates can better understand and recognize the standards in practice. Candidates often show a strong trend in situational analysis and how to perform in certain field-based situations, but sometimes are inconsistent in their abilities to make connections with a specific Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standard and elements.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 07: LO Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Dispositions –

Demonstrate appropriate dispositions necessary for success as a school leader.

Select and justify appropriate dispositions necessary for success as a school leader.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. The Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS) will be completed by all candidates as a self-assessment during the first 12 hours in the program. The professor in EDL 602 *Foundations II: Instructional Leadership Practices* will also complete an evaluation of each student at that time. Program faculty will use these to monitor candidate progress throughout the program.

Dispositional characteristics assessed are as follows: fairness, the belief that all students can learn, professionalism, resourcefulness, dependability, commitment to inquiry.

The assessment uses a 4-point rating scale. The appraisal scale is: 1, does not meet expectations; 2, meets a few expectations, but not sufficient; 3, meets expectations; and 4, exceeds expectations.

3. Mean scores on each dispositional characteristic will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation

Self-Assessment - As a group, the candidates rated themselves above meeting expectations in only two categories; the two categories were Resourceful and Dependability.

Professor Evaluation: Overall, these results indicate that candidates are generally open to diversity and meeting students' need, to personal growth, and self-reflection, and collaboration with all stakeholders in the program and school communities. These results are reflective of interview results when candidates were initially screened in the spring prior to admission into the program. The varied ratings appeared to indicate the candidates' individual differences and awareness of those differences and should have provided focus for growth in these areas for the program year.

Dispositions Rating Scale Candidate Performance Report
First Rating- Cohort XV(2012-13)

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Fairness Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.5/3 (83.33%)
The Beief That All Students Can Learn Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.75/3 (91.67%)
Professionalism Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.5/3 (83.33%)
Resourcefulness Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.00/3 (66.67%)
Dependability Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.00/3 (66.67%)
Commitment to Inquiry Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial DRF Template: Educational Leadership 2010-2011	Avg.=2.5/3 (83.33%)
Average of 6 Criterion Averages	2.38/3 (79.17%)

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. An exit interview is conducted in EDL 640 *Organizational and School Issues I*/EDL 740 *School and Community Issues I*, which is in the last 12 hours of coursework. The Dispositions Rating Scale is administered as a self-assessment for candidates and by the professor. Results will be compared with the first administration and analyzed by both the professor and the candidate to note any improvements or deficiencies.

Faculty should consider reporting on both sets of data to demonstrate changes over the program year.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-EAS 08: LO Clinical Correlations

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Clinical Correlations -

Demonstrate the ability to integrate content and professional knowledge and skills with real life experiences and situations

Organize and prepare documentation to demonstrate the ability to integrate content and professional knowledge and skills with real life experiences. Also included are aligning practice to Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium/Education Leadership Constituents Council standards, creating a reflection and alternate outcomes journal, and producing and presenting projects that implement a new operation for school effectiveness.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. Clinical Correlations are analyses of situations and experiences from each of the three internships. Each correlation must relate to ISLLC/ Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards, a current educational issue, and one of the program anchors. Each must include a description of an actual situation, the outcomes or consequences of actions taken, an analysis of possible alternative actions, the policy or legal implications, and a reflection on what was learned from the situation.

3. A 4-point rubric is used: 1 – Rudimentary, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, 4 – Exemplary

Results of Evaluation

The mean scores on all three sets of Clinical Correlations was 3.71 with four being the highest score.

The decrease in the overall mean from Correlations 1 to Correlations 3 is not consistent with past results to an increase in the expectations for quality in the correlations and a more specificity in the rubric for scoring. During the first internship, faculty reviewed clinical correlations each week, feedback was provided and candidates revised the correlations prior to final submission based on the feedback received. This process allowed candidates to develop skills and understand expectations. During the second internship, the debriefing sessions on Wednesdays included discussions and analyses of situations and actions, but the Correlations were submitted and evaluated only once as a final product. The scores decreased slightly due to less feedback in Internship II, but increased and slightly surpassed the overall mean in Internship I. This indicated an overall improvement in candidates' abilities to recognize issues and situations related to educational issues and the legal or policy implications, and then interpret and evaluate the actions taken as well as recommend actions that may have been more appropriate. Candidates showed growth in being able to apply "Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections" to each situation as they progressed from the first internship to the last internship. The third internship resulted in a decrease in Correlations scores from the two previous scores. This is the first decrease during the third Correlation, and faculty will continue to monitor to see if future results follow this same trend.

Trends Noted

In past years, it has been noted that candidates make limited progress or regress slightly during the second internship, due to less feedback from the instruction prior to submission; however, there is usually significant improvement in the last internship. These data indicate a similar trend but with less overall growth. This year, a decrease occurred during the third Correlation. This is the first decrease during the third Correlation, and faculty will continue to monitor to see if future results follow this same trend.

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. Faculty should continue to emphasize Clinical Correlations a strong component of the program to encourage reflection and help candidates link content and theory to best practice by analyzing actions with regard to policy or legal implications and to promote. Using various scenarios provided by students each week as class activities for analysis and discussion during the first two internships should promote growth over the course of the program year.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-ELE 01: LO Demonstrate understanding of knowledge and skills

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate understanding of knowledge and skills associated with the content of the M.Ed. degree program in Elementary Education

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Content and pedagogical content knowledge will be assessed using a comprehensive examination.
2. The comprehensive examination will be administered each semester and each summer session to candidates in the final course of the M.Ed.
3. A rubric will be used to evaluate the exams. Distribution of scores will be analyzed to assess strengths and weaknesses in the program.

The comprehensive examination is linked to both the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) for the middle childhood/generalist (Standard II, Knowledge of Content and Curriculum), and the early childhood generalist (Standard V, Knowledge of Integrated Curriculum). These standards relate directly to knowledge/skills that elementary teachers need in order to understand what needs to be taught.

Results of Evaluation

2013, a total of 57 online M. Ed. candidates took the comprehensive exam. Eleven candidates failed the exam, thus yielding a pass rate of 82%. All candidates responded to items for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction in Elementary School*, CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education*, & CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*, which is a requirement for Comps. Of the responses for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction in Elementary School*, 99% passed the item and 1% failed: 20 received target ratings, 36 received acceptable ratings, and 1 received an unacceptable rating. Of the responses for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education*, 91% passed the prompt and 9% failed: 21 received target ratings, 31 received acceptable ratings, and 5 received an unacceptable rating. Of the responses for and CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*, 95% passed and 5% failed: 24 received target ratings, 30 received acceptable ratings, and 3 received an unacceptable rating. Candidates had choices between the following courses: CEL 611 *Classroom Management*, CEL 620 *Fundamentals of Early Childhood Education*, CEL 621 *Education in the Intermediate Grades*, & CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education*. Forty-five candidates responded to CEL 611 *Classroom Management*: 96% passed and 4% failed with 18 receiving target ratings, 25 receiving acceptable ratings, and 2 receiving a rating of unacceptable. Forty-six candidates responded to CEL 620 *Fundamentals of Early Childhood Education*: 98% passed and 2% failed with 22 receiving target ratings, 23 receiving acceptable ratings, and 1 receiving unacceptable ratings. Forty candidates responded to CEL 621 *Education in the Intermediate Grades*: 95% passed and 5% failed

with 10 receiving a target rating, 28 receiving acceptable ratings, and 2 receiving unacceptable ratings. Thirty-two candidates responded to CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education*: 97% passed and 3% failed with 17 receiving a target rating, 14 receiving acceptable ratings, and 1 receiving unacceptable ratings.

Overall, a majority of the candidates demonstrated comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the important concepts and topics encountered throughout the M. Ed. program of study. A majority (47 out of 57 or 82%) mastered the exam with at least 85% passing for all course areas. The greatest number of failed responses were noted for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education* (9%) and CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School* (5%). The least number of failed responses were noted for CEL 620 *Fundamentals of Early Childhood Education* (2%) and CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* (3%). As a required item, CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School* yielded the greatest number of target ratings (24 or 42%). Of the choice items, CEL 620 *Fundamentals of Early Childhood Education* yielded the greatest number of target ratings (22 or 48%).

Trends Noted

The pass rate for the online program rose to 87% in 2010 and maintained in 2011. It then decreased to 74% for 2012. After highlighting comps content with more student-instructor interactions in the classes, the pass rate rose to 82% in 2013. Since Canvas facilitates synchronous class meetings with enhanced instructor-student interactions, the increased pass rate was expected.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Graduate faculty agreed that a strong overall pass percentage for the comps is 80%. Course discussions and readings that are covered on the comprehensive exam will be highlighted during synchronous online class meetings and discussions. Course discussions and readings for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education* that are covered on the comprehensive exam will be highlighted with more faculty-student engagement during class meetings and online discussions.
2. Graduate faculty will continue to review the content and delivery as well as the comprehensive examination items for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education*, CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*. Adjunct faculty teaching CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education*, CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*. will continue to be given the comprehensive examination items to ensure material given in the examination is covered in the class. All adjunct faculty are vetted to ensure they are qualified to teach the course.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate skill in verbal ability adequate for success in a graduate program

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate skill in verbal ability adequate for success in a graduate program.

Data Collection (Evidence)

A satisfactory writing proficiency score must be submitted during the first 12 hours of coursework in order to receive full admission and complete the program. Candidates may choose from one of the following assessments:

CAAP – minimum score of 3

GRE Writing – minimum score of 4.0

MAT – minimum score of 30

Praxis I Writing (PPST or CBT) – minimum score of 174

NTE (Communication Skills) – minimum score of 653

Results of Evaluation

A total of 71 online candidates were admitted to the M.Ed. program in 2013. The verbal ability test scores that were verified indicated that 3 candidates had NTE scores that ranged from 653-675, 64 candidates had Praxis writing scores that ranged from 174-185, and 4 candidates had CAAP scores that ranged from 3-4.

All fully-admitted candidates demonstrated acceptable verbal ability.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty continues to support 174 on the Praxis I Writing examination as opposed to requiring the score of 172 that is acceptable for licensure with the State Department of Education. It is believed that the 174 score is more suitable for graduate students who must demonstrate a higher level of verbal proficiency.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-ELE 03: LO Demonstrate ability to plan and support planning

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate ability to plan and support planning at both the lower and upper elementary levels using appropriate professional expertise.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. In CEL 630 *Practicum* candidates will be required to plan and implement a teaching unit.

3. Sections of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) will be used as a means to demonstrate candidate ability to plan and support planning. Sections to be used are Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision Making, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education. The first nine indicators of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument will also be used. A distribution of scores will be used to analyze data.

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013, all (100%) of the candidates in CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* demonstrated the ability to perform the following tasks: select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards; incorporate diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons; integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas; prepares appropriate assessments; communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students; and incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments. The greatest weakness was noted in the candidates' ability to plan appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures (1 out of 32 was acceptable) and plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information (1 out of 32 was acceptable). For fall, the strongest performance was noted in candidates' ability to select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives (19 out of 21 were target); prepare appropriate assessments (19 out of 21 were target); plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners (19 out of 21 were target); communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students (19 out of 21 were target); and incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments (19 out of 21 were target).

All of the candidates demonstrated the ability to plan appropriate lessons for K-6 students.

Trends Noted

A previous concern with the candidates' ability to explicitly align all lessons with learning goals, integrate physical education and health into the unit lessons, effectively use technology, and foster higher thinking skills was addressed with the following: more explicit and specific online discussions regarding planning effective lessons; targeted course readings; and research assignments that focused on specific aspects of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) indicators. Instructor feedback while planning the unit was also implemented. Previous weak areas have seen improvement with most (at least 90%) candidates meeting all of the indicators.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. We will maintain an emphasis on technology use, differentiating instruction, and fostering higher order thinking skills. We will continue to monitor candidate performance

of indicators 1-9 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI). We will also monitor adjunct perception of acceptable candidate performance.

2. None at this time.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 MED-ELE 04: LO Demonstrate the ability to teach effectively in a field experience/clinical setting

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to teach effectively in a field experience/clinical setting

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. In CEL 630 *Practicum*, candidates will be evaluated while teaching a lesson.

3. A rubric and a modified Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) incorporating parts of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (indicators 10-34) will be used to evaluate the candidates' teaching.

Results of Evaluation

Spring 2013, all candidates in CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* received target ratings for most indicators of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) for teaching. All (100% earned target ratings) candidates communicated high expectations for learning to all students; provided opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; demonstrated knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught; used a variety of appropriate teaching strategies; provided learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners; used family and/or community resources; and created and maintained a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. One out of 32 candidates earned an acceptable rating for the following indicators: provided clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities; engaged students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provided opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking; and maximized time available for instruction. Fall 2013, most candidates (96%) received target or acceptable ratings on most indicators. Strongest performance (all candidates received target or acceptable ratings) was noted in the candidates' ability to convey enthusiasm for teaching and learning and provide opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. Weakest performance (17 out of 21 received acceptable or target ratings) was noted in the candidates' ability to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning, provide opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking, and use family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning.

Though all of the candidates demonstrated a strong ability to implement appropriate teaching and assessment strategies for K-6 students, Spring candidates performed better than fall candidates. Strengths for both groups included the use of a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and the provision of learning experiences that accommodated differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

Trends Noted

Candidates have consistently implemented sound instruction and have demonstrated content and pedagogical content knowledge. The TIAI was revised to present more explicit descriptions of expectations for each indicator. Candidates continued to perform well as indicated by the revised instrument. The graduate faculty will continue to emphasize effective planning and teaching techniques in the practicum course and all other courses that include planning and teaching. Special emphasis will be put on providing a consistent level of instruction and instructor-student interactions to counteract a lull in performance for either group. Communicating course expectations with adjunct faculty and modifying discussions, course readings, and other course activities to increase candidate engagement with sound teaching practices seems to have also benefited this practicum course. Though candidates have noted improvement with providing learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners, providing opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking, using higher-order questions to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking, and using family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to enhance student learning, these areas will continue to be monitored.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The graduate faculty will continue to monitor candidate performance of indicators 10-25 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), especially in the areas of technology use, differentiating instruction, incorporating family and community resources, and fostering higher order thinking skills. Special emphasis will be put on providing a consistent level of instruction and instructor-student interactions to counteract a lull in performance for either group. We will also monitor adjunct perception of acceptable candidate performance.
2. Graduate faculty who teach this course and evaluate this assessment have done so consistently for the past 5 years. If new faculty are assigned, the Department Chair and program coordinator will engage him/her in rater reliability training.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-ELE 05: LO Demonstrate the ability to positively impact student learning in a field experience/clinical setting

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate the ability to positively impact student learning in a field experience/clinical setting

Data Collection (Evidence)

1 & 2. CEL 630 *Practicum*, pre- and post-assessment data will be used to evaluate the impact of the lesson developed for the course on student learning and the support of an environment that supports learning.

3. The Graduate Teacher Work Sample will be used in CEL 630 *Practicum* to collect the data to show that candidates have an impact on student learning and support an environment that supports learning.

Results of Evaluation

In 2013, overall candidates in CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* demonstrated the ability to develop and implement instruction based on contextual factors, meaningfully interpret student data, and draw appropriate conclusions. Fall 2013, strengths were noted in the candidates' ability to discuss how contextual factors could positively impact instruction (21 out of 21 met indicator), develop appropriate learning goals (20 out of 21 met indicator), develop and implement assessments (20 out of 21 met indicator), design appropriate and effective instruction (20 out of 21 met indicator), analyze student learning (21 out of 21 met indicator), reflect on their professional practices in a productive manner (21 out of 21 met indicator), and design accurate, standards-based instruction for elementary education (21 out of 21 met indicator). Weaknesses were noted in the candidates' ability to identify and utilize knowledge of students' skills and prior learning

(3 out of 21 did not meet the indicator). Spring 2013, candidates demonstrated the greatest weaknesses with the ability justify how their learning objectives promoted creativity and higher-order thinking skills (4 out of 32 partially met the indicator), the use of contextual factors to design instruction (3 out of 32 partially met the indicator), and implementing differentiated instruction (4 out of 32 partially met the indicator).

Overall, the candidates demonstrated they were able to positively impact student learning and provide evidence of such impact. Candidates in fall yielded the best evidence while candidates in spring appeared to struggle most with articulating implications of contextual factors for student learning and using differentiated instruction.

Trends Noted

In 2010, improvements were noted in candidates' ability to meaningfully interpret student data and draw appropriate conclusions and to demonstrate evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward

each. Faculty discussed the rigor of this assessment in regards to the task that requires data analysis for subgroups. It was agreed that the M.Ed. candidates needed to complete this task with practicality and usefulness of analysis results. Beginning Spring 2011, task 6 of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) was modified to require candidates to analyze prescribed subgroups which reflect current classroom populations, assessments, and school district policies. A review of the 2011 data revealed the candidates were able to follow prescribed data analysis requirements to successfully interpret their impact on student learning. In 2012, candidates maintained an ability to demonstrate impact on student learning. 2013 data continues to support evidence that, overall, candidates are able to impact student learning by using contextual factors and assessments to plan and guide instruction and determine impact on student learning. A weakness was noted in the candidates' ability to articulate a clear and compelling explanation of how objectives promote creativity and higher order thinking skills.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty participated in exercises that involved scoring and comparing scores for each area of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) in an attempt to align expectations for student performance.
2. Online candidates will continue to be supported with synchronous class meetings that focus on elements of the TWS in an effort to maintain strong performance in each area of the TWS, especially Section 1: Contextual Factors.

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-ELE 06: LO Demonstrate appropriate dispositions

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate appropriate dispositions for candidates who are working toward the M.Ed. degree in Elementary Education

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Candidates complete a Dispositions Portfolio prior to taking the comprehensive examination. The portfolio includes (1) completing the Graduate Version of the Dispositions Rating Scale as a self-assessment, and (2) the submission of artifacts to provide a rationale for the self-ratings given. The program coordinator uses a 4-point scale (1 low – 4 high) to assess the candidate's skill in providing a rationale for the self-ratings.
2. Data are collected in TaskStream.
3. TaskStream reports provide means and score distributions.

Results of Evaluation

In 2013, according to candidate self-ratings, most candidates perceived they met and exceeded the professional dispositions identified by the College of Education. However, they identified a commitment to inquiry as their greatest weakness. In Spring 2013, 20% of the candidates rated themselves inadequate in commitment to inquiry. Faculty ratings for Spring 2013 also identified that commitment to inquiry was an overall weakness (12.5% of candidates scored “2 – Meets a few expectations but not sufficient”). Faculty also noted that professionalism (12.5% of candidates scored “2 – Meets a few expectations but not sufficient”) and Fairness presented similar weaknesses (12.5% of candidates scored “2 – Meets a few expectations but not sufficient”). For Summer I 2013, all candidates (100%) met or exceeded the expectations. For Summer II 2013, commitment to inquiry, fairness, and the belief that all students could learn yielded similar weaknesses (75% performance). In Fall 2013, the strongest performance for dispositions was for fairness (83.33%). The weakest performance was for resourcefulness (77.08%).

Overall, candidates demonstrated professional dispositions. Weak performances were generally demonstrated by an average of 8 out of 57 candidates. Commitment to inquiry was the most consistent weakness while the belief that all children can learn was the most consistent strong area. Candidates’ demonstration of fairness, professionalism, and resourcefulness dipped and rose throughout 2013.

Trends Noted

Fall 2010 was the first iteration of the Dispositions Portfolio. Data analysis for future iterations was analyzed for trends. According to faculty ratings, the following means were noted: Fairness- 2.83/4; belief that all students can learn-3.33/4; professionalism- 3.33/4; resourcefulness- 3.17/4; dependability-3.33/4; and commitment to inquiry- 3.17/4. Particular attention was paid to the Fairness category since this was a weakness before the electronic Disposition Portfolio was begun. In 2011, a weakness continued to be noted in the candidates’ ability to demonstrate fairness. The faculty developed a tips sheet for helping candidates identify and reflect upon their demonstrations of fairness. The tips were added to the Dispositions Portfolio directions document. The 2012 data revealed that candidates’ overall ability to demonstrate fairness improved. In 2013, fairness remains a strong disposition for the candidates; however, commitment to inquiry has surfaced as the greatest weakness. Course instructors will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) the important role inquiry plays in professional development for educators.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Currently, Disposition portfolios are scored by the same faculty member. A new member will conference with the current faculty evaluator and engage in rater reliability exercises until a common expectation for portfolio evidence is reached.
2. We will continue to work to improve candidate ratings with commitment to inquiry by highlighting the role of research in education. Candidates have research assignments in a majority of their courses. However, they may not perceive the value of inquiry for designing and implemented effective instruction. Course instructors will explicitly discuss

(during synchronous classes or in online discussions) the important role inquiry plays in professional development for educators.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 MED-ELE 07: LO Demonstrate an understanding of diversity and the ability to teach diverse populations effectively.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate an understanding of diversity and the ability to teach diverse populations effectively.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1, 2, & 3. Diversity assessments will be carried out in CRD 624, *Literacy Instruction*. In this course, data will be collected from an essay question in the final examination.

Information pertaining to diversity is directly related to Standard II (Equity, Fairness, and Diversity) of the early childhood/generalist area of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards as well as Standard IV (Respect for Diversity) of the middle childhood/generalist area.

Results of Evaluation

During CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*, candidates (N=44) completed an essay item that evaluated their ability to accept and to meet the diverse needs of students. Thirty-two candidates received acceptable ratings and seven received outstanding ratings. Five candidates received marginal or unacceptable ratings.

A majority of the candidates (89%) were able to demonstrate their ability to accept and to meet the needs of diverse learners during literacy instruction.

Trends Noted

Candidates have consistently demonstrated their ability to accept and meet the needs of diverse learners during literacy instruction.

Using the Disposition Portfolio as a cross reference, candidates demonstrated consistent strengths with the belief that all students can learn. This indicates their understanding that education is interactive and reflective, as well as culturally contextualized and dynamic.

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. The lesson/teaching assignment for the course was modified to require candidates to assess and teach a struggling reader in grades K-6. This assignment gave further experience with teaching diverse learners.

Related Items

There are no related items.

≡ MED-SE 01: LO Demonstrate mastery of the content

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate mastery of the content of the M.Ed. degree program in special education (including, but not limited to, history, philosophy, theories, legal and ethical practices, service delivery, and curriculum and instruction) by successfully completing an essay-type comprehensive examination. The comprehensive examination will be rated on a two dimensional rubric which measures content mastery and writing competency. Candidates must score at least 280 out of a possible 400 points (70%). Program goal is for 70% of candidates to pass the exam in each semester. All candidates must pass the exam to exit the program.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Candidates will take an essay-type comprehensive examination in the last semester of their program. This may be the semester in which the candidate is taking remaining coursework, or it may be the semester after course completion. Candidates are required to attend at least one comprehensive examination study session before taking the comprehensive examination. These sessions orient the candidates to the format of the examination; provide a study guide with prompts and a copy of the rubric, and suggestions on time management and editing during the test session.

The examination consists of four sets of questions covering: 1) Law and Practices, 2) Development and Characteristics of Learners 3) Individual Learning Differences, and 4) Professional and Ethical Practice. Each set includes two questions and a single set of prompts derived from the Council for Exceptional Children standard(s) covered by that set. Candidates are given the prompts and related Council for Exceptional Children standards in practice comprehensive exams administered throughout the program and in comps study and orientation sessions. On the examination, the candidates are given the questions and the prompts. Prompts are provided to elicit parallel content regardless of the specific question. The exam is given in two three-hour sessions; each session covers two question sets. Candidates respond to one question from each question set.

Comprehensive exams will be graded using a 4-point rubric, which rates both content and writing. Candidates are rated on a) mechanics, b) content breadth, c) content depth, d) standards based content, e) organization, and f) clarity. Three faculty members read and score each candidate's work. Candidates must score 70% or higher from at least two faculty members. Faculty members meet to discuss the results for each candidate to make the final determination. All decisions are made blind; candidate names are not revealed until the entire group has been processed.

Comprehensive examinations are administered in the candidates' last semester of enrollment in the program.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Results of Evaluation

Candidate Data

Program Assessment II Special Education Comprehensive Examination 2013

Composite Scores:

Semester/ number of candidates	Did Not Meet Expectations Score below 70% <280	Met Expectations Score 70-89% 280-359	Exceeded Expectations Score 90% or higher 360-400	Comments
SPRING 2013; N=7	<i>n</i> =1	<i>n</i> =4	<i>n</i> =2	
SUMMER 2013; N=9	<i>n</i> =1	<i>n</i> =6	<i>n</i> =2	
FALL 2013; N=2	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =2	<i>n</i> =0	
Total for 2013; N=18	<i>n</i> =2	<i>n</i> =12	<i>n</i> =4	

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Scores by Question

Semester/ number of candidates	Did not meet expectation Score below 70% (<70%)				Met expectations Score between 70% and 89% (70%-89%)				Exceeded expectations Score 90% or above >89			
	QA	QB	QC	QD	QA	QB	QC	QD	QA	QB	QC	QD
SPRING 2013 N=7	n=1	n=1	n=3	n=2	n=5	n=4	n=2	n=3	n=1	n=2	n=2	n=2
SUMMER 2013 N=9	n=1	n=2	n=1	n=2	n=5	n=4	n=6	n=5	n=3	n=3	n=2	n=2
FALL 2013 N=2	n=2	n=0	n=1	n=1	n=0	n=2	n=1	n=1	n=0	n=0	n=0	n=0
Total 2013 N=18	n=4	n=3	n=5	n=5	n=10	n=10	n=9	n=9	n=4	n=5	n=4	n=4
	QA - Question Set A (Foundations of Special Education) QB - Question Set B (Development and Characteristics of Learners) QC - Question Set C (Individual Learning Differences) QD - Question Set D (Professional and Ethical Practice)											
Comments:	N=18 N represents 18 attempts. One candidate is counted twice, once in SPRING 2013, and once in SUMMER 2013. Question set A: 14 candidates (78%) met or exceeded expectations; Unduplicated count: 82% Question Set B: 15 candidates (83%) met or exceeded expectations; Unduplicated count: 88% Question set C: 13 candidates met or exceeded expectations (72%); Unduplicated count: 76% Question Set D: 13 candidates (72%) met or exceeded expectations; Unduplicated count: 76%											

Analysis of Data:

Three semesters of data are reported in 2013. The previous data report included the SPRING 2013 semester; that data is also included in this report. In 2013, a total of 18 candidates completed the comprehensive exam in this period, with 17 candidates out of 18 (94%) passing.

Four semesters of data are reported from 2012 and 2013. A total of 18 candidates completed comprehensive exams in this period with 16 of 18 (88%) passing (one candidate had two attempts, therefore, N=19 on the data chart). This exceeds the long-term program goal of 70% of the candidates passing the exam

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Individual candidate performance is analyzed by overall performance and by question. Candidates who score 70% (280 of 400 possible points) overall pass comps. Each question is worth 100 points. Performance levels for each question are a) did not meet expectations (below 70%, <70), b) met expectations (between 70 and 89%, 70-89) and c) exceeded expectations (90% or higher, 90-100).

In 2013, eighteen candidates took comprehensive examinations. On Question Set A, 14 candidates (78%) met or exceeded expectations (unduplicated count: 82%). On Question Set B, 15 candidates (83%) met or exceeded expectations (unduplicated count: 88%). On Question set C, 13 candidates met or exceeded expectations (72%) (Unduplicated count: 76%). On Question Set D, 13 candidates (72%) met or exceeded expectations (Unduplicated count: 76%).

In the previous SPA data report, nineteen candidates took comprehensive examinations. On Question Set A, 14 candidates (73%) met or exceeded expectations (unduplicated count: 78%). On Question Set B, 16 candidates (84%) met or exceeded expectations (unduplicated count: 80%). On Question set C, 23 candidates met or exceeded expectations (63%) (Unduplicated count: 67%). On Question Set D, 14 candidates (73%) met or exceeded expectations (unduplicated count: 78%).

Performance increased from 73% to 78% on Question Set A, and from 63% to 72% on Question Set C. Performance on Question Sets B and D remained stable.

Use of Evaluation Results

Continuing improvement is a result of several actions taken in the last few years. Specifically, we have backed comps practice activities into CSP 640 (Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs) and CSP 651 (Foundations of Special Education in Inclusive Settings), which are offered to candidates earlier in the program. In addition, in each course of the program, instructors are specifically targeting comps material. As a culmination, in CSP 547 (Internships in Special Education I) and 647 (Field Research in Special Education), we focused the special education professional folio more specifically to synthesize material which is covered in comps. We now have two comps practice sessions each semester, one for content and one for writing skills.

Because the program is now completely online, we plan to expand online resources for comps preparation. Currently, resources are available as part of the course content for CSP 547/557 and CSP 647. While those materials will remain available in the Canvas shells for those classes, we will add a Canvas shell external to any specific course that will enable candidates to access these materials at any time in the program. Each semester, all candidates will be enrolled in the Comps Canvas shell.

Related Items.

There are no related items.

MED-SE 02: LO Demonstrate skills in planning and implementing instruction

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Plans and implements instruction for students with exceptional learning needs (ELN) by using contextual factors to create learning goals and an assessment plan, which are incorporated into a 5-10 day teaching unit. The contextual factors, learning goals, assessment plan and instructional design for the teaching unit will be assessed with the rubrics from the Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Pre-planning Section (SETWSI). Candidates must score a 2 or higher on each indicator of the rubric. Program goal is for 90% of candidates to meet expectations on each element of the rubric.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Assessment III: Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Pre-planning Section (SETWSI)

Description of the assessment: Candidates write and implement a 5-10 day instructional unit during the clinical practice course (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education* or CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*). Candidates who have an undergraduate degree in education that included internship have already completed a 5-10 day unit and will complete a 5-day unit in their field research semester (CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*). Candidates who do not have an undergraduate degree in education will complete a 10-day unit in their internship (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education*).

To demonstrate the reflective nature of the planning process, the unit is embedded in a modified version of the Teacher Work Sample, which is used by several programs at Delta State University. The Special Education Teacher Work Sample is submitted in electronic form. Candidates complete a sample of the Unit Planner on a formative level in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*.

In preparing the 5-10 day unit, the candidate responds to prompts in four sections of the Electronic Folio: a) Contextual Factors, b) Learning Goals, c) Assessment Plan, and d) Design for Instruction. Each candidate submits individual sections of the folio for review by the course instructor. The unit is approved by the instructor before it is implemented. Final submission of the entire folio is required after the unit has been taught. The Folio is rated on a 3-point rubric. Candidates must score a minimum of a 2 on each of the four sections of the rubric.

Results of Evaluation

Assessment III: Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Pre-planning Section (SETWSI)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Summary of Results:

SPRING 2013 FALL 2013	Not Met	Met	Exceeded Expectations
CONTEXTUAL FACTORS			
	Average of Rating		
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	2.54		
FALL 2013 (N=7)	2.51		
Community, School Factors			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)
FALL 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)
Individual Student Characteristics			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)
Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =6 (86%)
Skills and Prior Learning			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)
FALL 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)
Instructional Implications			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

FALL 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
LEARNING GOALS			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	2.83		
FALL 2013 (N=4)	2.75		
Significance and Variety			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =7 (100%)
FALL 2013 (N=4)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (100%)
Clarity			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =7 (100%)
FALL 2013 (N=4)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (100%)
Appropriateness			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=4)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (50%)	<i>n</i> =2 (50%)
Alignment			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =7 (100%)
FALL 2013 (N=4)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (100%)
Creativity and Higher Order Thinking Skills (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)
FALL 2013 (N=4)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> = 3 (75%)	<i>n</i> =1 (25%)

ASSESSMENT PLAN			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)		2.71	
FALL 2013 (N=3)		2.81	
Alignment			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =6 (86%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Assessment Plan (New in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Clarity			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =6 (86%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)
Multiple Modes			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Technical			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Adaptations			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 33%	<i>n</i> =2 67%
Record Keeping			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
DESIGN FOR INSTRUCTION			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	2.49		
FALL 2013 (N=3)	2.70		
Alignment with Learning Goals			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =6 (86%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Accurate Representation of Content			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =6 (86%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
Lesson and Unit Structure			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =6 (86%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources			

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
Use of Technology			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (43%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Differentiated Instruction: Reading Level (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)
Differentiated Instruction: Language (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
Differentiated Instruction: Students on IEPs (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013 (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57%)	<i>n</i> =2 (29%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)

Analysis of Data:

In the Spring 2013 semester, 7 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample, but only 6 candidates passed. Data appears for all 7 candidates for the pre-planning component of the sample.

In the Fall 2013 semester, 7 candidates began the pre-planning component of the Special Education Teacher Work Sample. For this semester, data appears for 7 candidates for the Contextual Factors section and for 4 candidates for the Instructional Objectives section. The remaining sections (Assessment Plan and Design for Instruction) show data for the 3

candidates who actually completed the course. Data appears for these 3 candidates for the post planning section.

In the Spring 2013 semester, 7 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample. The mean score for Contextual Factors was 2.54, the mean score for Learning Goals was 2.83, the mean score for Assessment Plan was 2.71, and the mean score for Design for Instruction was 2.49. Subscores were reported in 3 levels: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met and 3=Expectations Exceeded. Expectations were met or exceeded in these areas: Content, Use of a Variety of Resources, Use of Contextual Information to Select Resources, Differentiated Instruction in Reading, Differentiated Instruction in Language, and Differentiation of Instruction for Students on Individual Education Plans (IEP). One candidate scored 0 (Not Met) on each of these indicators; this candidate did not complete the course.

Areas of relative strength are defined as those with at least 70% of candidates exceeding expectations. Areas of relative weakness are those with more than 50% meeting, but not exceeding, expectations.

Areas of relative strength in the Spring 2013 semester in the Contextual Factors section were (percentages are of candidates exceeding expectations): Individual Student Characteristics (71%) and Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning (71%). Areas of relative strength in Learning Goals were: Significance and Variety (100%), Clarity (100%), Appropriateness (71%), and Alignment (100%). In Assessment Plan, areas of relative strength were: Alignment (86%), Clarity (86%), Multiple Modes (71%), Technical (71%), and Record Keeping (71%). Areas of relative strength in Design for Instruction were: Alignment (86%), Accurate Representation of Content (86%), Lesson and Unit Structure (86%), and Variety of Resources (71%).

Areas of relative weakness in the Spring 2013 semester in the Contextual Factors Section were (percentages are of candidates exceeding expectations): Community and School Factors (43%) and Instructional Implications (29%). An area of relative weakness in Learning Goals was Creativity and Higher Order Thinking Skills (43%). There were no areas of relative weakness in Assessment Plan. Areas of relative weakness in Design for Instruction were: Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources (29%), Differentiated Instruction; Reading Level (29%), Differentiated Instruction: Language (29%), and Differentiated Instruction in IEPs (29%).

In the Fall 2013 semester, 7 candidates began the semester and 3 candidates completed the full Special Education Teacher Work Sample. The mean score for Contextual Factors was 2.51 ($N=7$), for Learning Goals 2.75 ($N=4$), for Assessment Plan 2.81 ($N=3$), and for Design for Instruction 2.70 ($N=3$).

Areas of relative strength in the Fall 2013 semester in the Contextual Factors Section were (percentages are of candidates exceeding expectations): Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning (86%) and Instructional Implications (71%). Areas of relative strength in Learning Goals were: Significance and Variety (100%), Clarity (100%), and

Alignment (100%). In Assessment Plan, areas of relative strength were: Alignment (100%), Assessment Plan (100%), Multiple Modes (100%), and Technical (100%). Areas of relative strength in Design for Instruction were: Alignment with Learning Goals (100%), Lesson and Unit Structure (100%), Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments, and Resources (100%), and Use of Technology (100%).

Areas of relative weakness in the Fall 2013 semester in the Contextual Factors section were (percentages are of candidates exceeding expectations): Community and School Factors (43%) Individual Student Characteristics (29%), and Skills and Prior Learning (29%). Weaknesses in Learning Goals were: Appropriateness (50%) and Creativity and Higher Order Thinking Skills (25%). The area of weakness in Assessment Plan was Record Keeping (33%). Areas of weakness in Design for Instruction were: Accurate Representation of Content (33%), Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments, and Resources (33%), and Differentiated Instruction: Language (33%).

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

1. Expand CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* to emphasize differentiation across reading, language, math and Individual Education Plan (IEP).
2. In CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, include unit on classroom assessment including pretesting, progress monitoring and record keeping.
3. In early lesson planning classes: CSP 672 *Fundamentals of Effective Teaching in Special Education* and 674 *Advanced Instructional Planning in Special Education*, emphasize all elements of planning with particular attention to assessment and differentiation

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-SE 03: LO Demonstrate skills in the measurement of student achievement and adjustment of instruction for maximum impact on student achievement.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrates maximum impact on student achievement by analyzing instructional decisions and their effect on student learning; and by reflecting on their own performance.

This will be measured by the rubrics in the **Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Post Planning (SETWS:II)**. Candidates must score a 2 or higher on each

indicator of the rubric. Program goal is for 90% of candidates to meet expectations on each element of the rubric.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Assessment V: Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Post Planning (SETWS:II)

Description of the assessment: Candidates write and implement a 5-10 day instructional unit during the clinical practice course (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education* or CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*). Candidates who have an undergraduate degree that included internship have already completed a 5-10 day unit and will complete a 5-day unit in their field research semester (CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*). Candidates who do not have an undergraduate degree in education will complete a 10-day unit in their internship (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education*).

To demonstrate the reflective nature of the planning process, the unit is embedded in a modified version of the Teacher Work Sample, which is used by several programs at Delta State University. The Special Education Teacher Work Sample is submitted in electronic form. Candidates complete a sample of the Unit Planner on a formative level in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*.

After teaching the 5-10 day unit, the candidate responds to prompts in three sections of the electronic folio: a) instructional decision making; b) analysis of student learning; and c) reflection and self-evaluation. Each candidate submits individual sections of the folio for review by the course instructor. The unit is approved by the instructor before it is implemented. Final submission of the entire folio is required after the unit has been taught. The folio is rated on a 3-point rubric. Candidates must score a minimum of a 2 on each of the four sections of the rubric.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results:

Assessment Three Teacher Work Sample Part II

Special education teacher work sample post planning section and Section H.

Ethnographic Study

SPRING 2013 (N=6) FALL 2013 (N=3)	Not Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Exceeded Expectations
INSTRUCTIONAL DECISION MAKING			

SPRING 2013		2.63	
FALL 2013		2.42	
Sound Professional Practice			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (17%)	n=5 (83%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (67%)	n=1 (33%)
Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 33%	n=4 67%
FALL 2013 (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (33%)	n=2 (67%)
Congruence between Modifications and Learning Goals			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	n=0 (0%)	n=4 (67%)	n=2 (33%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (67%)	n=1 (33%)
Modifications for Future Teaching (new SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (33%)	n=4 (67%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (67%)	n=1 (33%)
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			
SPRING 2013		2.88	
FALL 2012		2.75	
Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (33%)	n=4 (67%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (67%)	n=1 (33%)
Alignment with Learning Goals			

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (17%)	<i>n</i> =5 (83%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Interpretation of Data			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =6 (100%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =6 (100%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)
REFLECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION			
SPRING 2013	2.43		
FALL 2012	2.33		
Interpretation of Student Learning			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =5 (83%)	<i>n</i> =1 (17%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (50%)	<i>n</i> =3 (50%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Alignment among Goals, Instruction and Assessment			
SPRING 2013 (n=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (50%)	<i>n</i> =3 (50%)
FALL 2013	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	3 (100%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)

(N=3)			
Implications for Future Teaching			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (67%)	<i>n</i> =2 (33%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
Implications for Professional Development			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (67%)	<i>n</i> =2 (33%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
H. SETWS Post-planning Ethnographic Study (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2013	2.60		
FALL 2013	3.0		
Knowledge of Special Education Contextual Factors			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (67%)	<i>n</i> =2 (33%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Knowledge of Programming and Support Services for Students with ELN and Students At-Risk			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (67%)	<i>n</i> =3 (33%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Knowledge of Direct Services			
SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (50%)	<i>n</i> =3 (50%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
Quality of Ethnographic Elements			

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013 (N=6)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =6 (100%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013 (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)

Analysis of Results:

In the Spring 2013 semester, 7 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample, but only 6 candidates passed.

In the Fall 2013 semester, 3 candidates completed the post-planning component of the Special Education Teacher Work Sample.

In the Spring 2013 semester, 6 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample Part II. The mean score for Instructional Decision Making was 2.63, the mean score for Analysis of Student Learning was 2.88, the mean score for Reflection and Self-Evaluation was 2.43, and the mean score for Ethnographic Study was 2.60. Subscores were reported in 3 levels: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met, and 3=expectations Exceeded. Expectations were met or exceeded on all subscores. Areas of relative strength are defined as those with 70% of candidates exceeding expectations. Areas of relative weakness are those with more than 50% meeting, but not exceeding, expectations. An area of relative strength in the Spring 2013 semester in Instructional Decision Making was Sound Professional Practice (83%). Areas of relative strength in Analysis of Student Learning were: Alignment with Learning Goals (83%), Interpretation of Data (100%), and Evidence of Impact on Student Learning (100%). There were no areas of relative strength in Reflection and Self Evaluation or in the Ethnographic Study.

An area of relative weakness in Instructional Decision Making was Congruence between Modifications and Learning Goals (33%). There were no areas of relative weakness in Analysis of Student Learning. Areas of relative weakness in Reflection and Self Evaluation were: Interpretation of Student Learning (17%), Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment (50%), Alignment among Goals in Instruction and Assessment (50%), Implications for Future Teaching (33%), and Implications for Professional Development (33%). Areas of relative weakness in Ethnographic Study were: Knowledge of Special Education Contextual Factors (33%), Knowledge of Programming in Support Services (33%), Knowledge of Direct Services (50%), and Quality of Ethnographic Elements (0%).

In the Fall 2013 semester, 3 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample Part II. The mean score for Instructional Decision Making was 2.42, the mean score for Analysis of Student Learning was 2.75, the mean score for Reflection and Self-Evaluation was 2.33, and the mean score for Ethnographic Study was 3.0. There were no areas of relative strength in the Fall 2013 semester in Instructional Decision Making. An area of strength in Analysis of Student Learning was Alignment with

Learning Goals (100%). An area of strength in Reflection and Self Evaluation was Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment (100%). In the Ethnographic Study, all candidates scored a 3 on all indicators.

Areas of weakness in Instructional Decision Making were: Sound Professional Practice (33%), Congruence between Modifications and Learning Goals (33%), and Modifications for Future Teaching (33%). The relative weakness in Analysis of Student Learning was in Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation (33%). Areas of weakness in Reflection and Self Evaluation were: Interpretation of Student Learning (33%), Alignment among Goals in Instruction and Assessment (0%), Implications for Future Teaching (33%), and Implications for Professional Development (0%). There were no areas of weakness in Ethnographic Study.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

1. Expand CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion* to emphasize differentiation across reading, language, math and IEP.
2. In CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, include unit on classroom assessment including pretesting, progress monitoring and record keeping.
3. In early lesson planning classes: CSP 672 *Fundamentals of Effective Teaching in Special Education* and CSP 674 *Advanced Instructional Planning in Special Education*, emphasize all elements of planning with particular attention to assessment and differentiation

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-SE 04: LO Demonstrate the ability to complete a successful internship/practicum.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate teaching proficiency in lesson planning; instructional delivery; managing the classroom environment; and assessment and evaluation. Skills will be measured through observation of the candidate teacher using Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (SETIAI).

Candidates must score a 2 or higher on each indicator of the rubric. Program goal is for 90% of candidates to meet expectations on each element of the rubric.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Assessment IV: Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument

Description of the assessment: During the capstone course (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education* or CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*), each candidate is observed three times, at least one of which is during the implementation of the teaching unit. Observers use the Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (SETIAI), a statewide assessment used to evaluate pre-service and in-service teachers in Mississippi. The Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument is used to assess planning and implementation of a 5-10 day teaching unit. The instrument has 34 indicators, each of which is scored on a 0-3 point rubric. Candidates must score a minimum of 2 on each indicator.

Alignment to standards: Each of the 34 indicators has been aligned with the Council for Exceptional Children competencies. Because the emphasis in the Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument is on planning, implementation, and management of instruction, it corresponds closely with standards 4, 5 and 7. However, individual sections of the instrument target additional standards. Alignment to Council for Exceptional Children competencies are embedded in the rubric.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results:

For SPRING 2013 n=7 (for A and B) For FALL 2013 n=8 for the first evaluation (A), n=3 for the second evaluation (B) A=first rating, B=second rating	Not Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Exceeded Expectations
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION (items 1-6)			
SPRING 2013		2.36	
FALL 2013		2.72	
1. Selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards. (InTASC 4, 7; M-STAR Domain I – 4; NCATE 1a; CEC 5Standard 7)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=3 (42.86%)	n=2 (28.57%)	n=2 (28.57%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (42.86%)	n=4 (57.14%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =6 (75%)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)
2. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. Uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, interest inventories, surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful. (InTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 7; M-STAR Domains I – 2, III – 10; NCATE 1c, 4a; CEC Standard 2;7)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =6 (75%)	<i>n</i> =2 (25%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
3. Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons. (InTASC 4, 7; M-STAR Domain I – 1; NCATE 1a; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71.43%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =6 (75%)	<i>n</i> =2 (25%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)
4. Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology. (InTASC 1, 4, 5, 7, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 1, I – 4, III – 10; NCATE 1a, 1b; CEC Standard 4;7)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=0 (0%)	n=6 (85.71%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=1 (12.5%)	n=7 (87.5%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)
5. Prepares appropriate assessments (ex. pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress. (InTASC 6, 7; M-STAR Domains II – 5, II – 6, III – 9; NCATE 1a, 1d; CEC Standard 7;8)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=3 (42.86%)	n=4 (57.14%)	n=0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=4 (57.14%)	n=2 (28.57%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=3 (37.5%)	n=4 (50%)	n=1 (12.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (33%)	n=2 (67%)
6. Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge (ex. – use of pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation, and enrichment activities). (InTASC – 1, 2, 7, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 2, II – 5, II – 6; NCATE 1a, 1d, 4a; CEC S 7)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=5 (71.43%)	n=2 (28.57%)	n=0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=5 (71.43%)	n=1 (14.29%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=1 (12.5%)	n=3 (37.5%)	n=4 (50%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT (items 7, 8)			

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013		2.07	
FALL 2013		2.50	
7. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance. (InTASC 6; M-STAR Domains II – 5, II – 6; NCATE 1a, 1d; CEC Standard 7;8)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71.43%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =2 (25%)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =5 (62.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
8. Incorporates a variety of <u>informal and formal</u> assessments (ex. – pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (InTASC - 1, 2, 7, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 2, II – 5, II – 6; NCATE 1d; CEC Standard7;8)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =7 (87.5%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION (items 9-19)			
SPRING 2013		2.26	
FALL 2013		2.70	
9. Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction. (InTASC 5; M-STAR Domain III – 11 ; CEC Standard 9)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (28.57%)	n=5 (71.43%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=0 (0%)	n=7 (87.5%)	n=1 (12.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (33%)	n=2 (67%)
10. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities. (InTASC 8; M-STAR Domain III – 11; CEC Standard 4;9)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (42.86%)	n=4 (57.14%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (28.57%)	n=5 (71.43%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=1 (12.5%)	n=6 (75%)	n=1 (12.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)
11. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students. (InTASC 2; M-STAR Domains I – 3, IV – 15; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=4 (57.14%)	n=3 (42.86%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=6 (85.71%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=2 (25%)	n=6 (75%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)
12. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning. (InTASC 3, 4; M-STAR Domain IV – 15, IV – 16; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=3 (42.86%)	n=4 (57.14%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=6 (85.71%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =2 (25%)	<i>n</i> =3 (37.5%)	<i>n</i> =3 (37.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
13. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. (InTASC - 1, 3, 5; M-STAR Domains III – 8, IV – 15; NCATE 1b; CEC Standard 4;5)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =2 (14.29%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (50%)	<i>n</i> =4 (50%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
14. Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught. (InTASC 4; M-STAR Domain III -7; NCATE 1a, 1b; CEC Standard 4;9)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71.43%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.28%)	<i>n</i> =6 (85.71%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =3 (37.5%)	<i>n</i> =4 (50%)	<i>n</i> =1 12.5%
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33.33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (66.67%)
15. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) to enhance student learning. (InTASC 8; M-STAR Domain III – 8, III – 9; NCATE 1b; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71.43)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.28%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =3 (37.5%)	<i>n</i> =5 (62.5%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)
16. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e., enrichment/remedial needs). (InTASC 1, 2, 8; M-STAR Domain I – 2; NCATE 1c; CEC Standard 4;7)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =4 (50%)	<i>n</i> =4 (50%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)
17. Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. (InTASC 4, 5, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 3, II – 6, III – 8, III – 9; NCATE 1b, 1c; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =7 (87.5%)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
18. Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses. (InTASC 1, 5, 8; M-STAR Domains II – 5, II – 6, III – 9; NCATE 1c, 1d ; CEC Standard 4;5)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =5 (71.43%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=6 (85.71%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=1 (12.5%)	n=7 (87.5%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (67%)	n=1 (33%)
19. Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning. (InTASC 10; M-STAR Domain III – 10: NCATE – 1c, 1g; CEC Standard 4;5;10)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=6 (85.71%)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=1 (14.29%)	n=4 (57.14%)	n=2 (28.57%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=4 (50%)	n=4 (50%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)	n=0 (0%)
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT (items 20-24)			
SPRING 2013		2.26	
FALL 2013		2.70	
20. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning. (InTASC 3: M-STAR Domain IV – 12, IV – 13, IV – 16; NCATE 1d; CEC Standard 5;6)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=6 (85.71%)	n=1 (14.29%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (42.86%)	n=4 (57.14%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	n=0 (0%)	n=8 (100%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)

21. Attends to or delegates routine tasks. (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 12; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =2 (25%)	<i>n</i> =3 (37.5%)	<i>n</i> =3 (37.5%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 (100%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
22. Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 13, IV – 16; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 57.14%	<i>n</i> =3 42.86%
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =3 42.86%	<i>n</i> =4 57.14%
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =3 37.5%	<i>n</i> =5 62.5%	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 67%	<i>n</i> =1 33%
23. Creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 13; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =6 (85.71%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =6 (85.71%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =5 (62.5%)	<i>n</i> =2 (25%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)

24. Maximizes time available for instruction (Uses instructional time effectively). (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 14; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)	<i>n</i> =2 (28.57%)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =7 (87.5%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (item 25)			
SPRING 2013		2.14	
FALL 2013		2.33	
25. Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.). (InTASC 10; M-STAR Domain V – 19; NCATE 1g; CEC Standard 10)			
SPRING 2013A (first rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =4 (57.14%)	<i>n</i> =3 (42.86%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
SPRING 2013B (second rating) (N=7)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =6 (85.71%)	<i>n</i> =1 (14.29%)
FALL 2013A (first rating) (N=8)	<i>n</i> =7 (87.5%)	<i>n</i> =1 (12.5%)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)
FALL 2013B (second rating) (N=3)	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =2 (67%)	<i>n</i> =1 (33%)

Analysis of Results:

In the Spring 2013 semester, our special education program adopted the revised 25-indicator Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument as the current Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (SETIAI). We made some additions to the wording of several indicators to focus in on candidate needs. Six out of seven (86%) candidates successfully completed the Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument. Candidates were observed twice (the first rating and the second rating), and the results of the two observations were compared. Indicators are in five domains: Domain I: Planning and Preparation (indicators 1-6), Domain II: Assessment (indicators

7-8), Domain III: Instruction (indicators 9-19), Domain IV: Learning Environment, and Domain V: Professional Responsibilities (indicator 25). The first observation is considered to be formative (in essence); therefore, category (domain) skills are from the second (summative) observation. The strongest domain was Domain IV: Learning Environment, with a mean of 2.51. The weakest area was Domain II: Assessment, with a mean of 2.07. The mean score for Domain I: Planning and Preparation was 2.36, the mean score for Domain III: Instruction was 2.26, and the mean score for Domain V: Professional Responsibilities was 2.14.

Candidates were rated on 25 indicators (items) across all domains on a 3-point Likert-type scale, with these values: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met, and 3=Expectations Exceeded. Areas of strength were those in which at least 60% of the candidates obtained a score of 3; areas of weakness were those in which less than 30% of the candidates obtained a score of 3.

Indicators 1-6 represent candidate performance in Domain I: Planning and Preparation. In the first rating, one area appeared as a relative strength: 4. Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology. Areas of relative weakness appeared in

5 out of 6 indicators: 1. Selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on the Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards; 2. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. Uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, interest inventories, surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful; 3. Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons; 5. Prepares appropriate assessments (ex. pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress; and 6. Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge (ex. – use of pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation, and enrichment activities).

In the second rating in Domain I, one indicator appeared as an area of relative strength: 4. Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology. Areas of relative weakness appeared in 3 indicators from Domain I: Planning and Preparation: 3. Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons; 5. Prepares appropriate assessments (ex. pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress; and 6. Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge (ex. – use of pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation, and enrichment activities).

Indicators 7 and 8 represent Domain II: Assessment. In the first rating, there were no areas of relative strength. Areas of relative weakness included both 7. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance, and 8. Incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments (ex. – pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. In the rating for Domain II: Assessment, there were no areas of relative strength or weakness.

Indicators 9-19 represent Domain III: Instruction. In the first rating, an area of relative strength was 14. Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught. Areas of relative weakness included: 13. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; 15. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) to enhance student learning; 16. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e., enrichment/remedial needs); 17. Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking; 18. Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses; and 19. Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning.

In the second rating in Domain III: Instruction, areas of relative strength included: 9. Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction; 10. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities; 11. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students; 12. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning; 14. Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught; and 18. Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses. Areas of relative weakness included: 17. Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking; and 19. Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning.

Indicators 20-24 represent Domain IV: Learning Environment. For the first rating, an area of relative strength was 23. Creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. Areas of relative weakness for the first rating included: 20. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; and 21. Attends to or delegates routine tasks.

Indicator 25 represents Domain V: Professional Responsibilities. It is only one indicator: Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.). During the first rating, this

appeared to be an area of relative weakness. However, all seven candidates met expectations on this indicator at the time of their second ratings.

In the Fall 2013 semester, three out of eight candidates successfully completed the Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (SETIAI). We increased the number of TIAI observations from two to four. The results of the first and third observations were compared. The third observation represents the instruction of a lesson from the candidate's TIAI unit. For the first observation, $n=8$. For the second observation, $n=3$. Indicators are in five domains: Domain I: Planning and Preparation (indicators 1-6), Domain II: Assessment (indicators 7-8), Domain III: Instruction (indicators 9-19), Domain IV: Learning Environment (indicators 20-24), and Domain V: Professional Responsibilities (indicator 25).

The first observation is considered to be formative; therefore, category (domain) skills are from the third (summative) observation. We must note that although seven candidates received an initial observation, only three candidates reached the stage of teaching their unit and completing the course. For the third observation with $n=3$, the strongest category was Domain I: Planning and Preparation, in which candidates obtained a mean of 2.72. The weakest area was Domain V: Professional Responsibilities, in which candidates obtained a mean of 2.33. In Domain II: Assessment, candidates obtained a mean of 2.50, in Domain III: Instruction, candidates obtained a mean of 2.70, and in Domain IV: Learning Environment, candidates obtained a mean of 2.33.

Candidates were rated on 25 indicators on a 3-point Likert-type scale: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met, and 3=Expectations Exceeded. Areas of strength were those in which at least 60% of candidates obtained a score of 3. Areas of weakness were those in which less than 30% of candidates obtained a score of 3.

Indicators 1-6 represent Domain I: Planning and Preparation. In the first rating ($n=8$), there were no areas of relative strength. Areas of weakness were in all 6 indicators: 1. Selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards; 2. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. Uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, interest inventories, surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful; 3. Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons; 4. Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology; 5. Prepares appropriate assessments (ex. pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress; and 6. Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge (ex. – use of pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation, and enrichment activities).

In the first rating for Domain I: Planning and Preparation ($n=3$), all 6 indicators were areas of relative strength: 1. Selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards; 2. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. Uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, interest inventories, surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful; 3. Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons; 4. Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology; and 5. Prepares appropriate assessments (ex. pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress; and 6. Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge (ex. – use of pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation, and enrichment activities). There were no areas of relative weakness in the third observation.

Indicators 7 and 8 represent Domain II: Assessment. In the first rating ($n=7$), there were no areas of relative strength. Areas of relative weakness were both 7. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance; and 8. Incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments (ex. – pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs.

In the second rating for Domain II: Assessment ($n=3$), areas of strength were both indicators 7. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance; and 8. Incorporates a variety of informal and formal assessments (ex. – pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs.

Indicators 9-19 represent Domain III: Instruction. In the first rating ($n=8$), the area of relative strength was indicator 12. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning. Areas of weakness included indicators 9-11: 9. Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction; 10. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities; and 11. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students. Additional areas of weakness included indicators 13-19: 13. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; 14. Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught; 15. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) to enhance student learning; 16. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e.,

enrichment/remedial needs); 17. Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking; 18. Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses; and, 19. Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning.

In the second rating of Domain III: Instruction ($n=3$), areas of relative strength included indicators 9-18: 9. Uses acceptable, written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction; 10. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities; 11. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students; 12. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning; 13. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; 14. Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught; 15. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) to enhance student learning; 16. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners; 17. Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking; and 18. Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses. The area of relative weakness was indicator 19. Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning.

Indicators 20-24 relate to Domain IV: Learning Environment. For the first rating ($n=8$), areas of relative weaknesses included all indicators: 20. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; 21. Attends to or delegates routine tasks; 22. Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs; 23. Creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students; and 24. Maximizes time available for instruction (uses instructional time effectively).

In the second rating for Domain IV: Learning Environment ($n=3$), areas of relative strength included indicators: 20. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; 22. Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs; 23. Creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students; and 24. Maximizes time available for instruction (uses instructional time effectively).

An area of relative weakness was in indicator 21. Attends to or delegates routine tasks. There is only one indicator in Domain V: Professional Responsibilities: Indicator 25. Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues (positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.). In the first rating ($n=8$), this was an area of relative weakness. However, in the second rating ($n=3$), this was an area of relative strength.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

In the Fall 2013 semester, the new and simpler Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) lesson plan was first used as a pilot project in CSP 674 *Advanced Instructional Planning in Special Education* and in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*. Moreover, it was used in the capstone courses, CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education I*/CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*. In CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*, candidates developed and taught a 3-day unit using the new TIAI lesson plan. They were rated on the revised 25-indicator TIAI. Even though the new TIAI lesson plan has a simpler format than the previous horizontal plan, it contains embedded prompts specifying where one should address TIAI rubric indicators 1-8, as well as several other indicators that have proven problematic over time.

We recommend the following changes:

1. Train candidates to write the new TIAI lesson plan beginning in CSP 672 *Fundamentals of Effective Teaching in Special Education* and introduce the TIAI rubric.
2. Follow through with training by using the simpler plan for both methods courses, CSP 640 *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and for the capstone courses, CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education*, CSP 557 *Internship in Special Education II*, and 647 *Action Research in Special Education*.
3. Draw candidates' attention to the Special Education Teacher Work Sample (SETWS) Contextual Factors section and rubric, which calls for them to describe a community resource that will be used in the unit.
4. Insert a module into CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment* to teach candidates about specific informal assessments, including pre-posttests as well as formal assessments.
5. Emphasize how the Design for Learning Differentiated Elements narrative and planning chart direct candidates to: (a) write remedial and enrichment activities into the plan, and (b) implement them during lessons. Continue to emphasize the use of differentiated instruction in CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion*.
6. Embed units within earlier courses leading to capstone courses that educate candidates on engaging students in analytic and critical thinking. In earlier courses, continue to teach domains of knowledge (DOK) levels and how to maintain rigor.
7. Insert in both methods courses mini lessons on classroom management, including attending to and delegating routine tasks.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 **MED-SE 05: LO Demonstrate skills associated with analyzing student data and developing teaching/learning strategies based on the analyses.**

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Analyze developmental level (general characteristics, language skills, motor skills, social skills, inclusion needs) of a student with significant learning, motor, sensory, cognitive, or social needs, and prepare intervention plan for that student.

Data Collection (Evidence)

This is a new way of assessing these outcomes. The Alternate Assessment (MAAECF) Language Project is an exploration of the language section of the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF). The assessment has five sections, a) Application of Alternate Assessment Process, b) Targeting Objectives, c) Alignment to General Education, d) Use of Accommodations, and e) Use of Supports. Each section is scored on a rubric from 0-3. In order to earn a passing score on the assessment, each candidate is expected to score a 2 or higher in each area.

The candidate is given samples of the Present Level of Performance and Accommodations in Assessment pages for three students. Two of the samples will be from students who qualify for alternate assessment; one student would not be eligible for alternate assessment. The candidate is asked to choose one of the students who qualifies for alternate assessment, justify the selection and then create an Alternate Assessment Portfolio for that student. Alternate assessment in Mississippi covers the areas of language, math and science. The candidate will only create the language section.

The Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF) for students with significant cognitive disabilities (SCD) is part of the Mississippi Statewide Assessment System. It is designed to assess the educational performance of students with disabilities who cannot participate in the general education curriculum, even with accommodations. Students in grades 3–8 and 12 who meet the state’s three SCD criteria are eligible to participate in the MAAECF. In general, eligible students are those who have a history of requiring extensive individualized instruction and have been classified as being severely to profoundly cognitively disabled or experience a pervasive developmental disability. (MDE, 2012)

This is administered in CSP 550 *Programming for Individuals with Severe/Multiple Disabilities*.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results:

	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Emerging)	2 (Acceptable)	3 (Target)
Section 1: Application of Alternate Assessment Process	<i>n</i> =0 (0%)	<i>n</i> =1 (5.88%)	<i>n</i> =8 (47.06%)	<i>n</i> =8 (47.06%)
Section 2: Targeting Objectives	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =10 (58.82%)	<i>n</i> =7 (41.18%)
Section 3: Alignment to General Education	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =6 (35.29%)	<i>n</i> =11 (64.71%)
Section 4: Use of Accommodations	<i>n</i> =1 (5.88%)	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =10 (58.82%)	<i>n</i> =6 (35.29%)
Section 5: Use of Supports	<i>n</i> =1 (5.88%)	<i>n</i> =0	<i>n</i> =10 (58.82%)	<i>n</i> =6 (35.29%)

Analysis of Results:

There were a total of 17 candidates who participated in this assessment. Sixteen out of the seventeen (94%) candidates passed. The strongest areas were Section 1: Application of Alternative Assessment Process and Section 3: Alignment to General Education.

Although one candidate did not meet expectations on Section 1: Application of Alternative Assessment Process, eight candidates scored 2 (Acceptable) and eight candidates scored 3 (Target). The strongest area was Section 3: Alignment to General Education. Six candidates scored 2 (Acceptable) and eleven candidates scored 3 (Target). In the other three areas (Section 2: Targeting Objectives, Section 4: Use of Accommodations, and Section 5: Use of Supports), more candidates scored 2 (Acceptable) than scored 3 (Target).

This is a new assessment, first implemented during the Summer II semester of 2013. It is based on a Mississippi assessment process for students with severe disabilities. This process is not covered in detail in any other class. Therefore, during the Summer II 2013 semester, the program was first able to examine weaknesses and strengths in these areas. In revising the course, it will be important to spend more time examining the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF) with particular attention to the requirements for the use of accommodations and supports.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

In revising the course, it will be important to spend more time examining the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF) with particular attention to the requirements for the use of accommodations and supports. Specifically, we will expand instructional modules to require each candidate to fully explore the MAAECF and complete instructional activities demonstrating mastery of curriculum planning and assessment with MAAECF objectives. In addition, the course will include additional practice case studies to enable each candidate to better understand the process.

Related Items

There are no related items.

 **MED-SE 06: LO Demonstrate competency in the use of multidimensional assessment in special education**

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate competency in the use of multidimensional assessments in special education to a) identify students with learning problems, b) to plan and adjust daily instruction c) and to plan for inclusion and classroom differentiation. The competency will be measured by the rubrics in the Special Education Assessment Folio. Candidates must score a 2 or higher on each element of the rubric. Program goal is 70% of candidates meeting the standard.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Assessment for fall 2011: Special Education Assessment Folio

The Special Education Assessment Folio has replaced the Special Education Assessment Work Sample. The artifacts for this folio are developed in four classes: CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Disabilities*, CSP 686, *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and the capstone class (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education* or CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*). Artifacts are then revised and expanded based on the internship experience. The first section, Formal Assessment, is created in CSP 545, *Assessment in Special Education*. The subsections of this section include: Norm Referenced Assessment, Mississippi Assessment Systems: Research to Intervention (RTI), and Mississippi Assessment: Special Education, and Ethics in Assessment. The second section, Informal Assessments, is created in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescent with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and/or CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*. Subsections include: Curriculum Based Assessment Teacher Made Tests and Curriculum Based Assessment Authentic Assessment. The third section, Assessment for Long Term Planning, is created in the capstone course (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education* or CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*).

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results:

1=Adequate 2=Emerging 3=Developing 4=Achieving	Formal Assessment	Informal Assessment*	Assessment for Long-Term Planning
Spring 2013 (N=6)	1=Adequate (n=0) 2=Emerging (n=0) 3=Developing (n=5) 4=Achieving (n=1)	Informal Assessment was moved from CSP 545 to CSP 643; this group of candidates was not assigned the assessment in either class. The informal assessment requirement was resumed Fall 2013 in CSP 643.	1=Adequate (n=0) 2=Emerging (n=0) 3=Developing (n=3) 4=Achieving (n=3)
Fall 2013 (N=3)	1=Adequate (n=0) 2=Emerging (n=0) 3=Developing (n=2) 4=Achieving (n=1)	Informal Assessment was moved from CSP 545 to CSP 643; this group of candidates was not assigned the assessment in either class. The informal assessment requirement was resumed Fall 2013 in CSP 643.	1=Adequate (n=0) 2=Emerging (n=0) 3=Developing (n=1) 4=Achieving (n=2)

Analysis of Results:

Data from this assessment is weak. In 2011, in an effort to meet specific CEC requirements for assessment, a previous version of this instrument was re-tooled with the idea that parts would be administered across three classes. Because our candidates are not in a cohort, they were arriving at the parts of the assessment in different semesters. This made administration of the instrument inconsistent and collection of

data disorganized. Additionally, the rubric for this instrument is insufficient in detail to make instructional decisions or track student progress. This instrument will be redesigned for Fall 2014 in the following ways:

1. It will be made into a single assessment to be administered each fall in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*.
2. It will have multiple rubric elements for each of the three dimensions of assessment: formal assessment, informal assessment and assessment for long-term planning.
3. The section on informal assessment will be aligned with the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) and the Teacher Work Sample (TWS).

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

This assessment will be redesigned for Fall 2014 in the following ways:

1. It will be made into a single assessment to be administered each fall in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*.
2. It will have multiple rubric elements for each of the three dimensions of assessment: formal assessment, informal assessment and assessment for long-term planning.
3. The section on informal assessment will be aligned with the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) and the Teacher Work Sample (TWS).

Related Items

There are no related items.

MED-SE 07: LO Demonstrate mastery of the content knowledge associated with the Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Learning Outcome

Demonstrate mastery of the content knowledge associated with the Council for Exceptional Children Standards as measured by the Education of Exceptional Children: Core Content Knowledge (0354), Cutoff score 142.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Candidates entering the program may be divided into three categories. One subgroup includes individuals who have completed an undergraduate degree in special education. These candidates have already met the Praxis Specialty Area requirement. The second subgroup includes individuals with undergraduate degrees in other areas of education. These individuals are advised to take the Praxis examination upon completion of 15-18 hours of coursework. In the last subgroup, members have undergraduate degrees in areas other than education. Some have already passed the special education Praxis examination due to requirements for alternate licensure in Mississippi. Others are full time students and are advised to take the Praxis

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

examination upon completion of 15-18 hours of coursework. The Praxis examination must be passed in order to register for comprehensive examinations.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results:

Special Education Praxis Score Summary

Praxis 0353 (Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge)

<p>Note: Average range for scores is reported for each separate administration. Levels are determined by the average scores listed for the administration period in which the scores were recorded. Did not meet standard: score is not in average range Met standard: score is in average range Exceeded standard: score is above average range</p>				
Semester of program completion	Understanding Exceptionalities	Legal and Societal Issues	Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities	Range of Composite Scores (Cutoff=136)
SPRING 2013 N=1	Met Standard n=1	Exceeded Standard n=1	Exceeded Standard n=1	184
Total 2013 N=1	Met Standard n=1	Exceeded Standard n=1	Exceeded Standard n=1	184

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

<p>Note: Average range for scores is reported for each separate administration. Levels are determined by the average scores listed for the administration period in which the scores were recorded. Did not meet standard: score is not in average range Met standard: score is in average range Exceeded standard: score is above average range</p>						
Semester of Program Completion	Domain I Development and Characteristics of Learners	Domain II Planning and the Learning Environment	Domain III Instruction	Domain IV Assessment	Domain V Foundations and Professional Responsibilities	Range of Composite Scores (all candidates met standard, must have passing score to complete program) (Cutoff= 142)
SPRING 2013 <i>N=5</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=1</i> Met standard <i>n=3</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=1</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=0</i> Met standard <i>n=4</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=1</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=2</i> Met standard <i>n=2</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=1</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=1</i> Met standard <i>n=2</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=2</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=2</i> Met standard <i>n=3</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=0</i>	155-190
Summer 2013 <i>N=7*</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=4</i> Met standard <i>n=2</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=1</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=3</i> Met standard <i>n=3</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=1</i>	Met standard <i>n=2</i> Met standard <i>n=4</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=1</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=2</i> Met standard <i>n=5</i>	Did not meet standard <i>n=2</i> Met standard <i>n=5</i> Exceeded Standard <i>n=0</i>	144-186

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

				Exceeded Standard $n=0$		
FALL 2013 $N=1^*$	Did not meet standard $n=1$ Met standard $n=0$ Exceeded Standard $n=0$	Did not meet standard $n=0$ Met standard $n=0$ Exceeded Standard $n=1$	Did not meet standard $n=1$ Met standard $n=0$ Exceeded Standard $n=0$	Did not meet standard $n=0$ Met standard $n=1$ Exceeded Standard $n=0$	Did not meet standard $n=1$ Met standard $n=0$ Exceeded Standard $n=0$	161
Total 2013 $N=13$	Did not meet standard $n= 6$ Met standard $n=5$ Exceeded Standard $n=2$ 54% met or exceeded standard	Did not meet standard $n= 3$ Met standard $n=7$ Exceeded Standard $n=3$ 77% met or exceeded standard	Did not meet standard $n=5$ Met standard $n=6$ Exceeded Standard $n=2$ 62% met or exceeded standard	Did not meet standard $n=3$ Met standard $n=8$ Exceeded Standard $n=2$ 77% met or exceeded standard	Did not meet standard $n=5$ Met standard $n=8$ Exceeded Standard $n=0$ 62% met or exceeded standard	144-190

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Praxis 0354 (Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications)

*Nine students took comps in the Summer 2013 semester. One student was retaking after not passing comps during the Spring 2013 semester. One student had a passing score, but there was no record of subscores. Two students took comps during the Fall 2013 semester. One student had a passing score, but no record of subscores.

Analysis of Results:

Because Praxis 0353 was discontinued in the Fall 2010 semester, there was only one candidate using this test for State licensure in 2013. Because of the small *n*, it is challenging to draw conclusions from these data. The score for this candidate was 184 (the minimum cutoff was 136). Three subscores were reported for the candidate: Understanding Exceptionality, Legal and Societal Issues, and Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities.

The Understanding Exceptionality section content included a) human development and behavior as related to students with disabilities; (Standard 2) b) characteristics of students with disabilities; (Standard 2) and c) basic concepts in special education, including definitions of all major categories and specific disabilities (Standard 2). The Legal and Societal Issues Section included a) Federal laws and legal issues related to special education, including IDEA 2004, Section 504, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (Standard 1); b) the school's connections with the families, prospective and actual employers, and communities of students with disabilities (Standard 10); and c) historical movements/trends affecting the connections between special education and the larger society (Standard 1). The Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities section included a) background knowledge, including conceptual issues, placement and program issues and integrating best practices from multidisciplinary research and professional literature into the educational setting (Standard 1); b) curriculum and instruction and implementation (Standard 4 and 7); c) assessment (Standard 8); d) structuring the learning environment (Standard 5); e) professional roles (Standard 9 and 10); and f) the effect of disability across the lifespan (Standard 3).

The candidate exceeded the Mississippi State Department of Education (MDE) standard for licensure (136). The MDE does not stipulate a cutoff score for subscores, nor does it require these subscores to be reported. As a program, upon the suggestion of CEC reviewers, we grouped subscores in terms of program expectations: 1=did not meet expectations, 2=met expectations, and 3=exceeded expectations. These categories do not connote an absolute standard for candidates; rather, they allow the program to identify strengths and weaknesses in preparation. The program designates their score as not meeting the expectation if it fell below the average range reported for the respective subscore when the candidate took the test, met expectation if it fell in the average range and exceeding expectation if it fell above the average. The candidate who reported scores for 0353 in 2013 on the Understanding Exceptionality section met the standard. The candidate exceeded the standard for both the Legal and Societal Issues section and the Delivery of Services to Students with Disabilities section.

Praxis 0354 Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications

Most candidates now report the Praxis 0354 Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications test for licensure. The current cutoff score is 142, but it will change to 152 in the FALL 2014 semester. In the 2013 school year, a total of 13 candidates took the test. The scores ranged from 144 to 190; the minimum cutoff score is 142. The subtest areas are: Domain I:

Development and Characteristics of Learners, Domain II: Planning and the Learning Environment, Domain III: Instruction, Domain IV: Assessment, and Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities. Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners (Standard 2) covers human development and behavior, theoretical approaches to student learning and motivation, basic characteristics and defining factors for each of the major disability categories, impact of disabilities to certain individuals, co-occurring conditions, how family systems contribute to the development of individuals with disabilities, and the environmental and social influences on student development and achievement. Domain II: Planning and the Learning Environment (Standard 5 and 7) includes questions about characteristics and elements of an effective lesson plan, learning objectives that are measurable and appropriately challenging, means of providing access to the curriculum, organizing the learning environment, how to understand and manage students' behaviors, theory and practice of effective classroom management and the design and maintenance of a safe and supportive classroom environment that promotes student achievement. Domain III: Instruction (Standard 4) asks questions about instructional strategies or techniques that are appropriate to students with disabilities, strategies that facilitate maintenance and generalization of concepts, selection and implementation of research-based interventions for such students, options for assistive technology, strategies that support transition goals, and preventive and intervention strategies for at-risk learners. Domain IV: Assessment (Standard 8) covers evidence-based assessments that are effective and appropriate for students, the uses of various assessments, how to interpret assessment results and the use of assessments results. Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (Standards 1 and 10) includes questions about Federal definitions, federal requirements for the pre-referral, referral, and identification, federal safeguards of the rights of the stakeholders, components of a legally defensible individualized education program, major legislation, roles and responsibilities of other professionals who deliver special education services, strengths and limitations of various collaborative approaches, communication with stakeholders, and potential bias issues that may impact the teaching and interactions with students and their families.

All candidates met or exceeded the Mississippi State Department of Education (MDE) standard for licensure (142). The MDE does not stipulate a cutoff score for subscores, nor does it require these subscores to be reported. Again, as a program, upon the suggestion of CEC reviewers, we have begun to group subscores in terms of program expectations: 1=Did Not Meet Expectations, 2=Met Expectations, and 3=Exceeded Expectations. These categories do not connote an absolute standard for candidates; rather, they allow the program to identify strengths and weaknesses in preparation. Candidate scores were compared to the average range of scores for the administration period in which they took the examination, as reported by ETS. A simple system of categorizing the scores is not possible as the averages reported by ETS change with each administration. Candidates may have taken the examination any time within a 5-year period of submitting scores for licensure. Therefore, in a single semester, the program completers may have taken the test in several different time periods. The program designates their score as not meeting the expectation if it fell below the average range reported for the respective subscore when the candidate took the test, met expectation if it fell in the average range and exceeding expectation if it fell above the average.

Out of 5 major domains, the strongest areas were Domain II: Planning and the Learning Environment, with 77% (10 out of 13) of the candidates meeting or exceeding the expectation and Domain IV: Assessment, with 77% (10 out of 13) of the candidates meeting or exceeding the

expectation. This is related to the strong emphasis in our program on lesson planning, unit planning and reflective teaching in our methods classes and in our field experiences, as well as revisions made to our Assessment course and our focus on assessment throughout the methods courses. Weak performance was reported on Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners, with 54% (7 out of 13) of the candidates meeting or exceeding expectations, Domain III: Instruction, with 62% (8 out of 13) of the candidates meeting or exceeding expectations, and Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities with 62% (8 out of 13) of the candidates meeting or exceeding expectations. It is unclear why the 2013 scores are lower than the 2012 scores in all domains except for Assessment. The low *N* for each year makes it difficult to definitively identify trends.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

As the MDE cutoff scores for the 0354 specialty test increase from 142 to 152, we will make an increased effort through required coursework to raise scores. For Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners, CSP 640 *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs* was redesigned in the Spring 2013 semester, with a more rigorous emphasis on typical and atypical development across all developmental levels. For Domain II: Instruction, a new course was added to the curriculum during the Summer 2013 semester, CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion*. This course emphasizes differentiated instruction, co-teaching practices, grouping strategies, specialized instruction, and research based interventions. To strengthen Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities, beginning in the Fall 2013 semester, candidates without classroom experiences will now take two semesters of internship. In the first semester, they will shadow a special education teacher and complete an ethnographic study of the special education internship setting. The ethnographic study was added as a new section to Assessment V: The Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Post planning during the Spring 2013 semester. For candidates who are already teaching, this ethnographic study is completed in their one semester internship. Although scores in Domain IV: Assessment are higher than the scores from 2012, assessment is still an area of concern. In Mississippi all formal assessments are performed by school psychologists; therefore, it is difficult to provide a rounded training experience in formal assessment and interpretation of assessment results. The faculty will be working with a local school psychologist to increase rigor and expand activities in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*.

Related Items

There are no related items

Gen Ed Learning Outcomes



CEL_300_GE07: Cultural Awareness

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)

Outcome: Cultural Awareness

Developing an understanding of the need to be accepting of the variety of cultures future students will bring into the classroom and developing the ability to articulate that understanding particularly as it relates to education and their future students.

Data Collection

1. Assessment methods will include test items (multiple choice) and written research papers.
2. Data will be collected via item analysis of the test data which will come from the online management system used for testing. Data from written reports will be collected by the instructor of the course. A scoring rubric will be used to assess the written reports.
3. Data will be compiled into a report by the instructor. Data will then be presented to the faculty of the department. As a collective team, faculty will determine the level of success by students and the changes, if any, that need to be incorporated into the course.

Results of Evaluation

Analysis of data revealed that students have been successful in developing an understanding of the need to be accepting of the variety of cultures future students will bring into the classroom. They demonstrated the ability to articulate that understanding as they relate to future students.

Use of Results

1. No specific recommendations were made due to the students meeting the learning outcome.
2. No changes are being proposed.

Related Items

There are no related items.

Unit Goals



TEL 2014_01: SPA/NCATE Compliance

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Unit Goal

Program reports were submitted to specialized professional associations (SPAs). The following programs submitted reports: B.S.E. in Elementary Education, M.Ed. in Special Education, M.A.T., and M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision. When reports are returned, program coordinators will complete any necessary revisions. In addition, non-SPA program reports will be prepared for the fall 2014 NCATE visit. Non-SPA programs include the M.Ed. and Ed.S. in Elementary Education, the Ed.S. in Educational Administration and Supervision, and the Ed.D. Degree Programs.

Evaluation Procedures

Program coordinators and program faculty will submit any required revisions to SPA reports, based on the evaluation of the reports submitted to their respective SPAs. Non-SPA program coordinators and program faculty will develop program reports based on NCATE Standard 1 in preparation for the fall 2014 NCATE visit.

Actual Results of Evaluation

Each of the SPA reports was submitted and approved by the appropriate accrediting body.

Use of Evaluation Results

The approval of the SPA reports were included in the NCATE report to be assessed for the NCATE visit in October, 2014.

Related Items



SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores



SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision



SP3.Ind06: Diversity



SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE



SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

 **TELR 2014_02: Increased enrollment of graduate students and retention of undergraduate students.**

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Unit Goal

Increase the number of graduates in the graduate Teacher Education Programs by an average of 1% over five years, with the baseline year as AY 2008-2009, and maintain enrollment in undergraduate programs.

Evaluation Procedures

Continue to hold recruitment events in strategically identified areas. Track the number of events, as well as number of prospective applicants who attend. Continue to develop strategic retention activities at the program level. Continue to track graduation numbers.

Actual Results of Evaluation

The graduate enrollment increased overall particularly in the Ed. S. program in Administration and Supervision, and the Ed. D. program. The other programs remained stable with the exception of the undergraduate elementary education program which had a decrease in enrollment. Enrollment in the M. Ed. in Special Education fluctuated from year to year with no apparent pattern emerging.

Use of Evaluation Results

The results of the evaluation enabled the appropriate personnel in the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research to know which degree programs needed more emphasis on recruitment and development.

Related Items



SP2.Ind01: Enrollment



SP2.Ind02: Retention



SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate



TELR 2014_03: Increase Faculty Publications

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Unit Goal

Increase the number of papers submitted and published by faculty, with 2010 as the baseline year.

Evaluation Procedures

Use the end-of-year faculty activity reports to document publications and presentations.

Actual Results of Evaluation

The number of papers and presentations by the faculty in the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research as increased somewhat since 2010. For example the number of presentations and articles published increased in 2013 over 2012 from 14 to 19. Faculty are continually encouraged to be more scholarly by doing research, presenting, and publishing.

Use of Evaluation Results

The results were used to show where the division stood in relation to past years and to show where we are in this area currently. This information was also used in our NCATE report to support our position as a scholarly division in the COEHS.

Related Items



SP3.Ind07: Credentials



SP3.Ind09: Professional development



TELR 2014_04: Use results of Quality Matters evaluations to improve online courses.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Unit Goal

Use results of Quality Matters evaluations to improve online courses.

Evaluation Procedures

The Chair will work with Program Coordinators and the Director of Instructional Support to plan, prioritize work, and implement procedures for addressing online course weaknesses.

Actual Results of Evaluation

The Chair worked with Dr. Franco Zengaro, Director of Instructional Support, and the program chairs to ensure that faculty followed the procedures of Quality Matters as well as the standards of the Division.

Use of Evaluation Results

Inspection of the Canvas shells revealed that overall the quality of online instruction improved. The decision was made to discuss with each faculty member not meeting the standards to help them correct the situation.

Related Items

-   **SP1.Ind07: Resources: access to appropriate library and learning resources**
-   **SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training**
-   **SP3.Ind04: Technology training**

TELR 2014_05: Faculty will be trained in maintaining accuracy and consistency in advisement procedures when evaluating students and in how to be an effective advisor.

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Unit Goal

Faculty will be trained in maintaining accuracy and consistency in advisement procedures when evaluating students and in how to be an effective advisor.

Evaluation Procedures

Provide regular training for all personnel who collect and analyze data. Provide regular training for all faculty who evaluate candidate performance in appropriate use of various assessment instruments and assessment procedures. Provide confidentiality training for all who have access to confidential information. Maintain training session agendas and sign-in sheets.

Actual Results of Evaluation

Faculty members in the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research discussed ways to improve advisement and be more effective advisors. These discussions took place during regular division meets. Specific topics covered were contacting students when they did not schedule an appointment, adherence to the planned program of studies, professional responsibilities as an advisor, and the need for effective advisement in retaining students. Specific information was also given in various classes pertaining to requirements for those courses only. This information was given by the instructor of each of these courses.

Use of Evaluation Results

Although no official tabulations were keep concerning problems in advising, the number of advising errors reported was lower than in the past. It also needs to be noted that improvement in advising is an ongoing process.

Related Items



SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising



TEL R 2014_06: Increase scores on new state-required CASE examination for undergraduate students

Start: 7/1/2013

End: 6/30/2014

Unit Goal

Train faculty in procedures for increasing CASE scores and GPA with students in undergraduate programs.

Evaluation Procedures

Evaluate test results to see if scores have been increased.

Actual Results of Evaluation

Because the information concerning the CASE test was released so late in the year by the Educational Testing Service, it was not possible to evaluate test scores for the past academic year in any kind of a formal sense. The need for increasing GPA was emphasized in workshops that the elementary faculty, as well as faculty from across, held for students so that they could do better work, thus increasing their GPA and also make better scores on the CASE.

Use of Evaluation Results

The use of this evaluation will be delayed until more information can be obtained. This should happen in 2014. We will continue to schedule workshops to help students increase their GPA.

Related Items



SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

Section IV.a
Brief Description
Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Brief Description and/or Narrative of programmatic scope:

Teacher Education Programs

- Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education - This degree provides initial licensure in grades Kindergarten through 6. Supplemental endorsements for middle level grades lead to licensure in grades 7-8. The program is available at the Cleveland campus, with a few courses offered at the Greenville Higher Education Center. In the Spring 2009 Semester a 2+2 Program with Hinds Community College was begun; most courses in the 2+2 Program are taught as hybrids with a few totally online. In 2013 an agreement was reached with Holmes Community College to implement a 2 + 2 program in the same area also.
- Master of Education Degree in Elementary Education – This program is available online. The purpose of the program is to prepare quality teachers who can teach at all levels of the elementary school.
- Educational Specialist Degree in Elementary Education – Beginning with the Spring 2009 Semester, this program has been totally online. The purpose of the program is to prepare quality elementary teachers who can function effectively and provide leadership for fellow teachers at both the primary and intermediate levels.
- Master of Education in Special Education – This program provides initial licensure in Special Education and is an online program. The program’s mission is to train teachers to work with children and youth with mild/moderate disabilities. The program is also structured to allow teachers who already hold initial licensure in Special Education and other areas to be awarded the M. Ed. Degree
- Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) – The MAT is an alternate-route program designed for promising individuals with non-education degrees who want to become teachers. It leads to a Master of Arts in Teaching Degree and Mississippi AA licensure. The program is online. The program offers an emphasis in Elementary Education (Grades 4 – 6) and Secondary

Education (Grades 7 - 12).

- Educational Leadership Programs - The following graduate degree programs are available for the preparation of educational administrators and supervisors: Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision – Public School Emphasis (full-time cohort program), Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision – Independent School Emphasis, and Educational Specialist in Educational Administration and Supervision (online). Each of these degree programs is designed to help develop effective school leaders at levels of public and private education.
- The Doctor of Education in Professional Studies Program has tracks in Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, Higher Education, and Counselor Education. These programs are designed to give students an in depth understanding of teaching and leadership as related to the concentration of the student’s choice.

Section IV.b
Comparative data

Enrollment, CHP, majors, graduation rates, expenditures, trends, etc.

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Credit Hour Production						
	Summer 2013		Fall 2013		Spring 2014	
	UG	GR	UG	GR	UG	GR
Administration (AED)	3	432	0	309	0	393
Adult Education (CAD)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elementary Education (CEL)	114	519	1293	519	1398	363
Media-Library Science (CML)	117	0	66	12	54	18
Reading (CRD)	105	102	273	0	255	147
Secondary Education (CSD)	0	33	0	18	0	0
Special Education (CSP)	189	264	408	270	396	180
Curriculum (CUR)	0	4638	434	11,007	241	192
Educational Administration & Supervision (EDL)	0	51	0	36	0	48
Research (ELR)	0	273	0	483	0	540
Supervision (SUP)	0	132	0	54	0	114
Total	528	6,444	2,474	12,708	2,344	1,995

Enrollment by Major						
	Summer 2013		Fall 2013		Spring 2014	
	UG	GR	UG	GR	UG	GR
Educational Admn. & Supervision	0	65	0	83	0	87
Elementary Education	74	127	226	127	197	116
Professional Studies	0	47	0	93	0	112
Special Education	0	36	0	56	0	40
Teaching (Alternative Route)	0	28	0	13	0	10
Total	74	303	226	373	197	365

2013-14 Graduates	
Educational Admn. & Supervision	
EdS	37
MEd	7
Elementary Education	

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

BSE	49
EdS	14
MEd	68
Professional Studies	
EdD	6
Special Education	
MEd	1
Teaching (Alternative Route)	
MAT	10

MEd, Secondary Education Enrollment by Concentration						
	Summer 2013		Fall 2013		Spring 2014	
	UG	GR	UG	GR	UG	GR
English Education	0	4	0	3	0	4
Fine Arts Education	0	1	0	7	0	5
History Education	0	0	0	3	0	3
Social Science Education	0	5	0	6	0	3
Total	0	10	0	19	0	15

2013-14 Graduates	
Secondary Education	
MEd, English Education	0
MEd, Fine Arts Education	2
MEd, History Education	1
MEd, Social Science Education	3

[Trend Data 2010-14 Teacher Education, Leadership, & Research](#)
[Trend Data 2010-14 MEd-Secondary Education](#)

Trend data in TELR varies according to the specific degree program. Enrollment in the doctoral program has increased steadily during the past five years with most of it occurring during the last two. Credit hour production increased proportionally. Faculty evaluations indicate that the program is well-planned in a student accommodating manner. Continued growth is expected in this program.

In the Educational Administration and Supervision programs, enrollment increased steadily in the Ed. S. program but decreased in the M. Ed. Cohort program. Credit hour production increased or decreased consistently with the enrollment. Projections are that the Ed. S. enrollment will level off and the M. Ed. will remain steady as a result of the grant from the USDE.

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

The graduate program in Special Education has seen a slight overall decrease in enrollment during the past five years. This was also a slight drop in enrollment in the Master of Arts in Teaching program. Future enrollment in both of these programs will undoubtedly decrease because of increased standards mandated by the Mississippi Department of Education and the state legislature. Faculty evaluations in both of these programs were consistent with those from other academic areas for the past five-year period with the MAT receiving better ratings overall.

During the past five years, the graduate programs in Elementary Education increased significantly due to partial funding for tuition from the private Tri-State Foundation. However, the projection is that the enrollment in these programs will decrease because only one new cohort program in Elementary Education has been funded for the near future. Credit hour production has increased according to the increase in the number of students enrolling in these program. The undergraduate Elementary Education program has not shown a consistent pattern in enrollment during the past five years. However, future enrollment in the future is expected to decline and then level off because of increased entrance requirements imposed by the Mississippi Department of Education and the state legislature.

Overall, considering all of the elements which must be taken into account which are not controlled by the COEHS or DSU, projects would seem to indicate a slight decrease for the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research for the future with credit hour production dropping accordingly. All of the programs in the Division are rated by students as operating well and being beneficial to students. It is also assumed that faculty evaluations will be approximately the same as they have been with the ratings of faculty in other academic areas which has been the case for the time period under consideration.

Sources

-  [Trend Data 2010-14 MEd-Secondary Education](#)
-  [Trend Data 2010-14 Teacher Education, Leadership, & Research](#)

Section IV.c

Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress:

- A racial minority faculty member is the Coordinator of the graduate Elementary Education Program and one is Coordinator of the M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision. One minority work-study student and one minority graduate assistant were employed to assist faculty in the Division.
- The Masters of Arts in Teaching, Special Education, M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision, and Educational Specialist Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program have attracted "other race"* students from across the Delta region. The online Master's and Educational Specialist Degree Programs in Elementary Education have attracted "other race" students from across the Delta region, the State of Mississippi, and adjoining states.

- The Division had alternative course offerings during the past academic year through intersession courses, online courses, hybrids, and intense schedules in an effort to accommodate nontraditional students, working students, or those with other encumbrances that might make traditional course offerings difficult to access.

* Since the majority of Delta State University's faculty, staff and students are classified as "White," the term "other race," as used above, is to be defined as including those individuals classified by the U.S. Census Bureau as American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander.

Section IV.d

Economic Development Initiatives and Progress

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Economic Development Initiatives and/or Impact:

Faculty Service to Area Schools and Educators

The Division provided ongoing professional development opportunities to area school district teachers and administrators. These focused on best practices for inclusive classrooms, including effective teaching of literacy skills, differentiated instruction, and RTI. Faculty also hosted events, such as reading fairs, and served as judges for events. The Educational Leadership Program partnered with DAAIS to provide professional development for local administrators in school law. All of these were done at nominal or no cost to area schools and school districts.

The online Master of Elementary Education and Educational Specialist in Elementary Education Degree Programs continue to draw new students. The second group of candidates (23) graduated from the Delta State University/Hinds Community College 2+2 in Elementary Education Degree Program graduated in 2012. The Ed.S. in Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program and the Ed. D programs continued to grow through the provision of online and hybrid course offerings.

Faculty Service to the Community

One-Year Plan (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010)

The Division continued efforts to maintain the quality of the graduate and undergraduate programs, to provide professional development opportunities to area school district teachers and administrators, and to provide services to the community through the Literacy Enhancement Clinic. In addition, a Healthy Schools Coordinator was employed with DHA funds. The Coordinator worked with undergraduate Elementary Education and Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision faculty to infuse Healthy School components into their programs of study and developed a resource room of materials for check-out by undergraduate Elementary Education teacher candidates.

Two-Year Plan (July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011)

Efforts from Year 1 continued to be refined. In addition, the Healthy Schools Coordinator worked with the instructor of the secondary education introductory course to infuse Healthy

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

School components into these courses. The Healthy Schools Coordinator also worked with local schools on Healthy and Safe School initiatives.

Five-Year Plan (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2014)

The long-term plan includes continuing to provide quality graduate and undergraduate programs, as well as providing professional development for educators and the community. Division faculty also plan to investigate the possibility of establishing long-term partnerships with area school districts to train teacher leaders and provide degree programs at the Greenville Higher Education Center Mississippi Delta Community College and Holmes Community College.

Section IV.e

Grants, Contracts, Partnerships, Other Accomplishments

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Grants, Contracts, Partnerships, Other Accomplishments:

- The Literacy Across the Curriculum: Institute for Teachers in Grades 6 – 12 (LACI), funded by a \$89,447 IHL grant, provided training for Delta area teachers in the incorporation of literacy skills in the content areas. Dr. Levenia Barnes, a retired faculty member, is the director of the Institute.
- The undergraduate Elementary Education Program partners with the administration and faculty at Cypress Park Elementary and Nailor Elementary in Cleveland to teach CRD 326 Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties on site at these schools. Mrs. Anjanette Powers coordinate this partnership. Also the undergraduate Elementary Education Program partners with Parks Elementary School in teaching *CEL 312 Language Arts in the Elementary School*.
- The Delta State University/Tishomingo County School District Partnership received a grant from the Tri-State Educational Foundation to assist in funding tuition for Northwest Mississippi teachers to receive a Master of Education in Elementary Education Degree starting in August 2014. During the 2013 – 2014 academic year, the Ed. S. cohort programs in Elementary Education, Administration and Supervision, Ed. D. program in Professional Studies, and a Master of Education in Elementary Education sponsored by the Tri-State Foundation continued. These programs will complete the cycle of courses in spring, 2014. Additionally, the Ferguson Fellowship Program was initiated with the support of the Tri-State Foundation to further the education of two practicing administrators each year. Dr. Corlis Snow coordinates the program in Elementary Education, Dr. Terry Harbin coordinates the program in Administration and Supervision and the Ferguson Fellowship Program, and Dr. Jacqueline Craven coordinates the doctoral program.
- The DSU/HCC Partnership Elementary Education Partnership is a 2+2 partnership between the Hinds Community College and the undergraduate Elementary Education Program. The program began in the Spring 2009 Semester and provides graduates of Hinds Community College and other residents of Hinds and surrounding counties the opportunity to complete a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Degree from Delta State University. Mrs. Terry Parrish and Dr. Joe Garrison coordinate this partnership. An addition 2+2 program in Elementary Education was also initiated with Holmes Community College.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

- The College of Education and Human Sciences under the direction of Dean Leslie Griffin obtained a \$1,000,000 grant from the United States Department of Education to be funded over a five year period to train school administrators in the Mississippi Delta. The director of this grant is Dr. Jennifer Wilson.
- Service Learning Data (list of projects, number of students involved, total service learning hours, accomplishments, etc.): Two undergraduate Elementary Education student organizations (Mississippi Early Childhood Association, Mississippi Association of Middle Level Educators) participated in various projects to help children in selected local schools.

Section IV.f

Service Learning Data

List of projects, number of students involved, total service learning hours, number of classes, faculty involved, accomplishments.

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Section IV.g

Strategic Plan Data

Only use this section if you have strategic plan info to report that is not covered in other areas of your report

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Strategic Plan Data:

- 3.11 Number of professional development activities by FT faculty - See Section V. Noteworthy activities and accomplishments, Professional Growth and Development Section
- 3.12 Number of scholarly contributions by FT faculty – See Section V. Noteworthy activities and accomplishments, Scholarship Section
- 3.13 Number of service activities by FT faculty - See Section V. Noteworthy activities and accomplishments, Service Section

Section IV.h

Committees Reporting To Unit

Each unit includes in the annual plan and report a list of the committees whose work impacts that unit or any other aspect of the university; along with the list will be a notation documenting the repository location of the committee files and records. Committee actions affecting the unit's goals may be noted in other applicable sections of the annual reports. Not required to be included in the unit's annual plan and report, but required to be maintained in the repository location, will be a committee file that includes, for each committee: Mission and by-laws, Membership, Process, Minutes.

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Committees Reporting To Unit:

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

- The Division Chair is also chair of the Teacher Education Council (TEC) which is the policy-making body for all undergraduate Teacher Preparation Programs at Delta State University. Membership is made up of representatives from the Teacher Preparation Programs, P-12 teachers and administrators, community college faculty, community leaders and P-12 parents, and undergraduate and graduate teacher education candidates. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive. An equivalent organization, the Graduate Professional Education Council (GPEC), is the policy making body for all graduate programs in Teacher Education. The Teacher Education Advisory Committee was also established to ensure input from the community at large concerning ways to improve all aspects of our teacher education programs.
- The Division Curriculum Committee is made up of the division chair, who also chairs the committee; the Program Coordinators; undergraduate and graduate teacher and administrator candidates, and P-12 representatives. The committee reviews and approves all curriculum changes made to courses in the Division. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.
- The Assessment Committee for the unit is currently chaired by Dr. Cheryl Cummins and Dr. Kathe Rasch. This committee guides the development and refinement of candidate performance assessments and the Unit Assessment System used to collect, analyze, and disseminate data on candidate performance. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.
- The Ed.D. Program Coordinator, Dr. Jacqueline Craven, is chair of the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council, which is the policy-making council for the Ed.D. Program. Committee records are maintained in the Ed.D. Program Coordinator's Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.
- Dr. Joe Garrison, chair of the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research serves as chair of the Teacher Education Advisory Committee.

Section V.a

Faculty (Accomplishments)

Noteworthy activities and accomplishments

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Faculty Accomplishments

Publications

Craven, J., Howell, E., and McPherson, D. (2013). "The 'Art of Living Smart' Summer Camp Survey Results from 2012: Do Children in the Mississippi Delta have the Art?" *Delta Journal of Education*.

Craven, J., (2013). "Review of *Hierarchical Linear Models for Education*." *SAGE Publications*.

Kuykendall, M, Lambert, E, and Hartley, V. (2013). *Teacher Research on Cultural Responsiveness With Students With Exceptional Learning Needs*. American Council on Rural Special Education Conference, Orlando, Florida.

Thomas, D., (2013). "Review of *I Am: Albert Einstein*." In *What's New in Children's Literature 2013*. Little Rock, AR: Southern Early Childhood Association Publications.

Van Namen, M. (2013). "Three-dimensional students: Getting to know you." *Middle Ground*. Association of Middle Level Education.

Van Namen, M. (2013). *An Analysis of Praxis I Scores, GPA, CBASE Scores, TIAI Scores, and Praxis II Scores in a Mississippi Teacher Preparation Program*. Dissertation.

Delta State University FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Presentations

- Casebeer, C. (2013). "Choosing research methods: A refresher workshop." Delta State University
- Craven, J. (2013). "The Art of Living Smart Camp Participant Food Knowledge and Preferences." MSERA Conference, Pensacola Beach, FL.
- Harbin, J. (2013). "Poster Presentation." CREATE Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Hartley, V. & Street, S. (2013). *Could You Put That in Writing? Absent Minded Professors Meet Online Instruction*. American Council on Rural Special Education Conference, Orlando, Florida.
- Hartley, V. & Street, S. (2013). *Diverse Learners. Diverse Teachers. A Grand Combination*. Practitioner training at Mississippi Council for Exceptional Children, Philadelphia, MS.
- Hartley, V. & Street, S. (2013). *Person-Environment Fit in Online Teaching*. Teaching Professor Technology Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Kuykendall, M., Cessna-Lindsay, M., Reynolds, M., & Taylor, S. (2013). *Teacher action research on cultural responsiveness*. Power point presented at the 32nd Annual F.E. Woodall Conference for the Helping Professions. Delta State University. Cleveland, MS.
- Kuykendall, M. (2013). *Displays of culturally responsive teaching strategies*. Poster presented at the Annual Mid-South Educational Research Association Conference, Pensacola Beach, Fla.
- Kuykendall, M, Lambert, E, and Hartley, V. (2013). *Teacher Research on Cultural Responsiveness With Students With Exceptional Learning Needs*. American Council on Rural Special Education Conference, Orlando, Florida.
- Lambert, E, Hartley, V, Kuykendall, M and Harbin, J (2013). *Metamorphosis: Emerging from a Traditional Degree Program into an Online Program*. American Council on Rural Special Education Conference, Orlando, Florida.
- Powers, A., Thomas, D., Van Namen, M. (2013). *Staying afloat on the literacy life boat*. Presentation at the Mississippi Reading Association Conference, "Reading and Writing on the River," Vicksburg, MS.
- Powers, A., Van Namen, M., Tougaloo Elementary Education Students, & Marshall, S. (2013). *College student panel*. Presentation at the Future Educators Association State Leadership Conference, Jackson, MS.
- Snow, C., Griffin, L., & Cummins, C. (2013). *Investigating the need for Teacher Leadership Preparation Programs in the Mississippi Delta: Administrator's and Teachers' Perceptions*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association (MSERA) Conference, Pensacola, FL.

Collaboration

- Reviewer, Delta Journal of Education (Craven, Watkins)
- ACRES Presenter (Harbin)
- ACRES Conference Planning Committee (Lambert)
- ACRES Technology Committee (Lambert)
- ACRES Scholarship Committee (Lambert)
- Praxis I & II Workshop Coordinator (Powers, Thomas, Van Namen)
- Cleveland-Bolivar County Chamber of Commerce (Powers)
- Bedtime Story Hour Evaluator (Powers, Thomas, Van Namen)
- Advisory/Craft Committee, Cleveland Career Development and Technology Center (Powers)
- Crosstie Arts and Jazz Festival Committee – Volunteer Chairman (Powers)
- Reading Fair Judge (Powers, Van Namen)
- Neighborhood Children's Program Board Member St. Luke UMC, Cleveland (Lambert)
- Neighborhood Children's Program, St. Luke UMC (Lambert)
- Delta Arts Alliance Member (Powers)

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Technical Assistance/Professional Development Services to Area Schools and Communities
Bridges, A. (2013). "Differentiated Instruction/Improving Comprehension Strategies" Belzoni, MS.
Bridges, A. (2013). "Improving Comprehension Strategies/Fluency Building." Belzoni, MS.

Advisors to Student Organizations

Early Childhood Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Thomas)
Delta Reading Council (Thomas)
Future Educators Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Van Namen)
Student Association of Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education Co-Advisors (Van Namen)
Phi Mu Sorority Advisor (Powers)
Delta Delta Delta Sorority Advisor (Van Namen)
Kappa Delta Pi (Snow)
Student Advisory Committee Advisors (Thomas, Van Namen)

Affiliation with/Support of Professional Organizations, University, College, and Division Committees

Faculty members provide service as sponsors, officers, committee members, and/or members in the following organizations:

AERA
American Association of School Administrators
Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators
Arkansas Association of Elementary School Principals
Arkansas Association of School Business Officials
Arkansas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association for Middle Level Educators
Council for Exceptional Children
Delta Kappa Gamma
Future Educations Association
GLM Inc. Family Mentoring and Youth Advocacy
International Reading Association
Kappa Delta Pi
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Mississippi Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Mississippi Congregational Health Network
Mississippi Early Childhood Association
Mississippi Professional Educators
Mississippi Reading Association
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Council for Social Sciences
Omicron Delta Kappa
Southern Early Childhood Association

Delta State Univeristy FY2014 Unit Level Report
Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

Faculty members are involved in committee work at the University, College, and Division levels. During the past year, The Division had representation on each of the following:

University

Alumni Association
Courtesy Committee
College of Education & Human Sciences Curriculum Committee
Diversity Advisory Committee, Recorder
DSU Alumni Association
DSU Student Publications Committee
DSU Student Organizations Committee
Faculty Senate Senator
Faculty Senate Proxy
Graduate Appeals Committee
Graduate Council
Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Advisory Committee
Health and Wellness Committee
Merit Pay appeals Committee
QEP Committee
Safety Committee
SACS 2014 Reaffirmation Committee
Student Activities Committee
Textbook Committee
Teaching Excellence Committee
Writing across the Curriculum Committee

College

Assessment Committee; Co-Chair, Member
College of Education Enhancement Fund Committee
Division of Counselor Education and Psychology Tenure and Promotion
Committee
Doctoral Admissions and Curriculum Council; Chair, Member
Dissertation Committee; Chair, Member
Graduate Education Program Council
Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Advisory Committee
Learning Management System Committee
NCATE Coordinator
Standard 3 Committee
Various NCATE Committees, Members
Teacher Education Council; Chair, Member
Teacher Education Curriculum Committee

Division

Doctoral Program Coordinator
Tenure and Promotion Committee; Chair, Member
Search Committee for Division Chair
Teacher Education Curriculum Committee
Teacher Education Council Member
Coordinator's Council: Division of Teacher Education
Special Education Curriculum Committee

Section V.b
Staff (Accomplishments)
Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Staff Accomplishments

Staff members attended the following trainings:

 Respondus LockDown Browser training
 Timekeepers training

Common Core Bootcamp

Staff members participated in the following development activities:

 Reader, Advanced Placement World History Examination (Becker)
 Manuscript Reviewer, The Teacher Educator (Zengaro)
 MSERA Conference Main Program Reviewer (Zengaro)

Members of the following committees:

Health and Wellness Committee
Conferencing Advisory Committee
Information Technology Governance Committee

Presentations

Zengaro, F., & Zengaro, S. (2013, December). Voice Thread as a pedagogical tool in asynchronous courses. Paper accepted at the 7th Annual SoTL Commons Conference Coastal Georgia Center, Savannah, GA.

Zengaro, S., Zengaro, F., Ali, M., & Simmons, T. (2013, November). Using Critical Incidents and Reflections to Evaluate Student Engagement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Pensacola, FL.

Zengaro, S., Zengaro, F. (2013, November). Using First-Person Education to Promote Critical Thinking in College Classrooms. Symposium conducted at the Annual Meeting for the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Pensacola, FL.

Ali, M., Zengaro, F., & Zengaro, S. (2013, March). A Study of online and on-ground Students' responses to critical thinking technique to engage and focus them in course period in college. Paper accepted at the Innovative Professor Conference Austin Peay State University, Tennessee.

Section V.c
Administrators (accomplishments)
Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Presentations

Griffin, L., Cummins, C., Garrison, J. (2013). *Creating a Culture Shift for Assessment-Based Improvement*. Proposal submitted to the National Institute on the Assessment of Adult Learning Conference, Atlantic City, NJ.

Sandifer, L., McKnight, E., Bunn, P., & Garrison, R. J. (2013). *Soft Skills; Student Perceptions of their Abilities*. Society of Business, Industry and Economics, 2013 Annual Conference, Sandestin. FL.

Section V.d

Position(s) requested/replaced with justification

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Dr. Franco Zengaro was hired for the new position of Director of Instructional Support

Section V.e

Recommended Change(s) of Status

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Dr. JeVon Marshall resigned effective December 31, 2013

Dr. Dianne Thomas was promoted to Associate Professor and granted Tenure effective August 2013

Dr. Merideth Van Namen was promoted to Assistant Professor effective August 2013
Employed was Dr. Franco Zengaro as Director of Instructional Support

Section VI.a

Changes Made in the Past Year

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

Entrance requirements for the M.Ed. in Special Education were changed to require a 3.0 minimum GPA.

Entrance requirements for teacher education were changed for the MAT, B.S.Ed., and M.Ed. in Special Education programs to require the new Core Academic Skills for Educators Exam in place of the Praxis I.

Section VI.b

Recommended Changes for the Coming Year

Judgment

Meets Standards Does Not Meet Standards Not Applicable

Narrative

None

CEL 317 Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood/318 Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades Integrated Unit Components

	Possible Points	Points Earned
1. Unit Rationale (Grading Scale # 1)	9	_____
▪ Goal of the Unit		
▪ Attitudes to Be Developed		
2. Contextual Factors and Class Description (Rubric # 1)	12	_____
3. Learning Goals (Rubric # 2)	9	_____
▪ Objectives		
▪ Concepts and Skills		
▪ Vocabulary		
4. Unit at a Glance (Grading Scale # 2)	9	_____
▪ Integration of Content		
▪ Weekly Plan Sheet		
5. Lesson Plans (Rubric # 3)	*60	_____
▪ NOTE: The value of the lesson plans totals 30 points. This total will be doubled to weight the value of individual plans correctly.		
▪ Language Arts		
▪ Math		
▪ Science		
▪ Social Studies		
▪ Fine Arts		
▪ Physical Education		
▪ Health		
6. Assessment Plan (Rubric # 4)	*9	_____
▪ Tests and rubrics used		
▪ Justification of types of assessments used		
▪ Specific assessment materials	*5	_____
7. Home-School-Community Connection (Rubric # 5)	6	_____
▪ Parent Letter		
▪ Community Involvement		
▪ Homework		
8. Teaching day Assessments	*24	_____
▪ NOTE: The value of the teaching day assessment totals 12 points. This total will be doubled to weight he value of individual assessment correctly.		
▪ Individual Teaching Evaluation (Rubric # 6)		
▪ TIAI University Supervisor (if applicable)		
9. Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Rubric # 7)	*18	_____
▪ Team Reflections		
▪ Self-Evaluation		

		Total 161

Grading Scale # 1

Date _____

Names _____

	1 Indicator Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Rationale Content	Rationale is unclear, vague, and lacks specificity	Rationale is somewhat unclear and contains only a few details	A clear rationale for teaching the unit is present	
Goals	Goals do not represent developmentally appropriate practices	Some goals represent developmentally appropriate practices	All goals are representative of developmentally appropriate practices and are clearly mentioned	
Attitudes	Insufficient evidence of promoting attitudes for successful learning experiences	Some evidence of promoting attitudes for successful learning experiences is present	Attitudes that promote successful learning experiences are present and clearly outlined	
Writing Composition and Mechanics	More than three grammar, spelling, and mechanics errors	Less than two grammar, spelling, and mechanics errors	Correct use of standard grammar/spelling	
			Total	

Rubric # 1

Date _____

Names _____

CEL _____
Contextual Factors and Class Description
Rubric

TWS Standard: *The teacher uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals, plan instruction and assess learning.*

Rating Indicator	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Knowledge of Community, School and classroom Factors (ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2)	Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom.	Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	
Knowledge of Characteristics of Students (ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2)	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities).	Teacher displays general knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general and specific understanding of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	
Knowledge of Students' Skills and Prior Learning (ACEI 3.1)	Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning.	Teacher displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general and specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	
Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment (ACEI 3.1, 3.5)	Teacher does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.	Teacher provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Teacher provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	
			Total	

Rubric # 2

Date _____

Names _____

**Learning Goals: Objectives, Concepts, and Skills
 Rubric**

Rating Indicator	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Clarity and Appropriateness for Students (ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.5)	Less than 60% of the goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes. Less than 60% of the goals are not appropriate for the development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences, and other student needs.	60-94% of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes. 60-94% of the goals are appropriate for the development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences, and other student needs.	95% or more of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes. 95% or more of the goals are appropriate for the development, prerequisite knowledge, skills, experiences, and other student needs.	
Alignment with National, State, or Local Standards (ACEI 1, 2.1, 2.7, 3.1, 3.3)	Less than 60% of the goals are not aligned with national, state, or local standards.	60-94% of the goals are aligned with national, state, or local standards.	95% or more of the goals are aligned with national, state, or local standards.	
Facilitates Acquisition of Appropriate Concepts and Skills (ACEI 1, 3.4, 3.2)	Less than 60% of the goals facilitate the acquisition of appropriate concepts and skills.	60-94% of the goals facilitate the acquisition of appropriate concepts and skills.	95% or more of the goals facilitate the acquisition of appropriate concepts and skills.	
			Total	

Grading Scale # 2

Date _____

Names _____

The chart demonstrates:

	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met
Connections (ACEI 1, 3.1)	Inappropriate or no connections between subject areas	Few connections are seen between subject areas	Clear and appropriate connections are seen between subject areas
Collaboration (ACEI 5.2)	No collaboration is evident due to an incohesive unit of study	Some collaboration is evident throughout the unit of study	Clear collaboration as evidenced by a cohesive unit of study
Sequencing (ACEI 1, 3.1, 4)	Inappropriate or no sequencing of experiences, skills, and concepts	Some appropriate sequencing of experiences, skills, and concepts	Proper and clear sequencing of experiences with skills and concepts
		Total	

Lesson Plan Rubric

	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Acceptable 2	Outstanding 3
Objectives (ACEI 1, 3.1)	Objectives are missing, unclear, or are unrelated to standards.	Objectives do not provide a clear sense of what students will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson. Some of the objectives are related to standards.	Objectives provide some sense of what students will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson. Most of the objectives are related to standards.	Objectives provide a clear sense of what students will know and be able to do as a result of the lesson. All objectives are clearly and closely related to standards.
Grade Level Appropriateness (ACEI 1, 3.1)	Objectives and activities are inappropriate for the intended grade level.	Some, but not all, objectives and activities are appropriate for the intended grade level.	Most objectives and activities are appropriate for the intended grade level.	All objectives and activities are appropriate for the intended grade level.
Instructional Activities (ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.3, 4)	Activities are unrelated to objectives. Many activities are extraneous and irrelevant. No attempt is made to individualize activities for learning styles or strengths.	Activities relate peripherally to objectives. Some activities are extraneous or irrelevant. Activities are not accessible to students with different learning styles and strengths.	Activities relate to objectives. A few activities may be extraneous or irrelevant. Activities are accessible to students of more than one learning style of strength.	Activities provide a logical path to meeting objectives. No activities are extraneous or irrelevant. Students of many learning styles and strengths can benefit from activities.
Differentiated Instruction (ACEI 1, 3.2)	No differentiation of instruction is mentioned.	Lesson plan includes minimal differentiated instruction, limited to either gifted students OR students with special needs.	Lesson includes some differentiated instruction for gifted students and students with special needs.	Lesson clearly offers appropriate, creative, and well-integrated challenges for students of all levels, including gifted students and students with special needs.
Teacher-Created Supporting Materials (ACEI 1, 3.5)	No supporting materials are included.	Supporting materials and student handouts are messy, incomplete, and/or unappealing to students. Materials do not enhance lesson.	Supporting materials and student handouts are clear and complete. Materials enhance lesson.	Supporting materials and student handouts are clear, complete, and appealing to students. Materials enhance lesson significantly.
Assessment (ACEI 4)	Assessment is unrelated to objectives and standards.	Assessment is somewhat related to objectives and standards. Assessment is not appropriate for all students' learning styles and strengths.	Assessment is related to objectives and standards. Assessment is less accessible for students with certain learning styles and strengths.	Assessment is directly related to objectives and standards. Assessment provides opportunities for students with varying learning styles and strengths to excel.
Mechanics (ACEI 3.5)	Spelling and grammar are unacceptable.	The lesson plan contains many spelling and grammar errors.	The lesson plan contains few spelling and grammar errors.	Spelling and grammar in lesson plan are flawless.

Rubric # 3 (cont'd)

Integrated Unit Lesson Plan Rubric

	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Acceptable 2	Outstanding 3
Language Arts / Reading (ACEI 1, 2.1, 3.1)	Lessons do not reflect balanced reading instruction and inappropriately address the language arts modes.	Lessons inaccurately reflect balanced reading instruction and address no more than two language arts modes.	Lessons accurately reflect balanced reading instruction and address three to four language arts modes.	Lessons accurately reflect balanced reading instruction and address all language arts modes.
Mathematics (ACEI 1, 2.3, 3.1)	Lessons do not reflect instruction regarding major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes for mathematics and do not facilitate students' abilities to represent phenomena, problem solve, and manage data.	Lessons reflect inappropriate or poorly developed instruction regarding major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes for mathematics and inappropriately facilitate students' abilities to represent phenomena, problem solve, and manage data.	Lessons reflect appropriate use of major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes for math instruction and facilitate students' abilities to represent phenomena, problem solve, and manage data.	Lessons reflect outstanding use of major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes for math instruction and facilitate students' abilities to represent phenomena, problem solve, and manage data.
Social Studies (ACEI 1, 2.4, 3.1)	Lessons do not reflect application of major concepts and modes of inquiry to promote students' social understanding and civic efficacy.	Lessons reflect inappropriate application of major concepts and modes of inquiry to promote students' social understanding and civic efficacy.	Lessons reflect appropriate application of major concepts and modes of inquiry to promote students' social understanding and civic efficacy.	Lessons reflect outstanding application of major concepts and modes of inquiry to promote students' social understanding and civic efficacy.
Science (ACEI 1, 2.2, 3.1)	Lessons do not reflect application of fundamental concepts and do not incorporate the inquiry process.	Lessons inappropriately reflect application of fundamental concepts and inappropriately incorporate the inquiry process.	Lessons reflect application of fundamental concepts and appropriately incorporate the inquiry process.	Lessons reflect outstanding application of fundamental concepts and incorporation of the inquiry process.
The Arts (ACEI 1, 2.5, 3.1)	Lessons do not reflect knowledge and understanding of the content, function, and achievements of the visual and performance arts as primary media of communication, inquiry and insight among students.	Lessons inappropriately reflect knowledge and understanding of the content, function, and achievements of the visual and performance arts as primary media of communication, inquiry and insight among students.	Lessons reflect knowledge and understanding of the content, function, and achievements of the visual and performance arts as primary media of communication, inquiry and insight among students.	Lessons reflect outstanding knowledge and understanding of the content, function, and achievements of the visual and performance arts as primary media of communication, inquiry and insight among students.
Health/Physical Education (ACEI 1, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1)	Lessons do not reflect experiences that promote health and physical movement.	Lessons reflect inappropriate experiences that promote health and physical movement.	Lessons reflect experiences that promote health and physical movement.	Lessons reflect outstanding experiences that promote health and physical movement.

Rubric # 4

Date _____

Names _____

**Assessment Plan
 Rubric**

Rating Indicator	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction with Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance (ACEI 1, 4)	Less than 60% of the content and methods of assessment lack cognitive complexity and congruence with learning goals and/or less than 60% of the assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals.	60-94% of the content and methods of assessment include cognitive complexity and congruence with learning goals and 60-94% of the assessments contain clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals.	95% or more of the content and methods of assessment include cognitive complexity and congruence with learning goals and 95% of the assessments contain clear criteria that are explicitly linked to the learning goals.	
Multiple Modes and Approaches and Technical Soundness (ACEI 1, 4)	The assessment plan includes only one mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction and/or the assessments are not valid due to inaccurate scoring procedures, poorly written prompts, and confusing directions and procedures.	The assessment plan includes some valid measures and multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge skills and reasoning ability.	The assessment plan includes valid, multiple modes of assessments (including performance assessments, reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence.	
Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students (ACEI 1, 4, 5.1)	Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments but some of the adaptations are inappropriate for meeting the individual needs of some students.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate for meeting the individual needs of most students,	
			Total	

Rubric # 5

Date _____

Names _____

**Home-School-Community Connection
Rubric**

NAEYC Standard 2. Building Family and Community Relationships

Candidates know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children’s families and communities. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships that support and empower families, and to involve all families in their children’s development and learning.

ACEI Standard 5.2. Collaboration with families

Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of children.

Rating Indicator	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Builds Family and Community Relationships (ACEI 3.1, 5.2)	Inappropriate or no evidence of attempts to foster and utilize family and community support to facilitate achievement of learning goals.	Evidence of attempts to foster and utilize family and community support to facilitate achievement of learning goals noted but characterized by stereotypical and/or biased assumptions.	Evidence of attempts to foster and utilize family and community support to facilitate achievement of learning goals reveal clear understanding of the value of family and community relationships.	
Collaborates with Families (ACEI 1, 5.2)	Ineffective or no attempts to inform or involve families in student learning.	Attempts to inform or involve families in student learning are characterized by lack of understanding about the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of children.	Attempts to inform or involve families in student learning are characterized by full understanding about the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of children.	
			Total	

CEL _____
Field Experience
Individual Teaching Evaluation

Name(s): _____ Date(s): _____

	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Acceptable 2	Outstanding 3	
Organization (ACEI 1, 3.1)	Audience cannot understand lesson because there is no sequence of information.	Audience has difficulty following presentation because student jumps around.	Student presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow.	Student presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow.	
Teaching of Individual Lesson (ACEI 1, 3.1-3.5)	DSU student does not exhibit knowledge of the objective; offers no or inappropriate elaboration	DSU student exhibits little knowledge of the objective; offers little elaboration.	DSU student exhibits adequate knowledge of the objective; offers adequate elaboration.	DSU student exhibits outstanding knowledge of the objective; offers outstanding explanations and elaboration.	
Visuals (ACEI 3.5)	Student used no visuals or visuals were of poor quality.	Student occasionally used visuals that rarely support text and skills. Visuals were of minimal, acceptable quality.	Visuals related to text and skills. Visuals were of good quality.	Student used visuals to reinforce text and skills. Visuals were of high quality.	
Oral Communication (ACEI 3.5)	Student's verbal communication was incoherent. Student incorrectly pronounced 3 or more terms. Student used inappropriate language, facial expressions, gestures, and personal interactions. No enthusiasm or interest was conveyed by the student.	Student mumbled, incorrectly pronounced 1-2 terms, and communicated with inappropriate language, facial expressions, gestures, and personal interactions. Little enthusiasm or interest was conveyed by the student.	Student spoke coherently most of time with accurate pronunciation of terms. Student communicated with appropriate language, facial expressions, gestures, and personal interactions. Some enthusiasm and interest was conveyed by the student.	Student used a clear voice, appropriate intonation, and correct pronunciation of terms. Student conveyed appropriate enthusiasm and interest in teaching and learning of the content.	
				Total---->	_____

Comments:

Reflection and Self-Evaluation Rubric

Rating Indicator	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Development and Implementation through Collaboration (ACEI 5.1)	No evidence supports the collaborative development and implementation of the unit.	Provides evidence of collaboration but offers no explanation of its effect on the development and implementation of the unit.	Uses evidence to support the collaboration of the team in development and implementation of the unit and expounds on the effects of the collaborative efforts on the outcome of the unit implementation.	
Interpretation of Student Learning (ACEI 5.1)	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section.	Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section.	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals.	
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment (ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2)	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research).	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.	
Alignment along Goals, Instruction and Assessment (ACEI 3.1, 4, 5.1)	Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate.	Connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present.	Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	
Implications for Future Teaching (ACEI 5.1)	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these changes would improve student learning.	
Implications for Professional Development (ACEI 5.1)	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.	Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals.	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	

Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument

Teacher Candidate/Intern _____ Semester/Year _____

Evaluator _____ Circle One: **University/College Supervisor** **Cooperating Teacher**

I. PLANNING AND PREPARATION

*Items 1-9 should be assessed from written plans.

1. Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices. (1, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Objectives based on state frameworks and best practices are not present OR are not stated as performance outcomes and/OR inappropriate for student learning.	Objectives based on state frameworks and best practices are stated as performance outcomes and are appropriate for student learning.	Objectives, based on state frameworks and best practices, are stated as performance outcomes and are planned for different instructional levels and individual needs (DOK Levels, Bloom's, Understanding by Design, etc.).	In addition to acceptable , objectives, which are appropriate for student learning, are aligned with assessments.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

2. Plans appropriate teaching procedures. (2, 4, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
No procedures are included, OR procedures are not referenced to objectives.	Procedures are referenced to objectives and are appropriate for students.	Procedures are sequential, clearly referenced to objectives, and appropriate for students.	In addition to acceptable , procedures are both learner-centered and teacher-centered.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

3. Selects a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons. (1, 2, 6, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Materials and technology are not specified OR are limited to textbooks and worksheets.	Materials and technology other than textbooks and worksheets are specified and related to procedures.	Various types of materials and technology are appropriately integrated and are used effectively to enhance lessons.	In addition to acceptable , materials and technology show initiative and creativity in original development.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
Comments on Effectiveness			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

4. Prepares appropriate assessment procedures and materials to evaluate learner progress. (7, 8)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Assessment procedures and materials are not specified in the plans OR are inappropriate for students OR are not matched to objectives.	Assessment procedures and materials in plans are related to objectives and appropriate for students.	Multiple assessment procedures and materials are included in plans where needed and assessments directly correlate to objectives and are appropriate for students.	In addition to acceptable , informal (performance) and formal assessments and materials are planned including rubrics/checklists.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
Comments on Effectiveness			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

5. Uses assessment information (ex. – pretests, quizzes, unit tests, remediation, and enrichment activities) to plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (2, 3, 4, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of students.	Uses assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of some students.	Uses assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of most students.	Uses assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of all students.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
Comments on Effectiveness			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

6. Uses knowledge of students' backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, learning styles inventories, interest inventories, multiple intelligences surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful. (1, 2, 3, 5, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use knowledge of students' backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful.	Demonstrates some understanding of students' background, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge, but does not effectively use the information in developing learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful.	Demonstrates understanding of students' background, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge and effectively uses this knowledge in developing learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful.	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of students' background, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge and effectively and consistently uses this knowledge in developing learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

7. Integrates knowledge from several subject areas in lessons. (1, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Provides instruction that relates to only one subject and focuses on specific skills.	Instruction includes integration of content areas but lessons maintain a discipline centered focus and offer limited assistance in helping students make connections across disciplines.	Instruction includes effective integration of content areas clearly establishing connections across disciplines.	In addition to acceptable , creates innovative lessons which include activities that assist students in making connections across multiple disciplines.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

8. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. (3)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not incorporate diversity or multicultural perspectives into lessons.	Ineffectively incorporates diversity into lessons.	Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons.	Uses aspects of the world as well as the class make-up to purposefully and effectively incorporate diversity, including multiculturalism, into lesson.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

9. Uses a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons. (1, 6)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
No introductions and/or closures to lessons.	Inconsistently or inappropriately uses introductions and/or closures to lessons.	Consistently and appropriately uses a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons. Strategies to introduce lessons motivate students and closures accurately summarize the lessons.	In addition to acceptable , introductions and closures are creative and innovative.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

II. COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION**10. Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication. (6)**

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use standard written, oral, and non-verbal communication.	Uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication with multiple errors.	Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication with minimal errors.	Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication proficiently.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

11. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities. (4)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
No written and/or oral directions for instructional activities are provided.	Provides written and/or oral directions for instructional activities that are vague and/or confusing.	Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities.	In addition to acceptable , uses concrete examples to model and clarify tasks and concepts.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

12. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students. (3)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not communicate high expectations for learning to all students.	Inconsistent in communicating to all students that they are capable of meeting learning expectations.	Consistent in communicating to all students that they are capable of meeting learning expectations.	In addition to acceptable , provides a supportive, risk free environment.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

13. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning. (1, 5)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not convey enthusiasm for the content being taught.	Conveys limited interest and enthusiasm for the content being taught.	Motivates students by conveying enthusiasm and interest for the content being taught.	In addition to acceptable , the motivation, enthusiasm, and interest in the content are evident through students' attitudes, questions, and ability to stay focused on tasks and activities.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

14. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. (2, 5, 6)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not provide opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	Involves the students in interactive learning activities.	Involves students in teacher-planned cooperative group activities in which students are working toward a common goal.	In addition to acceptable , frequently plans instruction to include situations for students to work cooperatively on projects/activities of their choice.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

15. Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, etc.). (10)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not establish opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians.	Initiates communication with parents and/or guardians through an introduction.	In addition to emerging , maintains communication with parents and/or guardians.	In addition to acceptable , consistently communicates with parents and/or guardians for a variety of purposes and in a variety of ways.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

III. TEACHING FOR LEARNING

16. Demonstrates knowledge of the subject(s) taught. (1)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not demonstrate basic knowledge of the subject(s) taught.	Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject(s) being taught.	Evidence of thorough subject(s) knowledge is exhibited through minimal reliance on written notes and ability to lead effective class discussions.	In addition to acceptable , challenging questions and/or activities relating to subject(s) are included in lessons that demonstrate depth of understanding and knowledge of subject(s).
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

17. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) (4)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use a variety of teaching strategies.	Ineffectively uses a variety of teaching strategies.	Effectively uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies.	In addition to acceptable , teaching strategies are both teacher-centered and learner-centered.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

18. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e., learning styles, multiple intelligences and enrichment/remedial needs). (2, 3, 4)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not provide learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.	Inconsistently provides learning experiences that accommodate the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.	Consistently provides learning experiences that accommodate the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.	Consistently and effectively provides learning experiences that accommodate the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

19. Provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. (4, 6)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
No opportunities are provided for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.	Provides opportunities for students to recognize and identify problems.	In addition to emerging , provides opportunities for students to propose and test solutions.	In addition to acceptable , provides opportunities for students to analyze and evaluate their solutions and to present findings.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

20. Responds to and elicits student input during instruction. (6)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not respond to or elicit student input during instruction AND/OR uses negative words or actions to discourage students from giving responses and asking questions.	Inconsistently responds to and/or elicits student input during instruction.	Consistently and appropriately responds to and elicits student input during instruction.	In addition to acceptable , provides appropriate prompts to elicit expanded student responses.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

21. Allows sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses. (2, 4)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not allow sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses.	Inconsistently allows sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses.	Allows sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses.	In addition to acceptable , probes and encourages students to expand and support their responses.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

22. Uses higher-order questions to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking. (1, 4, 6)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use questioning to engage students.	Asks questions at the lowest level, gathering and recalling information (knowledge and comprehension).	Asks questions which are designed to apply knowledge, analyze, compare/contrast, or classify data (application, analysis).	In addition to acceptable , asks questions which encourage students to think intuitively, creatively, and hypothetically, to use their imaginations, to identify a value system; or to evaluate judgments (synthesis and evaluation).
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

23. Uses family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to enhance student learning. (10)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use family or community resources in lessons.	Limited use of family or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning.	Effectively uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning.	In addition to acceptable , encourages the students' effective use of family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

IV. MANAGEMENT OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

24. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning. (5)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not monitor or adjust the classroom environment.	Demonstrates an awareness of the social relationships and motivational strategies within the classroom, but does not always make adjustments to enhance learning.	Monitors and makes adjustments that are effective in enhancing social relationships, motivation, and learning.	In addition to acceptable , monitors students' participation and interpersonal interactions in learning activities and encourages students to develop self-monitoring skills.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

25. Adjusts lessons according to individual student cues, professional reflections, and group responses. (2, 4)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not adjust lessons.	Ineffectively or inconsistently adjusts lessons according to individual student cues, personal reflections, and group responses.	Effectively adjusts lessons according to individual student cues, personal reflections, and group responses.	In addition to acceptable , takes advantage of teachable moments to enhance lessons.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

26. Attends to or delegates routine tasks. (5)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not attend to or delegates routine tasks.	Seldom attends to and delegates routine tasks.	Attends to and delegates routine tasks.	In addition to acceptable , has a set plan which includes delegating appropriate responsibilities to students who complete these tasks efficiently.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

27. Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. (5)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not attend to inappropriate student behavior.	Inconsistently uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	Consistently uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	In addition to acceptable , uses a variety of strategies that promote cooperation and learning.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

28. Demonstrates fairness and supportiveness in order to achieve a positive, interactive learning environment. (5)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not demonstrate fairness and supportiveness in order to achieve a positive, interactive learning environment.	Inconsistently demonstrates fairness and supportiveness in order to achieve a positive, interactive learning environment.	Consistently demonstrates fairness and supportiveness in the treatment of students and actively encourages fairness among students.	In addition to acceptable , creates a positive, interactive learning environment.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

29. Uses instructional time effectively.(5)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use instructional time effectively - Substantial instructional time is spent in non-instructional activities and/or time is wasted during transitions.	Overall pacing and transitions are smooth; however, there are minor problems with effective use of instructional time.	Pacing is appropriate, transitions are smooth, and there are no unnecessary delays or undesirable digressions.	In addition to acceptable , students are on-task and engaged in meaningful learning activities.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

V. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

30. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. (8)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students.	Ineffectively communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students.	Effectively communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students.	In addition to acceptable , various strategies are used to communicate assessment criteria AND/OR student input is sought in developing assessment criteria.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

31. Develops and uses a variety of informal assessments (ex. – pretests, quizzes, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (2, 3, 4, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use a variety of informal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of students.	Occasionally uses informal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of some of the students.	Uses a variety of informal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of most students.	Consistently plans and uses informal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of all students.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

32. Develops and uses a variety of formal assessments (ex. – pretests, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (2, 3, 4, 7)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not use a variety of formal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of students.	Occasionally uses formal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of some of the students.	Uses a variety of formal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of most students.	Consistently plans and uses formal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of all students.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

33. Provides timely feedback on students' academic performance and discusses corrective procedures to be taken. (8)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not provide feedback.	Provides timely feedback on students' academic performance and occasionally discusses corrective procedures.	Consistently provides timely feedback on students' academic performance, discusses corrective procedures, and purposefully uses reinforcement and praise.	In addition to acceptable , encourages student conferences and reflections for self-evaluation.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

34. Maintains records of student work and performance and appropriately communicates student progress. (10)

Unacceptable (0)	Emerging (1)	Acceptable (2)	Target (3)
Does not maintain records of student work or performance.	Maintains limited records of student work and performance and attempts to communicate student progress.	Maintains adequate records of student work and performance and communicates student progress in a timely manner.	Maintains detailed records of student work and performance, communicates student progress and helps students develop self-evaluation processes.
First Assessment →	Score:	Second Assessment →	Score:
<u>Comments on Effectiveness</u>			
First Assessment:		Second Assessment:	

Contextual Factors Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals, plan instruction and assess learning.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom.	Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	
Knowledge of Characteristics of Students	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities).	Teacher displays general knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	
Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning	Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities).	Teacher displays general knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities).	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities) that may affect learning.	
Knowledge of Students' Skills And Prior Learning	Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning.	Teacher displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	Teacher displays general & specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning.	
Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	Teacher does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications.	Teacher provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Teacher provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	

Learning Goals Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Significance, Challenge and Variety	Goals reflect only one type or level of learning.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge.	Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging.	
Clarity	Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes.	Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes.	
Appropriate- ness for Students	Goals are not appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs.	Some goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs	Most goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs.	
Alignment with National, State or Local Standards	Goals are not aligned with national, state or local standards.	Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards.	Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards.	

Assessment Plan Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction	Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity.	Some of the learning goals are assessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.	Each of the learning goals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity.	
Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance	The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals.	Assessment criteria have been developed, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals.	Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals.	
Multiple Modes and Approaches	The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction.	The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability.	The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence.	
Technical Soundness	Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Assessments appear to have some validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear to students.	Assessments appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students.	
Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students	Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students.	Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students.	

Design for Instruction Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Alignment with Learning Goals	Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in the design.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in the design.	All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design.	
Accurate Representation of Content	Teacher's use of content appears to contain numerous inaccuracies. Content seems to be viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual structure.	Teacher's use of content appears to be mostly accurate. Shows some awareness of the big ideas or structure of the discipline.	Teacher's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the big ideas or structure of the discipline.	
Lesson and Unit Structure	The lessons within the unit are not logically organized organization (e.g., sequenced).	The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals.	All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals.	
Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources	Little variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets).	Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to learning.	Significant variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and/or resources. This variety makes a clear contribution to learning.	
Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources	Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student.	
Use of Technology	Technology is inappropriately used OR teacher does not use technology	Teacher uses technology but it does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning	Teacher integrates appropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning	

Instructional Decision-Making Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Sound Professional Practice	Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound.	Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not pedagogically sound.	Most instructional decisions are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning).	
Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning	Teacher treats class as “one plan fits all” with no modifications.	Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of student learning, best practice, or contextual factors.	Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, best practice, or contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress.	
Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals	Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals.	Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals.	

Analysis of Student Learning Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation	Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data.	Presentation is understandable and contains few errors.	Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation.	
Alignment with Learning Goals	Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals.	Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals.	
Interpretation of Data	Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.	Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data.	Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals.	Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal.	

Reflection and Self-Evaluation Rubric

Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.*

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Interpretation of Student Learning	No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section.	Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section.	Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in “Analysis of Student Learning” section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet learning goals. 1	
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment	Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others.	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research).	Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof.	
Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment	Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate.	Connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present.	Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction.	
Implications for Future Teaching	Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.	Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning.	
Implications for Professional Development	Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section.	Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals.	Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals.	

Design for Instruction in Elementary Education Rubric
Teacher Work Sample Standard: *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts in elementary education.*

Rating Indicator	1 Indicator Not Met	2 Indicator Partially Met	3 Indicator Met	Score
Alignment with Mississippi Curricular Standards	Few lessons are explicitly linked to the Mississippi Curricular Standards.	Most lessons are explicitly linked to the Mississippi Curricular Standards.	All lessons are explicitly linked to the Mississippi Curricular Standards.	
Selection and Integration of Content	The plans for the unit are generic to the grade level, with little or no connection between the various content areas. Goals for IEPs are absent from the plans.	The plans for the unit are generic to the grade level, with partial integration of language arts/reading, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, and physical education. Goals from IEPs are minimal or absent from the plans.	The teacher creates plans where all children can learn, integrating the content areas of elementary education (language arts/reading, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, physical education) and goals from IEPs into daily activities and routines.	
Language Arts and Reading	The language arts and reading lesson are separate from the other subjects and isolated from other learning experiences.	The lessons provide a limited focus on the various types of language arts and reading purposes and activities.	The lessons provide specific activities that help students identify the various purposes of reading and writing (narrative, expository, technical, and persuasive) and speaking, listening, and viewing.	
Mathematics and Science	Math and science are taught at the knowledge level with primary focus on memorization of facts.	Memorization of facts is supplemented with isolated problems and application of knowledge.	Describe the use of inquiry in mathematics and science lessons, connecting both to real life situations allowing for discover and application of knowledge.	
Social Science	The social sciences are taught incidentally or add on to the classroom activities.	The social sciences are taught as separate aspects of culture with the use of single sources to	Describe how the social sciences connect various elements of culture and the use of	

		study relevant events, processes, people, and regions.	resources, data, sources, and tools are used to interpret information.	
The Arts	The arts activities are left to the special area teacher.	The arts activities seem contrived and an add-on to the regular classroom.	The teacher describes the strategies that actively engage students in creating, performing and responding to the arts.	
Physical Education	The P.E. and movement activities are left to the special area teacher.	The teacher provides for outdoor play and P.E., but doesn't incorporate information about a healthy lifestyle.	The teacher describes the activities and strategies for healthy lifestyles that include play and physical activity.	
Health	Health integration is left to the special area teacher.	The lessons provide a limited focus on health integration into the daily routine.	The teacher describes the activities and strategies for healthy lifestyles.	
Selection of Instructional Materials	Little or no information is provided on how and why reading and curriculum materials were selected.	The teacher describes how they evaluated or why they selected the reading and curriculum materials used in the lesson.	The teacher describes the evaluation procedure and selected the appropriateness of the reading and curriculum materials used in the lessons.	

Scoring Guide/Description for CRD 326, *Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties, Reading Case Study*

Part I- Reading Case Study (RCS) Components/Requirements

I. Student Data

Provide the following information on the child: name, age, gender, grade, teacher, school, town, state, examiner's name, and dates of testing.

_____ (5 points)

II. Background Information

Provide a description of the family situation (e.g., number of brothers and sisters, parents, others residing in the home). Give a brief social history to include interests of the child both in and out of school. [ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 5.4]

_____ (10 points)

III. General Observations

Describe the testing circumstances, including the number of sittings and the child's attitude, behavior, and appearance during testing. Describe the child's general attitude toward reading, school, and self. [ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 4]

_____ (5 points)

IV. Tests Administered and Results

Identify tests you have administered as part of this diagnosis. List all the tests you actually gave and report results as appropriate to each section. [ACEI 4]

_____ (10 points)

V. Analysis

Interpret the student's performance in each of the areas evaluated. Present this information by describing the student's strengths and weaknesses and providing a summary in outline form. Rather than reporting each error, provide specific examples to support identified strengths and weaknesses appropriately. [ACEI 4, 5.1, 5.2]

_____ (10 points)

VI. Field Experiences (Teaching)

Complete the development of four lesson plans for implementation through tutorial sessions. A scoring guide is attached for reference both during the planning of the lessons and their implementation during supervised tutorial sessions.* [ACEI 1, 2.1, 3.1-3.5, 4, 5.2] (50 points)

VII. Summary and Recommendations

State the reading strengths and weakness of the student, listing them sequentially in order of the areas evaluated. Provide a list of recommendations for areas of remediation. The list of recommendations should be presented in priority order, with the most important areas listed first. [ACEI 4, 5.1, 5.2]

_____ (10 points)

_____ (100 points) Total Points Earned

**DISPOSITIONS RATING SCALE
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

Student Name _____

Rater _____ Date _____

Circle Program: Art Elementary English Mathematics Music P.E. Science Social Science

Directions: Use the Appraisal Scale to rate each of the five Dispositions. The Indicators (e.g., 1.1, 1.2) provide clarification. Provide evidence in the last column for ratings of 0, 1, or 3.

Appraisal Scale:

0 – Does not meet expectations

1 – Meets a few expectations but not sufficient

2 – Meets expectations

3 – Exceeds expectations

Characteristic (Disposition)	Rating of Disposition	Evidence for 0, 1, or 3 Rating
<p>1. Fairness</p> <p>1.1 Strives to meet the educational needs of all students in a caring, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner (IN 2, 3, 5)</p> <p>1.2 Treats students, families, community members, and colleagues with dignity and respect, regardless of background, ethnicity/race, capabilities, or beliefs (IN 10)</p>	<p>1. Fairness _____</p>	
<p>2. The Belief That All Students Can Learn</p> <p>2.1 Establishes a classroom climate that supports the learning, development, emotional well-being, and physical well-being of a diverse student population (IN 2, 3, 5)</p> <p>2.2 Effectively plans and implements teaching and assessment strategies that address the experiences; academic, emotional, and physical needs; developmental levels; and interests of a diverse student population</p>	<p>2. The Belief That All Students Can Learn _____</p>	

(IN 4, 8)		
<p>3. Professionalism</p> <p>3.1 Engages in ongoing self-reflection and participates in professional development opportunities (IN 9, 10)</p> <p>3.2 Displays professional appearance and actions, including effective oral and written communication (IN 6)</p> <p>3.3 Collaborates with professors, students, colleagues, families, and/or community members (IN 10)</p>	3. Professionalism _____	
<p>4. Resourcefulness</p> <p>4.1 Motivates self and others to perform well (IN 5)</p> <p>4.2 Anticipates what a situation calls for and responds appropriately (IN 6)</p> <p>4.3 Uses personal talents to enhance professional functioning (IN 6)</p> <p>4.4 Adapts willingly to change (IN 5)</p>	4. Resourcefulness _____	
<p>5. Dependability</p> <p>5.1 Attends all expected classes and meetings, and arrives on time (IN 10)</p> <p>5.2 Participates meaningfully in classes and meetings (IN 10)</p> <p>5.3 Fulfills responsibilities in the college classroom and in P-12 settings</p>	5. Dependability _____	

Philosophy of Education Scoring Guide	0 - Unacceptable	1 - Emerging	2 - Acceptable	3 - Target	Score
Teaching Rationale	Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples	Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak	Clear explanation with rational example	Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples	
Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate	Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples	Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak	Clear explanation with rational example	Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples	
Content	Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples	Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak	Clear explanation with rational example	Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples	
Professionalism	Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples	Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak	Clear explanation with rational example	Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples	
Composition/Mechanics	Excessive deficiencies noted related to indicators	Deficiencies related to indicators are distracting, though not at an unacceptable level	Deficiency is noted for one or more indicators, but meaning is intact	All indicators met at a high level of proficiency	

Credit Hour Production							
	Summer		Fall		Spring		Total
	UG	GR	UG	GR	UG	GR	
AED							
AY 2014	3	432	0	309	0	393	1,137
AY 2013	0	201	0	498	0	324	1,023
AY 2012	0	285	0	309	0	273	867
AY 2011	0	216	0	333	0	168	717
AY 2010	0	303	0	315	0	210	828
CAD							
AY 2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AY 2013	0	0	0	18	0	0	18
AY 2012	0	0	0	51	0	0	51
AY 2011	0	0	0	36	0	0	36
AY 2010	0	0	0	42	0	0	42
CEL							
AY 2014	114	519	1293	519	1398	363	4,206
AY 2013	126	582	1,539	582	1,323	621	4,773
AY 2012	126	684	1,593	576	1,611	618	5,208
AY 2011	195	738	1,395	675	1,485	588	5,076
AY 2010	132	822	1,293	762	1,185	324	4,518
CML							
AY 2014	117	0	66	12	54	18	267
AY 2013	120	0	81	18	69	33	321
AY 2012	120	0	69	24	72	45	330
AY 2011	78	0	81	27	84	45	315
AY 2010	30	0	60	24	72	33	219
CRD							
AY 2014	105	102	273	0	255	147	882
AY 2013	138	183	360	0	180	87	948
AY 2012	129	186	342	3	255	180	1095
AY 2011	129	183	363	3	276	165	1119
AY 2010	84	216	297	84	186	117	984
CSD							
AY 2014	0	33	0	18	0	0	51
AY 2013	0	24	0	18	0	0	42
AY 2012	0	24	0	21	0	0	45
AY 2011	0	36	0	24	0	0	60
AY 2010	0	24	0	18	0	0	42
CSP							
AY 2014	189	264	408	270	396	180	1,707
AY 2013	222	264	327	297	468	252	1,830
AY 2012	267	321	504	312	573	252	2,229
AY 2011	183	270	414	270	501	303	1,941
AY 2010	198	330	459	357	453	315	2,112
CUR							
AY 2014	0	4638	434	11007	241	192	16,512
AY 2013	6	405	550	9,993	259	276	11,489
AY 2012	0	510	526	8,370	458	273	10,137
AY 2011	0	645	605	3,894	436	297	5,877
AY 2010	0	591	579	273	395	402	2,240
EDL							
AY 2014	0	51	0	36	0	48	135
AY 2013	0	102	0	45	0	60	207
AY 2012	0	147	0	80	0	112	339
AY 2011	0	201	0	110	0	154	465
AY 2010	0	117	0	210	0	150	477
ELR							
AY 2014	0	273	0	483	0	540	1,296
AY 2013	0	306	0	423	0	384	1,113
AY 2012	0	288	0	360	0	228	876
AY 2011	0	366	0	276	0	273	915
AY 2010	0	324	0	348	0	375	1,047
SUP							
AY 2014	0	132	0	54	0	114	300
AY 2013	0	36	0	3	0	105	144
AY 2012	0	0	0	0	0	156	156
AY 2011	0	39	0	0	0	174	213
AY 2010	0	0	0	0	0	126	126
AY Totals							
AY 2014	528	6444	2474	12708	2344	1995	26493
AY 2013	612	2103	2857	11895	2299	2142	21908
AY 2012	642	2445	3034	10106	2969	2137	21333
AY 2011	585	2694	2858	5648	2782	2167	16734
AY 2010	444	2727	2688	2433	2291	2052	12635

Enrollment by Major						
	Summer		Fall		Spring	
	UG	GR	UG	GR	UG	GR
Education Administration and Supervision						
AY 2014	0	65	0	83	0	87
AY 2013	0	78	0	103	0	81
AY 2012	0	65	0	82	0	87
AY 2011	0	65	0	83	0	80
AY 2010	0	47	0	81	0	71
Elementary Education						
AY 2014	74	127	226	127	197	116
AY 2013	107	135	252	158	224	161
AY 2012	114	146	291	165	264	153
AY 2011	125	161	262	177	243	171
AY 2010	78	154	290	196	250	168
Professional Studies						
AY 2014	0	47	0	93	0	112
AY 2013	0	37	0	64	0	66
AY 2012	0	34	0	65	0	55
AY 2011	0	31	0	60	0	55
AY 2010	0	38	0	64	0	54
Special Education						
AY 2014	0	36	0	56	0	40
AY 2013	0	29	0	58	0	63
AY 2012	0	45	0	63	0	57
AY 2011	0	38	0	62	0	63
AY 2010	0	46	0	76	0	71
Teaching Alternate						
AY 2014	0	28	0	13	0	10
AY 2013	0	32	0	14	0	10
AY 2012	0	28	0	17	0	16
AY 2011	0	31	0	17	0	14
AY 2010	0	20	0	9	0	10
AY Totals						
AY 2014	74	303	226	372	197	365
AY 2013	107	311	252	397	224	381
AY 2012	114	318	291	392	264	368
AY 2011	125	326	262	399	243	383
AY 2010	78	305	290	426	250	374

Graduates								
	Ed Ad & Supervision		Elementary Education			Prof Stud	Spec Ed	Tch Alt Rt
	EdS	MED	BSE	EdS	MED	EdD	MED	MAT
AY 2014	37	7	49	14	68	6	13	10
AY 2013	27	11	60	22	68	3	12	10
AY 2012	20	12	39	13	73	2	20	15
AY 2011	32	7	50	10	73	1	16	7
AY 2010	12	10	44	76	7	2	7	12

Enrollment by Concentration							
	Summer		Fall		Spring		Total
	UG	GR	UG	GR	UG	GR	
English Education							
AY 2014	0	4	0	3	0	4	11
AY 2013	0	9	0	4	0	4	17
AY 2012	0	15	0	16	0	16	47
AY 2011	0	15	0	16	0	16	47
AY 2010	0	9	0	16	0	14	39
Fine Arts Education							
AY 2014	0	1	0	7	0	5	13
AY 2013	0	8	0	6	0	4	18
AY 2012	0	4	0	11	0	12	27
AY 2011	0	4	0	11	0	12	27
AY 2010	0	2	0	8	0	11	21
History Education							
AY 2014	0	0	0	3	0	3	6
AY 2013	0	1	0	2	0	3	6
AY 2012	0	3	0	8	0	6	17
AY 2011	0	3	0	8	0	6	17
AY 2010	0	1	0	8	0	9	18
Social Science Education							
AY 2014	0	5	0	6	0	3	14
AY 2013	0	7	0	6	0	5	18
AY 2012	0	9	0	16	0	12	37
AY 2011	0	9	0	16	0	12	37
AY 2010	0	5	0	13	0	13	31
AY Totals							
AY 2014	0	10	0	19	0	15	44
AY 2013	0	25	0	18	0	16	59
AY 2012	0	31	0	51	0	46	128
AY 2011	0	31	0	51	0	46	128
AY 2010	0	17	0	45	0	47	109

Graduates					
	Eng Ed	Fine Arts	History	Soc Sci	Total
	MED	MED	MED	MED	
AY 2014	0	2	1	3	6
AY 2013	4	5	0	7	16
AY 2012	5	1	2	3	11
AY 2011	2	4	5	3	14
AY 2010	5	1	0	0	6