

Delta State

Academic Affairs/Provost and VPAA

College of Education

COE Mission Statement

Mission statement

College of Education Mission

The mission of the College (Unit) is aligned with the mission of the University, which partially states, "...the University provides programs and services that promote intellectual, cultural, ethical, physical, and social development. Students from different cultural, socio-economic, and ethnic backgrounds will develop the ability to respect and evaluate the thoughts of others; to develop, assess, and express their own thoughts effectively; and to use the techniques of research and performance associated with their disciplines" (Bulletin of Delta State University, 2012, p. 8). The College of Education supports the mission of the University to serve the broader community of the Delta region and strives to aid in accomplishing the guiding principles established by DSU. It operates collaboratively with the other colleges/schools of the university, the university staff, and outside agencies to produce professional graduates who will be effective in the field of human learning and services. The College of Education offers a stimulating, positive environment and provides its students with professional faculty who demonstrate the competencies, skills, and dispositions expected of Delta State University graduates (COE 2010-2011 Annual Report).

Conceptual Framework

Faculty members within the College of Education continually refine a conceptual framework that articulates how all stakeholders in the COE unit are critical to the preparation of candidates through the delivery of programs. These programs are designed to ensure that candidates attain and/or develop the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective in their respective professions. The following three critical candidate components form the basis of the unit's programs and its assessment system: performance, preparation, and professionalism.

1. Preparation (knowledge) includes the professional training components of each of the unit's programs for the preparation of educators. Effective candidates must demonstrate proficiencies that verify they have mastered the content of their disciplines, have exhibited knowledge of the skills necessary to effectively communicate this content to all of their students, and have displayed knowledge of the systems of education including teaching, assessment, classroom management, and decision making. In advanced programs, candidates demonstrate knowledge of new content, professional skills and current research to enhance the architecture of their professional competence in order to better serve the complex needs of students in the region and beyond. Leadership candidates learn the ways in which they can establish distributed models of leadership (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004) and the critical components of school leadership (Portin, et al., 2003).
2. Performance (skills) are developed through the field-based components of each program. Field experiences are sequenced, intensive, reflective, and require data-driven supervision to ensure candidates' growth in meeting proficiencies in the skills and dispositions needed to positively impact student learning for all students. Field experiences provide the foundation for candidates to develop an effective and dynamic teaching repertoire, enhancing skills to serve a diverse student population. In the case of advanced programs, candidates develop in-depth knowledge of teaching and learning as well as leadership and counseling skills to assist their students.
3. Professionalism (dispositions) are the developing characteristics that candidates demonstrate as they assume new professional roles and are committed to the welfare of their students. These dispositions reflect the ways in which their concern for students is manifested in interactions with not only the students, but with colleagues, families, and community stakeholders. These professional behaviors manifest the candidates' beliefs about their roles as professional and include: compassion, critical self-reflection, diversity, ethical practice, management of time and resources, creativity, flexibility, appreciation for and commitment to life-long learning, collaboration, and the belief that all students can learn.

All three components of the Unit's conceptual framework work together to provide high quality preparation for candidates in initial and advanced programs. Each of the three components of the conceptual framework is interdependent on the others ensuring coherence across the entire Unit to include curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessment of both candidate proficiencies and Unit operations. Utilizing a student-centered approach, all stakeholders (faculty, the Delta education community, alumni, and other educational partners) fulfill varying roles, ensuring that consistency and coherence are maintained across all programs.

Five Guiding Principles

As an educational community, the Unit supports and uses the following principles and knowledge bases to inform the key components highlighted above. Each reflects its alignment with the Delta State University Strategic Plan (see brackets after each Guiding Principle (GP)).

- GP 1. Education is a lifelong endeavor.  
[SP1.Ind2; SP1.Ind3; SP1.Ind4; SP1.Ind5; SP1.Ind6; SP1.Ind7; SP2.Ind2; SP2.Ind3;  
SP2.Ind4; SP2.Ind6; SP2.Ind7; SP5.Ind1; SP5.Ind2; SP5.Ind4; SP5.Ind6; SP5.Ind8]
- GP 2. Education is interactive and reflective.  
[SP1.Ind5; SP1.Ind6; SP1.Ind7; SP5.Ind 4; SP5.Ind5]
- GP 3. Education is culturally contextualized.  
[SP1.Ind5; SP3.Ind6; SP5.Ind5; SP5.Ind6]
- GP 4. Education is dynamic.  
[SP1.Ind2; SP1.Ind4; SP1.Ind6; SP2.Ind4; SP4.Ind9; SP4.Ind10; SP4.Ind11; SP4.Ind12;  
SP5.Ind6; SP5.Ind8]
- GP 5. Education is enhanced by technology.  
[SP1.Ind7; SP3.Ind3; SP3.Ind4; SP3.Ind8; SP4.Ind5; SP4.Ind6; SPR.Ind10; SP5.Ind1;  
SP5.Ind2]

Related Items

There are no related items.

COE 2012\_01: External Resources/Community Outreach

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

Unit Goal

Establish one partnership and one funding source for the Child Development Center and submit funding request, leveraging NAEYC accreditation.

Evaluation Procedures

Review of Division of Family and Consumer Science Annual Report

Actual Results of Evaluation

Leadership for the Child Development Center worked with multiple offices on campus and external agencies in an attempt to grow partnerships and increase funding/support for the Center. They include the following:

- The Center developed and submitted two proposals in February 2011 (through the University) for federal legislative funding (Healthy Beginnings in Early Childhood Education in the Delta; Quality Training Facility for Early Childhood Educators in the Delta). The plans are sound, but the proposals were not put forward due to federal cuts in appropriations.
- The CDC Director participated in the work done by the Mississippi Department of Education in the formulation of their proposal for the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge (federal level—Depts. of Education and Health/Human Services). This work had the potential to translate into a role for the Center at Delta State University; the proposal was not funded.
- External funding pending: A grant has been submitted to the King's Daughters and Sons Circle Number Two, Inc. (Grant Application 2012 - \$6,857.67, which would enable the Center to have improved security and monitoring of services through camera surveillance)
- The Director of the Center applied for and received the following small grants (\$500 for art education from Crosstie Arts Council; \$200 for general use in the Center from Entergy)
- The Center continues to partner with the Mississippi Early Childhood Center at Mississippi State University for the provision of services in the Delta.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Analyses of the results suggests the complexities of seeking funding/viable partnerships. Federal funding is scarce. Additionally, larger institutions with a history of strong services and funding often receive competitive funding. Therefore, the leadership for the Center is working with the grants office at the University to submit proposals to state foundations which may have a particular interest in growing capacity in the Delta.

There are other factors relevant to the past year that should be noted. The Center Director resigned to take employment elsewhere. A competitive salary package was put together in an effort to recruit a Director with a terminal degree and experience in growing programs. Despite these efforts, the Center was not able to compete with salaries at nearby competitive institutions with similar position openings. The Center has, however, filled the position and moves forward aggressively.

In addition, the loss of funding to the State has diminished Building Blocks Mississippi, the statewide initiative to improve early childhood education. Therefore, the challenges to funding and support at the local level persist.

#### Related Items

[SP4.Ind03: External resources](#)

---

#### COE 2012\_02: Program Enhancements

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Host annual fall retreat resulting in program enhancements.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of Minutes of October 2011 Faculty Retreat

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

A unit-wide faculty retreat was held October 14, 2011, during which Dr. Katharine Rasch, Unit Assessment Director, presented results of the AY 10/11 assessment data with comparisons to the 2009 data (See Attachment 2.a.). The minutes also reflect feedback from faculty reviews of the Unit Conceptual Framework, English Language Learner (ELL) curriculum and best practices, and Teacher Work Sample (TWS) calibration.



##### Use of Evaluation Results

The results of the AY 10/11 assessment data were used by program coordinators to prepare program reports for submission to their respective specialized professional associations. Faculty feedback was used to update the Unit Conceptual Framework, develop curriculum materials and prepare a professional education agenda around best practices in ELL (both an in-house training and a video were developed and delivered during spring 2012), and modify the TWS.

#### Related Items

[SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

---

#### COE 2012\_03: Classroom Observation

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Chairs will observe in all traditional classes using observation form based on course evaluation instrument and establish feedback loop for online monitoring.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of observation summary sheets

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

Three of four chairs completed observations on all faculty in their division; a fourth chair who was new to the position chose to prioritize and completed approximately one-third of the observations, with the remainder to be completed during the fall 2012 semester. Observation forms were completed and housed within each division, with copies sent to Dean's Office.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Division chairs utilized the observations within the evaluation process to provide feedback to faculty, primarily assisting in the development of professional development goals and the identification of any professional development needs/resources.

#### Related Items

[SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

---

#### COE 2012\_04: Professional Development

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Develop professional development calendar based on identified needs; assess outcomes through informal focus groups/feedback.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of professional development calendar; minutes from CEAC meetings

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The calendar for professional development was developed based on faculty and chair input and discussion from the fall 2011 retreat. The calendar included the following:

- October 7 and 12, 2011 – WIMBA training for approximately 25; positive feedback; request for additional training in targeted areas
- March 22, 2012 – ELL workshop – Approximately 50 attended Session 1 and 70 attended Session 2; feedback was excellent, citing practical applicability as strength; request for training video
- Training video – a follow-up training video was developed based on the content of the ELL workshop and placed on file for faculty who may have missed the workshop or who are new to the College
- March 5, 2012 – Screencaster's /Clickers Workshop by Dr. Scott Drury and Dr. Scott Hutchens. Attendance was low; the workshop will be rescheduled.

In addition, the following occurred for the time period under review.

- Ongoing training for WIMBA throughout the year through small-group and one-on-one sessions (in response to initial training—high level of satisfaction with these focused sessions)

- Two faculty members were designated as Research Fellows through the Thad Cochran Center for Rural School Leadership and Research and worked with faculty on an as-needed basis to support research (less than satisfactory feedback; lacked structure)
- The Director of the Thad Cochran Center for Rural School Leadership and Research provided ongoing information letters and personal assistance for individuals pursuing research and scholarship.
- In excess of 65 professional development events involving multiple participants were experienced by faculty and staff during AY 11-12. Division reports document these activities. (Feedback varied based on the number of activities and participants)

#### Use of Evaluation Results

The following decisions were made by CEAC members based on informal feedback/assessments of the professional development activities for AY 11-12.

- Orientation sessions for WIMBA use will be held for all new faculty members. Small group training sessions will be scheduled throughout the year based on the previous year's feedback.
- Each division chair will work collaboratively within its ranks to develop a research agenda; chairs will provide oversight and leadership.
- Small group and individual professional development opportunities will continue to be supported; for maximum benefit, faculty members will be required to share information gleaned during these growth opportunities with colleagues.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

#### COE 2012\_05: Research Agenda

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Articulate cogent research agenda for COE.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of Thad Cochran Center outcomes through DHA/HRSA grant evaluation report/newsletters and division annual reports

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

Several positive measures have been realized to advance this goal. The COE has migrated to an online version of The Delta Journal of Education with peer review to increase rigor and visibility. Attendance by the Dean at the 2011 Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) led to a publication related to the exemplary master's cohort model for training educational leaders and an invitation to present at the 2012 UCEA Conference. Overall, combined presentations and publications increased by 26.97% for the period under review. Publications were comparable to the previous year, while paper presentations increased substantially. The intent to develop a research agenda that would cut a wide swath across the COE and answer broad questions related to the rural region served has been only partially attained for a variety of reasons. A reduction in grant funding resulting in reducing the Director of the Thad Cochran Center for Rural School Leadership and Research to a part-time position with teaching responsibilities. Additionally, faculty members carry heavy teaching loads. These conditions have produced more individualized and fragmented approaches to research, though not less significant research.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

The Dean and Chairs reviewed productivity for the year and the above referenced accomplishments related to the COE research agenda. To continue the pattern of increases in papers and publications, it will be important to provide support. Several strategies for prioritizing travel to afford the broadest involvement by the faculty will be employed. Travel associated with presentations will receive first priority in leveraging funding. Conferences convening in the region will be targeted as well. The consensus was that perhaps the approach to a broad and cohesive research agenda has been ambitious given limitations faced (i.e., reduction in funding, competing priorities, lack of support resources). Division Chairs have concluded that the best approach will be for them to foster collaboration at the Division level.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

#### COE 2012\_06: Research

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Reconsider capacity and mission of Thad Cochran Center for Educational Leadership and research; support part-time operation through assignment of two research assistants.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of Thad Cochran Center outcomes through DHA/HRSA grant evaluation summary; CEAC minutes

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

A part-time Director was employed in the Thad Cochran Center for AY 11/12. In addition, two faculty members were provided compensation equivalent to a course release both fall and spring semesters to support faculty members in their research.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

It is difficult for a part-time director to sustain support for research. The faculty members identified as research fellows set established hours to be available to faculty, but found that their approach did not provide enough structure. They had few faculty to avail themselves of the opportunity for assistance. They did, however, provide technical support, especially in the form of statistical analysis, for those preparing papers, conducting studies. With limited resources in the coming year, support will be provided through collaboration in Divisions, with chairs providing leadership/oversight.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

#### COE 2012\_07: Resources

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Identify a three-pronged partnership including private donors, appropriations, and grant sources.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of sustainability plan presented through DHA/HRSA grant evaluation summary and Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research annual report

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The following funding partnerships benefited the COE for the period under review.

##### Funding

- \$767,020 - Delta Health Initiative – Teacher/Leadership Shortage
- \$108,000 - Tri-State Foundation – Elementary Education Master's Cohort II
- \$48,000 – Tri-State Foundation – Specialist Degree Program
- \$8,820 - Tri-State Foundation – Tishomingo Outdoor Recreation Program
- \$89,553 - Summer Institute for Improving Teacher Quality, IHL/U.S. Dept. of Education
- \$251,670 - Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi Foundation, Healthy Campus/Community Initiative
- \$350,000 - E-Learning Appropriation, Mississippi Legislature

- \$25,145 - Delta Promise Community and Delta Health Alliance (The Art of Living Smart Grant with the B.B. King Museum for summer camps) (Dr. Kathy Davis and Ms. Draughon McPherson)
- \$500 - Crosstie Arts Council for art education (Ms. Leigh-Anne Gant)
- \$200 - Entergy for Child Development Center (Ms. Leigh-Anne Gant)
- \$2,500 - America's Farmers for the Child Development Center (Ms. Leigh-Anne Gant)
- \$15,900 - Importer Support Program of the Cotton Board with assistance from Cotton Incorporated (Dr. Jan Hayes)
- \$117,583 - Increasing Counselor Education Retention through Scholarships – HRSA-11-074 (Dr. George Beals)
- \$70,038 - International Baxter Foundation – Play Therapy Training Clinic (Dr. Mistie Barnes and Dr. Christine McNichols)

**Scholarships/Professorships Initiated/Funded**

- Dave Heflin Professorship, \$30,000
- Mary Ellen Arnold Leftwich Scholarship \$10,000

Grant work that did not result in funding:

- RUSS Grant
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Grant
- Early Childhood Proposals (Healthy Beginnings, Quality Training) Legislative Funding

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Program planners reviewed funding for the period under review with an eye toward the future. University leadership worked with the Delta Health Alliance to identify sources of continued funding for the teacher/leadership shortage programs, to no avail. Tuition waivers have replaced scholarships in the leadership program and state sabbaticals are required for students in the coming year to offset living stipends previously provided by the grant. The partnership with the Tri-State Foundation continues to scholarship students in new programs in the Tri-State service area. Cohorts in the doctoral program, educational leadership specialist's program, and elementary education specialist's program are on schedule to be added to offerings in AY 12/13. Work continues with the University grants office to identify and pursue funding partnerships and with the Alumni/Foundation office to identify prospective donors. E-Learning appropriations continue at level funding, and there are plans to apply for the Summer Institute in AY 12/13.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [SP4.Ind03: External resources](#)

**COE 2012\_08: Enrollment**

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Increase enrollment by 2% and restore current funding within 75% of current level.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Analysis of trends based on Institutional Research enrollment data

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Overall enrollment in the COE increased .84%. Funding awards totaled \$1,623,063, which represents 75.13% of AY 10/11 receipts. The funding goal was met.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

While shy of the goal of a 2% increase, division chairs and the dean were pleased to see a gain of .84% in enrollment for AY 11/12, given the economy, declining Delta population, and overall trends in enrollment at the University. Enrollment patterns for each program were reviewed to determine appropriate plans for programming and recruiting. A strategic plan is under development to identify possible causes for the decline in enrollment of the FCS (13.25% decline in AY 11/12; 23.65% decline from AY 09/10). Recruitment through community colleges and working with the Student Success Center on campus are components of the plan.

While the funding goal was met, this goal, going forward, will need to reflect more accurately national trends in funding. It will be adjusted based on sustainability plans for programs and projected sources of funding.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

**COE 2012\_09: Enrollment**

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Increase enrollment in off-campus and online offerings by 2%.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Analysis of trends based on Institutional Research enrollment data

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Overall enrollment in off-campus and online programs increased by 10.42%.

Delta State University College of Education C70 & Online Courses			
	AY 10-11	AY 11-12	Total
<i>Total C70</i>			
Enrollment	556	585	1,141
C70 Face to Face	420	164	584
C70 Online	136	421	557
<i>Total Online</i>			
Only	2,696	3,006	5,702
Grand Total	3,252	3,591	6,843

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Based on IRP data regarding off-campus and online duplicated enrollment, online and off-campus programs continue to have strong markets. With total online enrollment for the COE up 11.5%, program planners have identified additional courses/programs that could be offered online with integrity and practicality. Also, while off-campus programs experienced an overall increase of 5.22% in enrollment, enrollment in face-to-face courses and online courses was inverted, suggesting a strong preference for totally online courses.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

- ▶ [SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training](#)

---

**COE 2012\_10: Technology-Enhanced Expansion**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Enhance offerings through use of Wimba; identify one additional off-campus site/program during 2011 and initiate planning to offer courses/programs.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of Wimba usage, fall schedule of off-campus sites and programs (via division annual reports and university schedules)

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The Elementary Education program faculty incorporated WIMBA into coursework involving the Hinds Community College cohort. Faculty in the Counselor Education and Special Education programs, as well as Family and Consumer Sciences, also incorporated WIMBA into distance offerings. All faculty had opportunity for training in AY 11/12, thereby increasing capacity for future use of WIMBA.

The Educational Specialist's program in Elementary Education was offered through the Tishomingo cohort model during AY 11/12. The Doctor of Professional Studies program and Educational Specialist's program in Educational Administration were identified as programs in demand in AY 12/13 in the Tishomingo area.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

WIMBA will be utilized to a greater degree in the Master of Special Education degree program as it transitions to an online format in AY 12/13. Positive feedback from users has generated increased interest in the technology—and staff development will be provided in an ongoing manner. Three COE representatives will attend the Distance Education Conference in August 2012 to develop greater understanding of the capabilities of a host of tools and services to improve distance education (and will disseminate to faculty upon return). Grants will be submitted to the Tri-State Foundation to fund scholarships for the Educational Specialist's degree program in Educational Administration and the Doctoral degree program in Professional Studies, both to be offered to candidates in the Tri-State region (and both of which will rely upon WIMBA to improve distance delivery). It is expected that cohorts of a minimum of eight (8) will enroll in these programs.

**Related Items**

SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training

SP4.Ind06: Technology infrastructure

SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings

---

**COE 2012\_11: Marketing**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Publish new printed recruiting brochures; review website comprehensively and update.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of brochures and website

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Professional quality updated recruiting brochures were developed and printed for all programs in AY 11/12. In addition, the COE website was reviewed and updated with assistance from the Office of Communications and Marketing. Further, a quality video was produced to highlight the Educational Leadership Master's Cohort Program.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Based on ongoing demand for literature and information, the COE will continue to develop quality recruitment materials to utilize in recruitment fairs, e-blasts, and similar recruiting activities. The determination will be based on targeted program marketing.

**Related Items**

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP4.Ind06: Technology infrastructure

---

**COE 2012\_12: Recruitment**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Implement and monitor master plan for recruitment developed in Year One (of COE Strategic Forecast). [Continued from Year One.]

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of CEAC minutes related to recruitment plan.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The master plan has the following six dimensions: 1) assessing enrollment gains/losses against benchmarks; 2) conducting market analyses for off-campus sites; 3) developing professional quality brochures using standard template; 4) building a stronger networking presence through the website; 5) working with Graduate and Admissions offices to develop a master recruitment plan; and 6) working through the advisement system and Banner to develop a strategic plan for retention, with pre-registration as a focus/gate-keeper.

Dimensions 1 and 2 are addressed under Goals 9 and 10.

Dimensions 3 and 4 are addressed under Goal 11.

Dimension 5 has only partially been realized. Thus far, the master plan has consisted of working with Graduate and Admissions offices to support their overarching strategies for marketing and enlisting their assistance on targeted marketing/recruiting for online and off-campus programs, as well as building community college relations. The COE had conversations with all community colleges and varied recruitment activities on the campuses. Intensive efforts at Hinds Community College continue to result in an increase in graduation numbers. While 15 graduated through the Hinds/DSU partnership in AY 09/10, that number was 24 in AY 11/12. Groundwork was laid for establishing a presence on each community college campus relevant to the regions served by DSU; this effort continues. Phone conversations, visits, and recruitment sessions were the primary method of contact. Contact with high schools occurred primarily through admissions recruitment events and orientations, and university visits.

Dimension 6 involves working through the advisement system to engage and retain students. CEAC implemented the consistent practice of contacting all advisees prior to registration to encourage them to meet with advisors for early registration and to inquire about their status if they were not currently enrolled in school. Each advisor submitted findings to the chair of the department.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Dimensions 1-2 are addressed under Goals 9 and 10; Dimensions 3-4 are addressed under Goal 11. A review of the evaluation results associated with Dimension 5 (working with Admissions/Graduate offices to develop master recruitment plan) indicates that there needs to be further refinement of this plan and that communications and events with community colleges need to be more deliberate and more strategically tracked. While there is evident of successful strategic recruitment in areas cited as having potential for growth (off-campus/online, with 10.42% increase in enrollment in AY 11/12), there may be potential markets that are being neglected. Dimension 6 (engaging and retaining students through advisement) was successfully implemented in AY 11/12, but needs refinement as well. The process needs to be institutionalized with tracking of results needed to determine the benefit of the practice.

Overall, the COE needs to work with the Director of the newly formed Student Success Center and Undergraduate/Graduate admissions in developing plans that are consistent with the strategic goals of the University in the areas of recruitment and retention.

**Related Items**  
▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

---

**COE 2012\_13: Retention**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Implement and assess retention plan enacted through advisement; adjust as necessary (consider Maguire Report for implications that cut across all academic units).

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of advisement reports from division chairs in light of Maguire Report

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

This goal was addressed under Goal 12.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

This goal was addressed under Goal 12.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

---

**COE 2012\_14: Retention**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Work with Institutional Research to establish baseline retention rate for COE. (In light of Maguire Report, (consultant report on recruitment and retention) develop plan consistent with that identified through Academic Affairs unit.)

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of Maguire Report and Academic Council minutes

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The goal was not realized. There was some confusion as to what the initiatives associated with the Maguire Report would entail.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The appropriateness of this goal will be explored with Institutional Research and the Office of Academic Affairs and adjusted based on findings. Program planners will work with the Director of the newly formed Student Success Center to identify appropriate retention strategies.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

---

**COE 2012\_15: Professional Development**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Develop calendar of professional development on diversity and responsiveness to English Language Learners (ELL) and disseminate at beginning of 2011 year; provide training and monitor.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of professional development calendar

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

This goal was realized. Not only was diversity addressed through the annual fall faculty retreat, an ELL training was held in March 2012 for approximately 125 faculty/student participants and a follow-up training video was produced. Feedback cited the practical nature of the training and its content/delivery as strengths. The video mirrors the training. In addition, Dr. Kathe Rasch disseminated electronically an onsite library of resources for faculty use in revising syllabi to more broadly reflect diversity; Dr. Rasch reviewed syllabi and provided critique.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The training video will be used to replicate the training for new faculty and as a refresher for all faculty. The fall 2012 faculty retreat provides the opportunity to review progress related to diversity issues in curriculum and target needed training.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

---

**COE 2012\_16: Diversity**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Monitor Year One (COE Strategic Plan) progress relevant to diversity initiatives; adjust as necessary.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of syllabi, recruiting/hiring reports, and professional development calendar

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

This goal was subsumed under Goals 4 and 15.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

This goal was subsumed under Goals 4 and 15.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

▶ [SP3.Ind06: Diversity](#)

---

**COE 2012\_17: Identity**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Expand COE identity through affiliation with the National Rural Education Association (NREA) and increase presence at the American Education Research Association (AERA), the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), the SouthEastern Region for Vision in Education (SERVE), others to forge research identity/agenda.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of memberships and involvement with professional organizations (NREA, AERA, UCEA, SERVE) through division annual reports

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

Due to a decrease in grant funding support for this goal, attendance at each of these annual conferences will be handled on a rotating basis. The COE Dean attended the 2011 UCEA Conference; as a result, a partnership was forged that led to a publication on the COE's model principalship preparation program and invitation to present at the 2011 UCEA Conference.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

COE leadership and program planners agree that a presence is needed at these organizations, but also realize that they are more in tune to research universities at times. Nonetheless, the goal to build a presence continues; however, the goal will be revised to reflect a more targeted approach and the rotation of attendance at conferences. This goal will not be realized short-term.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

---

#### COE 2012\_18: Prof. Development and Research

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Offer one major professional development opportunity associated with research both fall and spring semesters.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of professional development calendar

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

Note: The decision was made to support research through the provision of research fellows in the Thad Cochran Center for Rural School Leadership and Research. See related Goal 4.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Note: The decision was made to support research through the provision of research fellows in the Thad Cochran Center for Rural School Leadership and Research. See related Goal 4.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

---

#### COE 2012\_19: Professional Dev. Partnerships Schools

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Continue affiliation with Bell Academy as professional development school site; initiate one new program or project.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of division annual reports and grant summative evaluations (HCCI; DHA/HRSA)

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

This goal was fulfilled. The Elementary Education faculty members continue to teach a literacy course on site at a local school, utilizing Nailor Academy this year, thereby incorporating model teaching and real-world experiences into the curriculum. Further, through the Healthy Campus/Community Initiative, other programs/projects at the school have focused on health and physical fitness, foci associated with the magnet schools. A description follows.

**Fit-Tastic Fridays at Bell Academy** - One hundred sixty-two (162) fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students at B.L. Bell Academy participated in nutrition lessons for five (5) consecutive Friday afternoon sessions. Based on pre- and post-test assessment data, students showed a 31% increase in their knowledge of healthy foods and components of proper nutrition as a result of the lessons. Additionally, test results revealed a 21% increase in the number of students who indicated enjoying physically active games at recess.

**Bell Academy Health Fair** - A community wide health fair was conducted for all family, friends, and local neighbors of Bell Academy. Nutrition students helped conduct screenings and physical education majors volunteered for the kids' zone while participants received free health screenings and nutritional education.

In addition to the regular field placements programs have within the school district, the following Healthy Campus/Community Initiative programs occurred at school sites within the district.

**Fit-Tastic Fridays at Cleveland Vocational and Technical School** - Ninth through twelfth graders from Cleveland High School and East Side High School participated in nutrition lessons for four (4) consecutive Friday morning sessions. DSU student athletes, physical education, and nutrition students volunteered to lead students through planned lessons and activities.

**C.O.R.E. Afterschool Program** - One hundred forty-two (142) fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students from three elementary schools in the Cleveland School District participated in this pilot study that examines an ongoing research component of a grant-funded health initiative, entitled Fostering Healthier Students through Focused Educational Activities Afterschool: Centering on Recreation Education and Nutrition (The C.O.R.E. Nutrition Afterschool Program). The three main objectives are to positively affect behavior choices, attitudes, and perceptions toward nutrition and physical fitness, to encourage participants to value positive healthy eating behaviors and to engage participants in moderate to vigorous physical activity that would increase cardiovascular fitness and introduce them lifelong recreational activities. The overall goals for participating children and their parents are to increase awareness of the health benefits of fruits and vegetables, to encourage behavior modification during meal selection, to promote healthy eating at home, and to instill a foundation of health and wellness for improved lifelong health habits. The program's staff consists of twelve (12) pre-service professionals from Delta State University, including six (6) elementary education majors, three (3) nutrition majors, and three (3) physical fitness majors. The schools served were Bell Academy, Cypress Parks Elementary, Parks Elementary, and Pearman Elementary.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

A review of the evaluation results indicates that this goal was fulfilled. Program leaders examined the possibility of expanding the use of one professional development site within the Cleveland School District to offer more comprehensive experiences for candidates. The decision was made to continue to use diverse sites in order to offer the broadest experiences for candidates. The goal will be revised to reflect the need for alternative and diverse experiences.

The programs initiated through the Healthy Campus/Community Initiative reinforce the COE emphasis on ensuring that candidates have the knowledge, dispositions, and skills to achieve healthy schools in the region. The positive gains reported and the nature of these programs are such that program leaders will continue them in the future.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

---

#### COE 2012\_20: Partnerships DAAIS

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Provide collaborative leadership through the Delta Area Association for the Improvement of Schools (DAAIS) to strengthen rural region of the Delta. (Work with DAAIS Director to articulate a shared vision and an agenda of work for the year.)

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review of DAAIS agendas and minutes, as well as CEAC minutes

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The Dean of the College of Education serves on the Executive Board of the Delta Area Association for the Improvement of Schools (DAAIS) and works closely with the

Executive Director of DAAIS, Mrs. Joyce McNair, as she ensures that appropriate partnerships and services are provided to the region through this consortium. A schedule of DAAIS-sponsored workshops and trainings is attached. Bi-monthly meetings of Superintendents and School Board members are also attended by the Dean. Mrs. McNair attends CEAC meetings and provides a report of DAAIS activities. Professional Development Workshops sponsored by DAAIS include:

Delta Area Association for Improvement of Schools

July 2011 – June 2012 Professional Development

#### **Leadership**

The Educational Challenge  
The Principal as Strategic Thinker  
Elements of Standards-Based Instructional Systems  
Foundations of Effective Learning  
Leadership for Excellence in Literacy  
Leadership for Excellence in Mathematics  
Leadership for Excellence in Science  
Promoting Professional Learning  
Principal as Coach  
The Principal as Instructional Leader and Team Builder  
Introduction to Leadership  
Classroom Instruction that Works  
Purposeful Communities Supporting Student Achievement  
Ensuring a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum  
Building Instructional Leadership Teams that Make a Difference  
Coaching to Facilitate Change  
Balanced Leadership  
Designing Assessment to Improve Student Learning  
Leading School-Wide Numeracy Initiatives  
School Law  
Regional Superintendents Meetings  
Regional Principal Meetings  
MS Principal Evaluation System Focus Group Meeting (M-STAR)  
MS Teacher Evaluation System Focus Group Meeting(M-STAR)

#### **PD for Teachers and other building level personnel**

English II Veteran Teachers SATP2 Boot Camp  
Algebra I Veteran Teachers SATP2 Boot Camp  
Biology I Veteran Teachers SATP2 Boot Camp  
Differentiated Instruction  
Classroom Management with a Twist  
MAX Teaching  
TACT-2 Training  
Response to Intervention  
Doing What Works (with MDE)  
Teaching Economics K-12  
Ah-Ha Moments in Physical Science  
Gear Up for Common Core Math Grades K – 5  
Co-Teaching in the Regular Classroom  
First Aid  
Components of a Successful Classroom  
Lesson Planning for Effective Instruction  
Textbook Caravan  
Fluency Building in the Elementary Grades  
What Works in Classroom Instruction  
Developing Digital Leaders and Learners for 21<sup>st</sup> Century K-12 Classrooms  
Rigor and Relevance to improve Higher Order Thinking Skills  
Fluency Building Activities to Enhance comprehension  
Effective Student Response Solutions in the Classroom  
A Student Centered Learning Environment using the Document Camera  
How and Why of Guided Reading  
Integrating Google Apps into the Learning Environment  
Thinking Maps  
The Stock Market Game

#### **Parents and Community**

MDE Stakeholder Meeting (NCLB Waiver Input)  
Common Core and Its Impact on Your Children  
MS Accountability System: An Overview for Parents  
How to Conduct Successful Parent Teacher Conferences

#### **Use of Evaluation Results**

Schedules and minutes reflect a high level of engagement between DAAIS and the members of the COE. They reflect the interrelated nature of the two entities. The COE



Unit Assessment Committee has identified the need to extend sharing of unit assessment data with superintendents so that they can provide feedback for the improvement of the Unit and its programs.

**Related Items**

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

**COE Executive Summary**

**Overview (brief description of scope)**

The College of Education (COE) at Delta State University is composed of four divisions: Counselor Education and Psychology; Family and Consumer Sciences; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research. The College is served by 43 faculty members and 19 staff members serving within the COE. Additionally, the *Office of Field Experiences* and *The Thad Cochran Center for Rural School Leadership and Research* within the College of Education function as support offices for the divisions. The College of Education Administrative Council (CEAC) is comprised of the four chairs of the COE divisions, the Director of Field Experiences, the Director of Recreational Facilities and Aquatics, the Executive Director of the Delta Area Association for the Improvement of Schools (DAAIS), and the Dean. DAAIS is a 40-member consortium of Delta school districts that works closely with the COE.

**Comparative data**

**Enrollment by Division (each column represents Summer II, Fall, and Spring semesters)**

Division	09-10	10-11	11-12
Counselor Ed/Psy	336	359	362
FCS	334	294	255
HPER	584	561	612
Teacher Ed, Ldrshp, Research	1723	1738	1747
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2977</b>	<b>2952</b>	<b>2976</b>

Outcome(s): Overall enrollment in the division increased .84%. Summer enrollment decreased, but fall and spring increased. Enrollment patterns varied by division/program. The dean met with each division chair to ascertain possible reasons for the decline. The following were identified as possible contributing factors. One program experiencing decline was Family and Consumer Science concentrations, particularly child development. Child development majors have possibly decreased due to the elimination of Workforce in Action (WIA) funds. The general economy, higher tuition, migration from the delta, and the fact that enrollment has spiked with new online programs in recent years possibly contributed to the decline, which was slight compared to the overall enrollment pattern at the university.

**Credit Production Hours by Division (each column represents Summer II, Fall, and Spring semesters)**

Division	09-10	10-11	11-12
Counselor Ed/Psy	5,646	5,412	5,292
FCS	3,360	3,179	3,272
HPER	6,548	6,108	6,332
Teacher Ed, Ldrshp, Research	12,299	16,731	21,333
TFA Hours		-3,675	-8,082
<b>Totals</b>	<b>27,853</b>	<b>27,755</b>	<b>28,147</b>

Outcome(s): There was a boost in the fall 2011 enrollment due to Teach for America credit hours produced (credit hours). With these hours counted, CHP is up 15.56%. Without TFA credit hours, CHP is up 1.7%. This is consistent with the enrollment pattern.

**Off Campus and Online Enrollment**

	10-11	11-12
Off Campus	556	585
Online	2,696	3,006

Outcome(s): Off campus enrollment increased 5.22%. Online enrollment increased 11.5%

**Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress**

The College of Education supports the definition of diversity put forth by the National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education (NCATE). The definition states: "Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. The types of diversity necessary for addressing the elements on candidate interactions with diverse faculty, candidates, and P-12 students are stated in the rubrics for those elements (Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions, p. 86).

During AY 10/11, faculty determined that an area of diversity that needed particular focus for AY 11/12 was language, specifically preparing both faculty and candidates to work proficiently with ELL students. Therefore, professional development on effective ELL instruction was offered to 125 faculty and students and a videotape was produced for future training. In addition, the curriculum continues to be audited to determine sufficiency of appropriate learning outcomes and activities associated with diversity components. The Office of Field Experiences continues to work with programs to identify diverse settings for candidates, and tracks the same through a database.

Every effort is made when hiring to conduct searches that will yield a more diverse faculty. Strategies include targeting advertising in diverse publications/organizations and sending letters directly to universities that have populations which yield diverse candidate. During AY 11/12 position searches, two faculty positions were filled by races other than Caucasian. Of the nine positions filled during AY 11/12, three represented races other than Caucasian. Despite efforts to offer competitive salary packages and working accommodations, it is difficult to recruit quality candidates to the area due to the highly competitive market. The COE continually seeks contacts with professionals of diverse backgrounds and explores ways in which to provide a positive working environment for these potential faculty and staff candidates.

**Economic Development Initiatives and/or Impact**

N/A

**Grants, Contracts, Partnerships**

**Funding**

- \$767,020 - Delta Health Initiative – Teacher/Leadership Shortage
- \$108,000 - Tri-State Foundation – Elementary Education Master’s Cohort II
- \$48,000 – Tri-State Foundation – Specialist Degree Program
- \$8,820 - Tri-State Foundation – Tishomingo Outdoor Recreation Program
- \$89,553 - Summer Institute for Improving Teacher Quality, IHL/U.S. Dept. of Education
- \$251,670 - Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi Foundation, Healthy Campus/Community Initiative
- \$350,000 - E-Learning Appropriation, Mississippi Legislature

**Partnership Grant Activities**

- \$25,145 - Delta Promise Community and Delta Health Alliance (The Art of Living Smart Grant with the B.B. King Museum for summer camps) (Dr. Kathy Davis and Ms. Draughon McPherson)
- \$500 - Crosstie Arts Council for art education (Ms. Leigh-Anne Gant)
- \$200 - Entergy for Child Development Center (Ms. Leigh-Anne Gant)

- \$2,500 - America's Farmers for the Child Development Center (Ms. Leigh-Anne Gant)
- \$15,900 - Importer Support Program of the Cotton Board with assistance from Cotton Incorporated (Dr. Jan Hayes)
- \$117,583 - Increasing Counselor Education Retention through Scholarships – HRSA-11-074 (Dr. George Beals)
- \$70,038 - International Baxter Foundation – Play Therapy Training Clinic (Dr. Mistie Barnes and Dr. Christine McNichols)

#### Scholarships/Professorships Initiated/Funded

- Dave Heflin Professorship, \$30,000
- Mary Ellen Arnold Leftwich Scholarship \$10,000

#### Committees reporting to unit

**Department or Division (College of Education (COE) and Arts and Sciences (AS):** Proposed changes go to the department or division chair. If the change is curriculum related, admissions related, or a change affecting other university programs, it then proceeds to the Administrative or Chairs' Councils for approval. Changes related to the doctoral program are submitted to the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council (DACC).

**College of Education Administrative Council (CEAC) or Chairs' Council (Arts and Sciences):** Changes made at the department or division level require approval from CEAC or the Chairs' Council. Deans of the respective colleges (College of Education or Arts and Sciences) chair these councils. Decisions made at this level regarding graduate program policy also go through Graduate Council for approval.

**Teacher Education Council (TEC):** Decisions affecting teacher education (elementary or secondary) must be approved through the CEAC (this pertains to decisions made within programs within the College of Education). These changes are then approved by TEC and subsequently submitted by the Dean for approval to the Academic Council (AC). Similarly, changes made in the College of Arts and Sciences will go through the Chairs' Council, to TEC, and then back to the Dean of Arts and Sciences to be submitted for approval at the Academic Council level.

**Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council (DACC):** This represents the first interdependent level for graduate program approval. The DACC, housed within the College of Education, deals with changes within the doctoral program (i.e., admission criteria, policy changes, program orientation, etc.). Any DACC decisions require approval by CEAC (this is exclusive to the College of Education).

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

#### COE Aquatics SWOT Analysis

**Providing Department:** College of Education

##### Strengths

- State of the art Aquatic Center
- Outreach programs with the community, Lifesaving Class, water aerobics, and Learn to Swim programs
- Provide pool time for Age Group, Masters, and High School swim team
- Host site for large-scale swim meets and triathlons
- Provide recreational swim time
- Teach a wide variety of Aquatic Classes (Lifesaving, Learn to Swim, Scuba Diving, Coach Swimming, Kayak and Canoeing)
- Provide space for athletic training
- Provide space for DSU men's and women's swim team

##### Weaknesses

- Additional classroom space equipped with technology is needed, as well as space for water aerobics and Learn to Swim classes
- The budget is not sufficient for the number of student workers needed to perform various functions/duties (RSE funds).
- Aquatic equipment needs upgrades/replacements

##### Opportunities

- Teach more aquatic classes
- Expand facilities (new lap and therapy pool)
- Renovate Aquatic Center
- Provide host site for more swim meets

##### Threats

- Limited budgets
- Limited motel space in town for hosting large scale swim meets
- Repair and renovation of the Aquatic Center

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

#### COE Counselor Education SWOT Analysis

**Providing Department:** College of Education

##### Strengths

- Faculty members take seriously the gate-keeping responsibilities expected by the profession.
- Faculty members seek to help students in a developmental way including providing some remedial help in academic skills and critical thinking skills.
- Ten-to-one student-to-faculty ratio is highly valued
- Rigorous attention to basic counseling skills
- Diverse skills and viewpoints across faculty members
- The program has a regional and statewide reputation for graduating effective, ethical professionals.
- A live supervision counseling lab
- Sufficient faculty positions

##### Weaknesses

- Lack of physical coverage during the work week to attend to program business and speak with students
  - Need to increase faculty availability
    - Schedule office hours to ensure coverage
  - Need to develop a 12-month program coordinator/CACREP accreditation position
    - Or hire a CED faculty to serve as division chair
- Lack of long-term faculty research programs/agendas
- Lack of faculty publications
- Lack of alumni support
- Junior level faculty with no senior faculty members in the program area. This lack of mentorship is severely debilitating in several ways:
  - Understanding and finding best practices for the Delta population being served.
  - Insufficient mentoring in balancing the multiple roles of Counselor Educators including:
    - Research & publication
    - Supervision

- Social justice leadership
  - Rigorous accreditation standards
  - Self-care
  - Teaching strategies
- Lack of institutional memory
  - Difficulty in creating a viable 5-year plan
- The need to move the program toward a hybrid approach for the Master's Program and a fully online program supplemented with residency opportunities for the new EDS program. This needs a concerted effort and faculty committed to the ideas of online education. It will be time consuming and will detract from research efforts.
  - Salaries are significantly below what master's level counselors can make with only a few years of experience. That is, with three years of experience our students will be earning salaries competitive with our own. In some cases, this is true even when considering a nine-month calendar versus a twelve-month calendar. In addition, the DSU entry level salary for new assistant professors is significantly lower than most programs across the southeast. It is difficult to attract and maintain a viable faculty. Therefore, we remain dependent on mission-driven persons or persons who are committed to living in the area.
  - Area students are substantially weak in academic skills and this program needs to recruit students who are up to the academic rigors and critical thinking required of professional counselors.
  - The EDS program, while very important, has gotten off to a slow start due to the other demands facing new faculty and other program demands.
  - With the exit of longer term faculty, two of whom were alumni of the master's program, this program has lost substantial connection with the counseling community in the region.

#### Opportunities

- Explore opportunity to develop a 12-month program coordinator/CACREP accreditation position
- Explore possibilities for collaboration to increase scholarly efforts
- The EDS program gives this program the impetus to create online course work at both degree levels. It will create a student base of seasoned professionals and will enable us to sustain a viable student headcount while becoming more selective at the master's level. Once fully online the EDS program should have students on a waiting list for admission.
- The grant from Baxter Corporation to create a play therapy lab to serve the community is a tremendous "seed" opportunity to move this program toward a community counseling lab. Our students would have more counseling opportunities with better supervision. The significance of a community counseling lab serving the area should not be underrated. It would move this program to a significantly higher level of training for clinical mental health counselors and would increase funding opportunities.
- Develop stronger alumni relations and partnerships through outreach efforts.
- With a stable faculty and a community counseling lab, this program could create programs that would attract federal grants. There are a multitude of programs for which we would be viable with a program focus and some program changes and additions. Some examples of those changes could be:
  - The addition of two or three undergraduate classes in counseling that might serve the psychology, social work, criminal justice and nursing programs as electives. These would be important recruiting tools and would foster better preparation for graduate school. Course examples would be:
    - Facilitative skills
    - Critical thinking for helping professionals
    - Introduction to counseling
  - A series of pre-requisite courses offered during the summer that identifies incoming student strengths and weaknesses
  - An identified system available to non-traditional students at the university level to facilitate graduate writing
  - A significant effort to attract high quality students from both DSU and Mississippi Valley
  - Perhaps an early identification effort to find students at Coahoma and Northwestern Community College who are academically strong and socially motivated to be counselors

#### Threats

Most challenges are mentioned in the weaknesses and opportunities listed above.

- Finding funds to develop a 12-month program coordinator/CACREP accreditation position
- Increasing scholarship and publication efforts
- Maintaining rigor while serving under-served students
- Salaries
- Creating a stable faculty
- Mentoring
- Dwindling population in the Delta and qualified students
- Prioritizing efforts and having all stakeholders agree
- Balancing the CACREP standard of 10:1 student-faculty ratio while growing the opportunities mentioned above
- We must restore and enhance our connection to the counseling community in the Delta Region. We should probably make an effort to make connections in eastern Arkansas as well.

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

---

#### COE FCS SWOT Analysis

**Providing Department:** College of Education

##### Strengths

- Individual attention for students from faculty
- **Well educated, knowledgeable faculty; adjunct faculty with expertise in areas they teach**
- Students are not just names, professors know them as individuals
- All students have required internships incorporated into their programs.
- Major accreditations: Division is one of 49 programs accredited by the American Association of Family & Consumer Sciences; Dietetics program is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND) of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (A.N.D.); Child Development Center is accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
- Programs are respected in region
- Excellent training facilities at DSU, such as Viking Foods Lab, Child Development Center, Healthy Campus Community Initiative and health and wellness facilities
- Student diversity
- Child Development students have many hours of experience and observation in NAEYC accredited child development facility.
- Child Development students have supervised experience with planning and teaching before graduation.
- Fashion Merchandising students have opportunities to participate in state and national design competitions, to tour fashion industry in New York City, and to produce a professional level fashion show.
- **Dietetics students have 100% job placement.**
- **Dietetics students have a seamless transition from didactic courses to supervised practice.**
- Dietetics students receive mentoring from preceptors at many different types of facilities, exposing them to a variety of different professional styles.
- Dietetics program is widely connected with Delta area facilities: **Hospitals** DRMC, NWRMC, GLH, NSMC, SSCH, Grenada Lake Medical Center, Bolivar County Medical Center. **Clinics** Good Samaritan Clinic in Greenville, and Belzoni (Delta Health Alliance), all health departments in north MS, all Fresenius dialysis centers in north MS. Other affiliations: Mid Delta Home Health, Cleveland District School Food Service, BB King Museum- Art of Living Smart Camp (Indianola Promise Community)
- Other regional facilities: River Oaks Hospital, Central Ms Bariatric Clinic, MS Food Network- Jackson, St. Jude's- Memphis, Fresenius in Jackson and on the Gulf Coast, Singing River Hospital- Gulf Coast School Food Services
- Dietetics students have a broad educational background in nutrition, health and wellness, and food service.

##### Weaknesses

- Enrollment has dropped in the Division in areas other than Dietetics.
- There is a limited number of sufficiently large hospitals in the Delta to provide all necessary clinical Dietetics experiences for that specific rotation
- First time pass rate on Registration exam for Dietitians needs to improve.
- Few very large hospitals in the area to provide clinical experiences for that rotation

##### Opportunities

- Division produces qualified professionals in two major health and welfare areas of concern and focus: Child Development and Dietetics and in a business area where there is a need for qualified professionals in a huge industry: Fashion Merchandising. Statistics on the importance of professionals and jobs available in the retail industry have been provided by the National Retail Federation and can be located at [www.RetailMeansJobs.com](http://www.RetailMeansJobs.com). Below is information from this website, citing only Mississippi data:

- Retail directly and indirectly supports 1 in 4 Mississippi jobs.
  - Retail is directly and indirectly responsible for 18% of Mississippi's GDP.
  - Retail directly and indirectly generates 17% of labor income in Mississippi.
  - Retail supports 346,632 jobs in Mississippi.
- In all areas, utilization of distance opportunities can grow program numbers.
  - With respect to the Child Development concentration, the division might offer more classes at night or by distance, creatively arranging times and opportunities for those students to still be able to obtain their hours in the Child Development Laboratory.
  - In Child Development, the division should explore opportunities with the new Head Start administration for the Head Start teachers in the surrounding areas to take classes at Delta State, since our program is accredited.
  - There are opportunities to connect with other areas of the state and recruit students from different locations as we broaden our marketing base.
  - Explore opportunities with community colleges, in addition to MDCC and Coahoma Community College, enhance 2 + 2 partnerships, particularly with Hinds and Holmes.
  - The Child Development students need to better prepare to pass the PRAXIS exam.
  - Since the Dietetics program is a Coordinated Program, we assure our students the 1200 hours of work experience they are required in order to sit for the RD exam. Most all programs in the country depend on having students obtain internships after their BS in Nutrition/Dietetics and there are only 2500 internships available for 5000 students. This puts us in a great position to serve students who do not receive an internship at the end of their 4 year degree. Not all states have a Coordinated Program in Dietetics, so this program is now attracting out of state students. For the fall 2011 semester, 27% of the Dietetics students were from out of state; 2/3 of the out-of state students had completed baccalaureate degrees. For the spring 2012 semester, 20% of the Dietetics students were from out of state; 3/4 of the out of state students had completed baccalaureate degrees. For the fall 2012 semester, 18% of the Dietetics students are from out of state; 3/5 of those have completed baccalaureate degrees.
  - The Dietetics graduates have a 100% job placement rate; many have jobs before they graduate.
  - Attracting Dietetics students who did not get an internship from other programs is likely to increase the RD pass rate. These are students with GPA's of  $\geq 3.5$ .
  - An education in Nutrition & Dietetics in the MS Delta is one of the best places to learn about the relationship of diet and disease as this area is known for having the highest rates of diet-related diseases such as obesity, cardiovascular disease, renal disease, cancer, and diabetes. There is no better place to see what nutrition education and lifestyle changes can do to prevent and manage disease first hand.
  - The DSU Nutrition and Dietetics Coordinated Program has the opportunity to positively affect the health and wellbeing of the MS Delta by assisting the RD's currently here and filling positions that are vacant for healthcare facilities and programs.

#### Threats

- The Division faces the challenge of integrating three new full time faculty into the Division this fall, providing the necessary mentoring.
- Marketing the programs is improving, but remains a challenge
- In recent years, it has been a challenge for the Child Development program to successfully partner with Head Start. This needs to be overcome.
- The Dietetics program is expensive for students due to the amount of driving they must do to get work experience. They are also required to purchase membership to A.N.D. and student malpractice insurance, as well as background checks and numerous immunizations and health screens to be eligible to work in public facilities. Most students struggle with the financial requirements.
- The bar will need to be raised for applicants to the Dietetics program as far as GPA and screening goes, to assure better pass rates on the RD exam
- The Delta is understaffed by RD's, making it more difficult to maintain quality preceptors, and creates the risk of tiring existing preceptors

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

#### COE Field Experiences SWOT Analysis

**Providing Department:** College of Education

##### Strengths

- Exit survey results from undergraduate teacher candidates reflect high satisfaction with the majority of placements.
- Good relationships with a variety of school districts for placements for early field experiences as well as internships

##### Weaknesses

- Some of the programs in teacher education do not provide as many field experience opportunities for their candidates as others do (unequal number of quality field experiences for certain programs).

##### Opportunities

- Networking with a variety of school districts in order to form better partnerships
- Recruitment for various teacher education programs when supervisors and evaluators are out in the field

##### Threats

- Receiving placements from certain school districts in a timely manner
- Finding quality placements for candidates to reflect NCATE's definition of diversity (ELL, for example)
- Placements for early field experiences for Hinds candidates is sometimes difficult as principals in that area are not yet completely familiar with our program and do not always understand what is needed.

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

#### COE HPER SWOT Analysis

**Providing Department:** College of Education

##### Strengths

- Facilities in the Wyatt Center
- Outreach programs with the community
- Relationships with the State Department of Education, Mississippi Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (MAHPERD), and the Mississippi Athletic Trainers' Association
- Increase in HPER majors and credit hour production over the past year
- Outdoor Recreation Program
- One of only two accredited athletic training programs in Mississippi
- Network of community and junior college faculty and staff
- Required internship options which allow interaction with community, state, and regional contacts

##### Weaknesses

- Limited technology in classrooms (e.g., only one smart classroom in the Wyatt Center)
- Need to increase research and publications
- Need more classroom space, more space for exercise classes, and more space for recreation
- Additional funds needed to hire student workers (RSE)

##### Opportunities

- Prospective online degree options
- Opportunity to expand niche for Athletic Training degree program
- Potential for grants and research
- Room to expand facilities
- Potential host site for events and conferences
- Large alumni base, with opportunity for relationship building/fundraising/promoting programs

##### Threats

- Getting all faculty to use and embrace technology and online courses
- Curriculum changes, ongoing
- Getting students to use Blackboard
- Students in class without text books
- Repair and renovation of the Wyatt Center

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

**COE Psychology SWOT Analysis**

**Providing Department:** College of Education

**Strengths**

- Cohesion among faculty
- Faculty serves under-served students with respect.
- Faculty members maintain a rigorous program of study.
  - There is no grade inflation.
- Faculty members are dedicated to teaching.
- Focus on student empirical research.
- Rigorous attention to research methods and APA writing skills.
- Faculty members seek to help students in a developmental way including providing remedial help in academic skills, writing skills, and critical thinking skills.
- Diverse skills and viewpoints across faculty members
- Sufficient faculty positions
  - Dr. Jones' part time teaching is highly valued

**Weaknesses**

- Maintaining rigor while serving under-served students. (This is easier said than done.)
  - We have spectacularly under-served cohort not in a position to succeed as a function of regional education, resulting in subtle watering down of our pedagogy to reflect the students as opposed to what we bring; 4-4 load leaves little room for else.
- The program needs to recruit students who are up to the academic rigors and critical thinking that are expected.
- Lack of long-term faculty research programs/agendas
- Lack of faculty publications
- Lack of grant writing
- Lack of Alumni support
  - Institutional memory hamstrung by faculty turnover
- The possible need to move the program toward a hybrid/online approach while maintaining rigor and serving under-served students.
- DSU entry level salaries for new assistant professors and existing salaries are low and have not kept up with rising living costs.
  - Difficult to attract and maintain a viable faculty
  - Remain dependent on mission-driven persons or persons who are committed to living in the area
- Instructional environment
  - Classroom appearance, lighting, and desks
- Lack of engagement of students in professional and school activities (e.g., Psi Chi and Psychology Club)
- Student professionalism – millennial students – fast food service mentality
  - Attendance
  - Quality of work
  - Late work

**Opportunities**

- Faculty collaboration to increase scholarly efforts
- Explore opportunities to increase enrollment
  - Need to develop more online course offerings while maintaining rigor and serving under-served students. Delta students do not do well in online course.
  - Or . . . need to play up the fact that students get a face-to-face education
- Grow student body with greater undergrad culture (this will need to be face-to-face)
- Recruitment – Need to make a significant effort to attract high quality, competent students
- Develop stronger relationships with alumni through outreach efforts.

**Threats**

Most challenges are mentioned in the weaknesses and opportunities listed above.

- Maintaining rigor while serving under-served students. (This is easier said than done.)
  - We have spectacularly under-served cohort not in a position to succeed as a function of regional education, resulting in subtle watering down of our pedagogy to reflect the students as opposed to what we bring; 4-4 load leaves little room for else.
- Enrollment
  - Attracting high quality, competent students in a dwindling Delta population
- Increasing scholarship and publication efforts
- Creating a stable faculty
- Salaries
- Prioritizing efforts and having all stakeholders agree

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

**COE Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research SWOT Analysis**

**Providing Department:** College of Education

**Strengths**

- Good relationships with school districts and public school personnel at all levels
- A wide variety of excellent professional education programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels
- A faculty that has a desire to produce quality educators at all levels of the professional education continuum
- Graduates who have a reputation for performing well in the professional education arena
- NCATE accreditation for all programs

**Weaknesses**

- The faculty body has several members who are either new to higher education or have not completed the dissertation.
- Limited funding for professional development, travel, and technology
- Lack of faculty presence and commitment (resources) during summer months
- Inordinate amount of time required in association with accreditation process

**Opportunities**

- Recruitment of students who wish to teach in impoverished areas

- Recruitment of students for online programs in Mississippi as well as the southern region of the United States
- To develop the Hinds Community College 2+2 program in Elementary Education into a large program that contributes substantially to both enrollment and credit hour production
- To develop the Ed. S. in Educational Leadership and the M. Ed. in Special Education into online programs that enhance visibility, enrollment, and credit hour production
- To develop the Ed. D. program using various delivery forms to serve wide areas of Mississippi
- To offer the M. Ed. and Ed. S. in elementary education to a larger geographical area
- To build a strong faculty and leadership team through professional development

#### Threats

- Securing funds from various sources to continue the development of programs in the division
- Directing the faculty at large in directions that benefit the growth and development of the university
- Increasing the cooperation of the faculty to work together for the benefit of all programs
- Helping novice faculty members to become productive and understand their role in the professional development of educators
- Securing funding to offset the reduction in state contributions to Delta State University in general and teacher education in particular

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

### Counselor Education and Psychology

#### CEDP Mission Statement

##### Mission statement

##### Counseling Program Mission Statement

The faculty and staff of the Delta State University Counselor Education Program through teaching, training, supervision, and experiential activity, develop ethical, competent counselors who are prepared to work in school or community settings. Program faculty seek to foster within students a life-long disposition toward respecting, caring for, and valuing individuals in all stages of development, cultural sensitivity, continued growth and learning, interpersonal openness, and practical application of sound principles and practices in their work as professional counselors.

##### Psychology Program Mission Statement

The Delta State University Psychology Program consists of committed, knowledgeable, and engaging faculty who represent a diverse selection of the subfields of psychology. The Program emphasizes excellence in instruction by providing a friendly environment, small classes and opportunities for students to develop intellectually, professionally and socially. The Psychology Program encourages significant student-faculty interactions which promote intellectual, cultural, ethical, and social development, allowing students to develop the ability to respect and evaluate the thoughts of others; to develop, assess, and express their own thoughts effectively; and to use the techniques of research and performance associated with the discipline of psychology. Through challenging coursework and one-on-one empirical research opportunities with faculty, students have the opportunity to develop the skills and competence in psychology needed for post baccalaureate careers or graduate school.

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

#### BA-PSY 01: LO Learning and Cognition

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Learning Outcome

Students will recognize and apply terminology of the major concepts and theories in learning and cognition.

##### Data Collection (Evidence)

Course assessments in PSY 402 Learning and Cognition (a core course) and a standardized assessment from the Major Field Test in Psychology (given in PSY 490 Senior Seminar [a core course]) are used to measure student learning in the area of learning and cognition.

PSY 402 Learning and Cognition course assessments are conducted through two unit tests, a final exam (FE) and reflection papers (RP). Average proportion scores were recorded for 2011-2012.

PSY 490 (Senior Seminar) Capstone Course Assessment:

MFT PSY assessment indicator for Memory and Thinking

##### Results of Evaluation

##### PSY 402 Learning and Cognition Course Assessment Data

PSY 402 Learning and Cognition assessment data (i.e., unit tests, a final exam [FE], and reflection papers [RP]) for fall 2011 and spring 2012 are reported below:

	S11	F11	S12
Test 1	.82	.74	.82
Test 2	.83	.97	.83
FE	.83	.86	.82
RP1	.80	.72	.81
RP2	NA*	.77	NA*

\*not required

##### MFT PSY Assessment Data

MFT PSY Assessment Indicator (Mean Percent Correct based on 19 students) for Memory and Thinking = 29 (national average = 44).

National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Mean MFT Memory and Thinking student scores are below the national average.

Note – Due to the number of courses transferred to DSU and course scheduling issues, some transfer students take PSY 490 before taking PSY 402. This adversely affects their Memory and Thinking scores on the MFT PSY. We are exploring ways to resolve this problem.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY score: 19 PSY students = 144 out of a possible 200. National average is 156. Two area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., clinical/abnormal and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. The sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score.

**Summary Table**  
**Major Field Test (MFT) in Psychology Assessment Indicators**

Year (spring)	Number of Students Tested	Overall MFT Score (national average)	Memory and Thinking (national average)	Sensory and Physiology (national average)	Developmental (national average)	Measurement and Methodology (national average)
2010	14	152 (155)	44 (48)	38 (38)	43 (46)	44 (52)
2011	20	148 (156)	47 (48)	33 (38)	38 (46)	49 (52)
2012	19	144 (156)	29 (44)	45 (49)	38 (52)	45 (55)

2011 National average is based on 365 institutions and 36,515 students taking the test from February 2005 to June 2010.

2012 National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. It is important to note that DSU students accepted into psychology graduate programs averaged a score of 164 on the MFT PSY (above the national average of 156).

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Program faculty review results of the MFT PSY in formal faculty meetings and discuss changes to curriculum within the program and in specific courses in order to increase student learning.

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

Due to the three-year MFT PSY trend data and the fact that many students have limited writing skills, faculty have provided more scaffolding in their courses.

The PSY program hosted writing and plagiarism workshops to address noticeable student writing weaknesses.

#### PSY 402 Learning and Cognition

In order to increase student learning the following were carried out in PSY 402 Learning and Cognition:

Textbook changed for Spring 2011.

Course is now functionally divided into 2 sections: learning and cognition.

Emphasis in cognition section was altered and placed on information processing stages—pattern recognition, attention, short and long-term memory; Vygotsky, Piaget and Bruner theories (replaced previous 2010 material on language, semantic organization, categorization, problem solving and decision making).

Writing assignments (reflection papers) have been increased from two to four in order to provide students with greater familiarity with original source materials. That is, starting in fall 2012 students are required to complete four reflection papers instead of two.

#### Related Items

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Students will recognize and apply terminology of the major concepts and theories in biological psychology.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Course assessments in PSY 409 Biological Psychology (a core course) and a standardized assessment from the Major Field Test in Psychology (given in PSY 490 Senior Seminar [a core course]) are used to measure student learning in the area of biological psychology.

PSY 409 Biological Psychology course assessments are conducted through unit tests, a final exam (FE), and reflection papers (RP). Average proportion scores were recorded for 2011-2012.

PSY 490 (Senior Seminar) Capstone Course Assessment:  
MFT PSY assessment indicator for Sensory and Physiology.

**Results of Evaluation**

PSY 409 Biological Psychology Course Assessment Data

PSY 409 Biological Psychology assessment data (i.e., unit tests, a final exam [FE], and reflection papers [RP]) for spring 2011 and spring 2012 are reported below:

	S11	S12
Test 1	.83	.80
Test 2	.82	.85
FE	.77	.72
RP1	.69	.81
RP2	.71	.81

MFT PSY Assessment Data

MFT PSY Assessment Indicator (Mean Percent Correct based on 19 students) for Sensory and Physiology = 45 (national average = 49).

National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Mean MFT PSY Sensory and Physiology student scores increased this year and are just below the national average.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY score:19 PSY students = 144 out of a possible 200. National average is 156. Two area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., clinical/abnormal and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. The sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score.

**Summary Table**

**Major Field Test (MFT) in Psychology Assessment Indicators**

Year (spring)	Number of Students Tested	Overall MFT Score (national average)	Memory and Thinking (national average)	Sensory and Physiology (national average)	Developmental (national average)	Measurement and Methodology (national average)
2010	14	152 (155)	44 (48)	38 (38)	43 (46)	44 (52)
2011	20	148 (156)	47 (48)	33 (38)	38 (46)	49 (52)
2012	19	144 (156)	29 (44)	45 (49)	38 (52)	45 (55)

2011 National average is based on 365 institutions and 36,515 students taking the test from February 2005 to June 2010.

2012 National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. It is important to note that DSU students accepted into psychology graduate programs averaged a score of 164 on the MFT PSY (above the national average of 156).

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Program faculty review results of the MFT PSY in formal faculty meetings and discuss changes to curriculum within the program and in specific courses in order to increase student learning.

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

Due to the three-year MFT PSY trend data and the fact that many students have limited writing skills, faculty have provided more scaffolding in their courses.

The PSY program hosted writing and plagiarism workshops to address noticeable student writing weaknesses.



PSY 409 Biological Psychology

In order to increase student learning the following were carried out in PSY 409 Biological Psychology:

There was a textbook upgrade to current version.

Writing assignments (reflection papers) used to familiarize students with primary resource literature were implemented.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

**BA-PSY 03: LO Developmental Psychology**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Students will recognize and apply terminology of the major concepts and theories in developmental psychology.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Course assessments in PSY 307 Developmental Psychology (a core course) and a standardized assessment from the Major Field Test in Psychology (given in PSY 490 Senior Seminar [a core course]) are used to measure student learning in the area of developmental psychology.

PSY 307 Developmental Psychology course assessments are conducted through four unit tests. Average proportion scores were recorded for 2011-2012.

PSY 490 (Senior Seminar) Capstone Course Assessment:

MFT PSY assessment indicator for Developmental Psychology.

**Results of Evaluation**

[PSY 307 Developmental Psychology Course Assessment Data](#)

PSY 307 course trend data based on four-unit test average:

Spring 2011 .83 (N= 27)

Fall 2011 .79 (N = 31)

Spring 2012 .77 (N = 34)

MFT PSY Assessment Data

MFT PSY Assessment Indicator (Mean Percent Correct based on 19 students) for Developmental = 38 (national average = 52).

National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Mean MFT PSY Developmental student scores are below the national average.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY score: 19 PSY students = 144 out of a possible 200. National average is 156. Two area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., clinical/abnormal and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. The sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score.

**Summary Table**

**Major Field Test (MFT) in Psychology Assessment Indicators**

Year (spring)	Number of Students Tested	Overall MFT Score (national average)	Memory and Thinking (national average)	Sensory and Physiology (national average)	Developmental (national average)	Measurement and Methodology (national average)
2010	14	152 (155)	44 (48)	38 (38)	43 (46)	44 (52)
2011	20	148 (156)	47 (48)	33 (38)	38 (46)	49 (52)
2012	19	144 (156)	29 (44)	45 (49)	38 (52)	45 (55)

2011 National average is based on 365 institutions and 36,515 students taking the test from February 2005 to June 2010.

2012 National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. It is important to note that DSU students accepted into psychology graduate programs averaged a score of 164 on the MFT PSY (above the national average of 156).

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Program faculty review results of the MFT PSY in formal faculty meetings and discuss changes to curriculum within the program and in specific courses in order to increase student learning.

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

Due to the three-year MFT PSY trend data and the fact that many students have limited writing skills, faculty have provided more scaffolding in their courses.

The PSY program hosted writing and plagiarism workshops to address noticeable student writing weaknesses.

#### PSY 307 Developmental Psychology

In response to student performance on unit tests and the MFT assessment indicator, more emphasis has been placed on an end-of-semester group presentation project to increase student learning. This assignment requires students to summarize and demonstrate proficiency in the analysis and application of major developmental theories including: Erickson, Piaget, Levinson, Marcia, and Kohlberg.

#### Related Items

[GE 05: Self](#)

[SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

[SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

[SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

[SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

#### BA-PSY 04: LO Statistics

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Students will produce and interpret descriptive and inferential statistics.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

Course assessments in PSY 331 Statistics (a core course) are used to measure students' abilities to produce and interpret descriptive and inferential statistics.

PSY 331 Statistics course assessments are conducted through six tests and homework assignments. Average proportion scores were recorded for 2011-2012.

#### Results of Evaluation

##### PSY 331 Statistics Assessment Data

Statistics PSY 331 has been on a six-test system since fall 2010. Average proportion scores from 2011-2012 are reported below. All tests are strongly correlated with each other. This suggests reliability at minimum. N = 89, 5 sections, 2 taught in spring 11. Homework was scored more leniently, either 8/10 points or 10/10 points if they did it. Average of .84 is factoring in a lot of zeroes. Despite that, homework is a predictor of all tests and semester average. In short, everything correlated with everything.

Test 1 = .74; Test 2 = .81; Test 3 = .73; Test 4 = .73; Test 5 = .78; Test 6 = .75; Homework = .84; semester average = .77.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

##### PSY 331 Statistics

In order to improve student learning, the use of "Screencasting" was implemented. "Screencasting," in which a professor narrates over static or changing content on a screen, was used to demonstrate computer applications of statistics as they are done on SPSS. "Screencasting" allows the professor to demonstrate without affecting a lab setting. While the class itself is chiefly about the concept of statistical processes, computer-approaches therein are an important component.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

[SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

#### BA-PSY 05: LO Research Design Writing

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Students will be able to demonstrate effective research design and scientific writing skills using APA style which culminates in an executable research proposal.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

Course assessments in PSY 330 Research Methods I (formerly 102) and PSY 332 Research Methods II (formerly 201) (both core courses) and a standardized assessment from the Major Field Test in Psychology (given in PSY 490 Senior Seminar [a core course]) are used to measure student learning in the areas of research design and writing skills.

Detailed assessments in PSY 330 and PSY 332 were implemented in fall 2010. Comparison data was first available in spring 2012 after the redesign had been fully

implemented.

PSY 330 and PSY 331 course assessments are conducted through tests and structured graduated writing assignments. Average proportion scores were recorded for 2011-2012.

PSY 490 Capstone Course Assessment: MFT PSY assessment indicator for Measurement and Methodology was used to measure student learning of research design.

Student research and presentation production was also recorded. Students incorporate conceptual learning in professional research presentations that require students to present concepts to professionals in the area of psychology.

**Results of Evaluation**

Research Methods Redesign Grade distribution data from 2006 to 2009 compared to data from 2010 to fall 2011 indicate that the redesign has been ineffective in increasing student pass rates (pre-redesign 75% pass rate compared to post-redesign 73% pass rate).

PSY 330 Research Methods I Assessment Data

PSY 330 assessment data (i.e., unit tests, research topic proposal, annotative bibliography [Bib], rough draft [Draft], and final literature review [Lit R]) for spring 2011 and spring 2012 are reported below:

	<u>S11</u>	<u>S12</u>
Test 1	.76	.83
Test 2	.83	.88
Proposal	.62	.77
Bib	.74	.70
Draft	.64	.84
Lit R	.73	.80

PSY 332 Research Methods II Assessment Data

PSY 332 has been on the four-test system since F06. Average proportion scores from 2011-2012 are reported below. There is an early-semester talk to peers designed to pressure them for the details for their project. There is also an annotated bibliography, first draft, second draft. All tests are correlated with each other which suggests reliability at minimum. N = 37, 3 sections. The talk and bibliography predicted neither draft, suggesting improvement independent of early-semester performance. There was a significant difference between first and second tests,  $t(36) = 2.71, p < .01$ , and between the first and second drafts,  $t(36) = 6.08, p < .001$ . The four draft-related assignments were largely unrelated to tests. We would have preferred that they were.

Test 1 = .77; Test 2 = .70; Test 3 = .81; Test 4 = .79; Talk = .82; Bib = .66; Draft 1 = .65; Draft 2 = .80; semester average = .77.

MFT PSY Assessment Data

MFT Assessment Indicators for Measurement and Methodology (Mean Percent Correct) increased from 2010 to 2011, but decreased in 2012:

2010: 44 (52 national average)

2011: 49 (52 national average)

2012: 45 (55 national average)

National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012

Note – Mean MFT PSY Measurement and Methodology student scores are just below the national average.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY score: 19 PSY students = 144 out of a possible 200. National average is 156. Two area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., clinical/abnormal and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. The sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score.

**Summary Table**

**Major Field Test (MFT) in Psychology Assessment Indicators**

Year (spring)	Number of Students Tested	Overall MFT Score (national average)	Memory and Thinking (national average)	Sensory and Physiology (national average)	Developmental (national average)	Measurement and Methodology (national average)
2010	14	152 (155)	44 (48)	38 (38)	43 (46)	44 (52)
2011	20	148 (156)	47 (48)	33 (38)	38 (46)	49 (52)
2012	19	144 (156)	29 (44)	45 (49)	38 (52)	45 (55)

2011 National average is based on 365 institutions and 36,515 students taking the test from February 2005 to June 2010.

2012 National average is based on 167 institutions and 4,603 students taking the test from September 2010 to April 2012.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. It is important to note that DSU students accepted into psychology graduate programs

averaged a score of 164 on the MFT PSY (above the national average of 156).

#### Student Research and Presentation Production

Psychology students conducted a good number of research projects. Dr. Hutchens' fall 2011 PSY 315 (Social Cognition) students conducted 5 empirical research projects. Three were presented as professional research presentations in 2012 at The Mid-South Psychology Conference (one student was awarded first place for Best Research Poster). One of Dr. Drury's students also conducted a research project in 2011 and presented it as a professional research presentation at a The Mid-South Psychology Conference in 2012.

#### **Use of Evaluation Results**

Program faculty review results of the MFT PSY in formal faculty meetings and discuss changes to curriculum within the program and in specific courses in order to increase student learning.

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

Due to the fact that many students have limited writing skills, faculty have provided more scaffolding in their courses.

The PSY program hosted writing and plagiarism workshops to address noticeable student writing weaknesses.

#### PSY 330 Research Methods I

In order to increase student learning the following were carried out:

Students were engaged in structured graduated writing assignments based on APA format and style requirements.

Extensive feedback was provided on proposal, annotated bibliographies, and rough draft to facilitate performance on final literature review.

Expanded assigned readings were given to provide more direction to completing the writing assignments

#### PSY 332 Research Methods II

In order to increase student learning the following were carried out:

Preliminary draft assignments now precede the final draft, which is designed to mimic the exactitude of a proposal in a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation process. They include the heavily edited first draft, the annotated bibliography that is designed to create the structure of a literature review, and the research presentation to peers. This presentation to peers forces students to confront undeveloped portions of research proposals, much in the spirit of an oral proposal in graduate school.

#### Research Methods Redesign:

Due to the fact that the redesign has been ineffective in increasing student pass rates, the fact PSY 330 and PSY 332 require intense writing and research components, and the fact that many students have limited writing skills, it became apparent that the redesign needed to be recalibrated to narrow the field of possible research topics for student research proposals. The recalibration explored the use of canned research projects (e.g., using CogLab) to ensure that students conduct appropriate, doable projects. By doing so, students were provided with more scaffolding to write a research proposal.

Note – Around ten years ago PSY 493 (Independent Research) was developed to give students an opportunity to take a course solely devoted to conducting research and writing an APA research paper. The course was productive in the past. However, the intensive nature of the course is not conducive to an enrollment of 10 or more. As a result, due to budget constraints over the last five years, PSY 493 has not been able to be offered as part of a faculty member's course load. Thus, PSY 493 has only been offered sporadically to a few students over the last five years for per-head faculty pay.

#### **Related Items**

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

 [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

 [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

 [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

 [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

 [SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate](#)

---

#### **EDD-COU 01: LO Mastery of Prior Knowledge**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

#### **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.

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**

One candidate submitted a portfolio in Fall 2011 for the Ed.D. counseling track. This was the candidate's second submission and it was not accepted. There were no submissions in Spring 2012.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Because no new Counseling Track students were admitted in this reporting period, no data was collected. Thus, no program changes were made. In the event that students apply and are admitted, assessment data is collected and evaluated in order to make necessary changes.

Efforts to recruit more qualified students for the Counseling Track of the Ed.D. program were initiated:

Faculty have explored online/hybrid delivery methods for the program in order to better market the program to nontraditional students.

The initiation of the Ed.S. program may create a better pipeline for more students to enter the Counseling Track of the Ed.D.

**Related Items**

[SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

**EDD-COU 02: LO Content Knowledge**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Program Specific Content: Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Counselor Education.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. Comprehensive Examinations: Comps 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 NCATE Coordinator annually.

3. Results will be analyzed by program faculty by section and overall scores and trends are identified.

**Results of Evaluation**

There were no counseling track students taking comprehensive exams in this reporting period.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Because there were no Counseling Track students taking comprehensive exams in this reporting period, no data was collected. Thus, no program changes were made. In the event that students take comprehensive exams, assessment data will be collected and evaluated in order to make necessary changes.

Efforts to recruit more qualified students for the Counseling Track of the Ed.D. program were initiated:

Faculty have explored online/hybrid delivery methods for the program in order to better market the program to nontraditional students.

The initiation of the Ed.S. program may create a better pipeline for more students to enter the Counseling Track of the Ed.D.

**Related Items**

[SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

[SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

[SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

**EDD-COU 03: LO Advanced Counseling Skills**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Advanced Counseling Skills: Demonstrate advanced skills as a counselor in the current place of counseling practice. Advanced skills include additional knowledge and counseling techniques beyond the master's degree.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Advanced counseling practicum and internship are times when students are under DSU faculty supervision. Faculty form collaborative consulting relationships with these students to encourage professional growth and assess the students' application of advanced knowledge and skills in the workplace and in the university classroom.

**Results of Evaluation**

This year, one student completed counseling practicum.

Evaluations are on file.

The student exhibited outstanding qualities as a school counselor and received excellent evaluations from her workplace. In addition, she assisted the supervisor in teaching a class and supervising master's level students. Her work was considered developmentally appropriate.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

One student completed counseling practicum during this reporting period. Even though the student performed very well, she would have had a richer experience in counseling practicum if she were part of a cohort of peers. Thus, efforts to recruit more qualified students for the Counseling Track of the Ed.D. program were initiated:

Faculty have explored online/hybrid delivery methods for the program in order to better market the program to nontraditional students.

The initiation of the Ed.S. program may create a better pipeline for more students to enter the Counseling Track of the Ed.D.

Currently enrolled students are in dissertation stages. Except for counseling practicum, no other Counseling Track Ed.D. courses were offered in this reporting period because there were no students taking coursework. Thus, no other program changes occurred. In the event that courses are offered, assessment data will be collected and

evaluated in order to make necessary changes to improve student learning.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

**EDD-COU 04: LO Research and Writing Techniques**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Mastery of research techniques and academic writing (dissertation):

Demonstrate the ability to create a research question relevant to the counseling literature; design the appropriate research methodology; collect and analyze the data; and, report the findings in a manner conducive to enhancing the counseling literature.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students will complete the dissertation. Starting the dissertation process in ELR 888 students will work with faculty to complete a meaningful research project that will contribute to the counseling literature.

**Results of Evaluation**

One student recently completed a dissertation and graduated from the program. In doing so, he demonstrated mastery of research techniques and academic writing. His dissertation was very well written. Currently there are four counseling students in various stages of the process.

One student awaits comprehensive exams, but has not responded to taking comprehensive exams twice.

Three students are working on their dissertations.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

One student completed a dissertation during this reporting period. Even though the student demonstrated mastery of research techniques and academic writing in his dissertation, he would have had a richer experience if he went through the program with a cohort of peers. Thus, efforts to recruit qualified students for the Counseling Track of the Ed.D. program were initiated:

Faculty have explored online/hybrid delivery methods for the program in order to better market the program to nontraditional students.

The initiation of the Ed.S. program may create a better pipeline for more students to enter the Counseling Track of the Ed.D.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

---

**EDS-COU 01: LO Mastery of Prior Knowledge**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Demonstrate mastery of the prior knowledge needed to be successful in Ed.S. program.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

The application process for the Ed.S. in counseling – school track includes:

1. Students are currently employed as school counselors and have at least two years' experience.
2. Students must pass a writing proficiency test and submit a writing sample to be evaluated by the faculty.
3. Students must secure at least 3 letters of recommendation.

The CED faculty will decide collectively on students to be admitted to the program based on writing samples and recommendations.

**Results of Evaluation**

To date, the faculty have admitted 3 students to the Ed.S. program.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Faculty are currently exploring online/hybrid delivery methods for the program in order to better market the program to nontraditional students.

The initiation of the Ed.S. program may create a better pipeline for more students in the Counseling track of the Ed.D.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

---

**EDS-COU 02: LO Content Knowledge**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Program Specific Content: Students will demonstrate detailed knowledge of the ASCA School Counseling model.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students will demonstrate detailed knowledge of the ASCA school model and the supporting science behind the development of that model. Students will apply the model to their specific school counseling sites and determine the strengths and deficits of their programs. Students will develop a plan for implementation of an enhancement to their program and will acquire consent/cooperation from stakeholders in the school community. This process will be documented in a paper submitted at the end of CED 717 that includes necessary steps and citations from the literature supporting the enhancement.

**Results of Evaluation**

Since this is a new program, no students have advanced to this stage in the process yet.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

None - 1<sup>st</sup> year

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

---

---

**EDS-COU 03: LO Advanced Counseling Skills**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Advanced Counseling Skills and program enhancement: Demonstrate advanced skills as a counselor in the current place of counseling practice. Advanced skills include additional knowledge and counseling techniques beyond the master's degree. Implement the enhancement plan created in CED 717 Advanced School Counseling.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Advanced counseling practicum and internship are times when students are under DSU faculty supervision. Faculty form collaborative consulting relationships with these students to encourage professional growth and assess the students' application of advanced knowledge and skills in the workplace and in the university classroom.

In addition, the student will implement the plan created in CED 717 and will document the installation, maintenance and results of the enhancement with suitable evaluation techniques.

Students will receive supervision from DSU faculty who will evaluate advanced skills. In addition, students will complete the paper started in CED 717 showing implementation and results as they have moved their campus counseling program toward the ASCA school counseling model.

**Results of Evaluation**

Since this is a new program, no students have advanced to this stage in the process yet.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

None - 1<sup>st</sup> year

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

---

**EDS-COU 04: LO Supervision Skills**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Mastery of Supervision Strategies: Demonstrate knowledge and skills related to performing effective and ethical counselor supervision.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students will demonstrate knowledge by passing tests within the class semester. Also students will demonstrate ability by providing tapes of counseling supervision processes (a rubric will be developed).

The instructor of record will be the primary evaluative source for this. However, the entire faculty assist in supervising counselor supervisors and will have evaluative input.

**Results of Evaluation**

Since this is a new program, no students have advanced to this stage in the process yet.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

None - 1<sup>st</sup> year

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

---

**MED-COU 01: LO CACREP Knowledge Base**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Counseling students will demonstrate knowledge in the eight CACREP core areas.\*

\*Professional Identity

Helping Relationships

Assessment

Group Work

Career Development

Human Growth and Development

Social and Cultural Diversity

Research and Program Evaluation

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. The **two** assessment instruments used in determining acquisition of content knowledge in the program are the **CPCE** (Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam) and the

**NCE** (National Counselor Exam). The CPCE is offered every semester, and students are eligible to sit for the exam after taking CED 609. The NCE is offered each spring and fall semester, and students are eligible to sit for the exam while they are in their last semester of coursework in the program or within six months of their graduation from the program.

2. Scores from the CPCE are generated through the Center for Credentialing in Education (CCE), an affiliate with the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) which generates the scores for the NCE. The CPCE scores are generated each semester, and the NCE scores are generated twice a year in the spring and fall. The CPCE test summary provides descriptive statistical data to compare program results with national results; the NCE also has national data with comparisons with CACREP and non-CACREP programs.

3. Data from test results are distributed to faculty for review in preparation for a discussion in a faculty meeting (or multiple faculty meetings as needed). At these faculty meetings, strategies are developed that will help students perform better on these instruments, including program preparation workshops, professionally prepared test prep materials, and curricular changes within targeted courses.

**Results of Evaluation**

Recently, the majority of the students have passed the CPCE. Based on the past 6 years (see summary tables), CPCE pass rates have been on an upward trend. In comparing aggregate data from 2011-2009 to 2008-2006, it is evident that first time pass rates have significantly increased by 30% (2011-2009 = 76%, 2008-2006 = 46%).

Although, the percentage of students passing the CPCE in spring 2011 and fall 2011 was very high. The CED faculty, in consultation with CCE and fellow Mississippi state universities who administer this exam, changed the cut score beginning with the fall 2009 administration. The previous cut score was ½ standard deviation below the mean. The current cut score is 55%.

In 2011, all students passed the CPCE with 13 of 14 students passing it the first time and the remaining student passing it on the second attempt in April of 2012.

NCE pass rates indicate a downward trend from spring 2003 to spring 2010. However, the NCE pass rate in spring 11 increased from 37% in spring 2010 to 64% in spring 2011 indicating the start of an upward trend.

**Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) Pass Rates**

CPCE Administration Dates	# of Students Tested	# of Students Passed	Pass Rate %
12/11 retake	1	0	0%
10/11	10	9	90%
03/11	5	5	100%
11/10 retake	3	3	100%
11/10	9	6	66%
03/10 retake	1	1	100%
03/10	13	12	92%
10/09 (fall 09) retake	3	1	33%
10/09 (fall 09)	7	6	86%
07/09 (summer 09) retake	4	3	75%
06/09 (summer 09)	6	4	67%
04/09 (spring 09) retake	6	1	17%
03/09 (spring 09)	13	4	31%
10/08 (fall 08) retake	4	1	25%
10/08 (fall 08)	26	19	73%
4/08 (spring 08) retake	4	3	75%
3/08 (spring 08)	10	5	50%
11/07 (fall 07) retake	8	3	38%
10/07 (Fall 07)	12	1	8%
3/07 (spring 07) retake	6	3	50%
3/07 (spring 07)	10	3	30%
11/06 (fall 06) retake	5	4	80%
10/06 (fall 06)	10	7	70%

**National Counselor Exam (NCE) Pass Rates**

NCE Administration	# of Students Tested	# of Students Passed	Pass Rate %
Spring 11	14	9	64%
Spring 10	19	7	37%
Spring 09	17	NA	NA
Spring 08	10	3	30%
Spring 07	15	9	60%
Spring 06	9	4	44%
Spring 05	7	6	86%
Spring 04	10	8	80%
Spring 03	8	7	88%

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Reviewed courses and adopted new textbooks in counseling theory, group counseling, and research methods.

Added additional on-line exercises to increase student interaction with the material.

To evaluate student learning and integration of material, a comprehensive professional portfolio of the eight core CACREP areas was implemented. To address student needs, many courses have been web enhanced.

**Related Items**

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores



➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate](#)

---

#### MED-COU 02: LO Counseling Skills

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Learning Outcome

Counseling students will be able to apply relationship building skills. Students will form a theoretical orientation while implementing basic therapeutic intervention, and forming case conceptualization.

##### Data Collection (Evidence)

Counseling students are observed closely in at least **five** clinical courses (CED 630, 601, 604, 609, and 610 or 619). Documented taped session reviews in 630 and 604 and site supervisor observations reflected in formal evaluations serve to monitor student progress.

##### Results of Evaluation

For the spring 11 and fall 11 semesters, documented observations indicated that 8 students self-selected out in CED 630; 4 students self-selected out of the program or were mandated to repeat the course in CED 604; all students passed CED 609; and all students successfully passed CED 610 or CED 619. This multiple evaluation procedure is determined by program faculty to be an effective "gate keeping" process.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Faculty members meet two times per semester to review videos of students applying relationship building skills and implementing basic therapeutic interventions. Faculty members, as well, provide supervision following each counseling session to address issues related to theoretical orientation, case conceptualization, and related issues.

Students, following each faculty meeting to review counseling skills videos, are given the opportunity to meet with a faculty member to discuss faculty feedback.

Following evaluation by faculty members, counseling students not meeting the expected level of performance are provided various forms of remediation by faculty via additional clients, continued supervision throughout the semester, and/or repeating the course for additional experience.

##### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

#### MED-COU 03: LO Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Learning Outcome

Counseling students will demonstrate professional proficiencies as evaluated by core faculty members through the Professional Proficiencies Rubric. Professional proficiencies include qualities such as ability to establish cooperative relationships with others, ability to accept and implement feedback, ability to deal with conflict effectively, tolerance for differences, and proficiency in written and oral communication.

##### Data Collection (Evidence)

As part of the clinical observations (documented taped session reviews and site supervisor observations reflected in formal evaluations), faculty review and discuss student progress in the areas of professional and ethical conduct and an appreciation for diversity; multicultural issues are covered in all coursework with the foundational course as CED 616; experiential and didactic experiences serve to develop a disposition toward appreciating diversity.

In addition to the above observations, in 2010, the counseling faculty decided to pilot a counselor dispositions rubric. This rubric has been court-tested and used for several years at the College of William & Mary in Maryland.

The faculty implemented it in spring 2011 and adopted it policy in fall 2011. As a result all 60 CED students undergo evaluation of professional dispositions twice each semester with feedback given to them either by the instructor of CED 604 Counseling Pre-practicum or their advisor.

##### Results of Evaluation

Analysis of faculty and site supervisor observations indicated that all interns adequately demonstrated minimal competency in developing and demonstrating the ability to work effectively with diverse populations and exhibiting professional and ethical conduct.

Immediate results of this pilot project are that students are demonstrating more awareness of the professional standards by which they are being adjudicated. There is now a concrete reference for students relative to appropriate program behaviors.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Faculty continue to discuss didactic and experiential activities that enhance the curriculum in student acquisition of knowledge of skills. Faculty have made substantial revisions to the CED curriculum in 2011-12 to ensure compliance with the revised CACREP standards. Current revisions include updating course syllabi to the new standards and changing the order of courses.

As a result of this implication, there is suitable feedback for students to understand the dispositions required of faculty and students verbalize an understanding that passing coursework is not all that is necessary to successfully complete the program. Faculty will continue to use the rubric and will continue its discussions on how to use the data.

##### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

#### MED-COU 04: LO Appreciation of Research

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Counseling students will demonstrate an alignment with the counseling profession through proof of membership in a professional organization. Counseling students will demonstrate familiarity with research and present at professional conferences.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students are required as part of their internship experiences (CED 610 or 619) to present at a professional conference. Many take the opportunity to present at the F.E. Woodall Annual Spring Conference or the state's Mississippi Counseling Association (MCA) conference.

**Results of Evaluation**

Students are observed and/or required to submit documentation of these presentations; during the 2011-2012 year, 7 students presented or co-presented at the MCA conference; and 10 presented or co-presented at the F.E. Woodall Spring Conference (Total = 17).

**Use of Evaluation Results**

This continues to be an ongoing requirement in the program. Faculty actively recruit students to become members of state and national professional organizations (MCA, ACA).

Students are now required to have faculty sponsors as they submit materials for consideration as presentations for professional conferences.

**Related Items**

[SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_01: Division Increase Enrollment**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Increase enrollment in Counselor Education and Psychology Programs by a minimum of 1% (through expanded/new [Ed.S.] programs and innovative program/course offerings, as well as vigorous recruiting practices) and retain quality students.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of enrollment and retention reports from Institutional Research and Planning. Track the number and type of productive recruitment efforts.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Total CED enrollment over the last three years was 171 in 2009-10, 155 in 2010-11, and 170 in 2011-12. Three-year and two-year trend data indicate that CED enrollment decreased 1% from 2009-10 to 2011-12 and increased 9% from 2010-11 to 2011-12. In order to help increase retention, the CED program increased the fall and spring new student orientation from three hours to a day-long orientation and included a workshop on writing and plagiarism in order to address noticeable weaknesses in student writing. The orientation also gives students a clear program description in the spirit of thorough informed consent in order for the students to gain a better understanding of the nature of the program and expectations concerning rigor. However, the CED program will continue to have some attrition due to the gate-keeping function inherent in the ethics of counselor education. Total PSY enrollment over the last three years was 165 in 2009-10, 204 in 2010-11, and 192 in 2011-12. Three-year and two-year trend data indicate that PSY enrollment increased 14% from 2009-10 to 2011-12 and decreased 6% from 2010-11 to 2011-12. The PSY program will continue to engage in vigorous recruiting practices. The division worked with the DSU Office of Communications and Marketing to develop three different professional brochures (Psychology program, Counselor Education master's program, and education specialist's program). The counseling EDS program was approved in August 2011, an admissions requirement policy was put in place, and advertising was started in spring 2012 with the development of a professional brochure and website announcement. Also, in summer 2012, an electronic announcement about the EDS program (including the brochure) was sent to the Mississippi Counseling Association list serve. All school counselors and clinical mental health counselors in Mississippi receive the list serve. Students will be admitted into the program during the summer of 2012 and start in fall 2012. Also, in fall 2011 the division implemented an enrollment and retention plan developed by CEAC. This involves academic advisors personally contacting all advisees for early registration and then following up with advisees who do not sign up for advising. The practice will be continued every semester. Moreover, another CEAC enrollment plan to better recruit students from community colleges will be launched in 2012. This will involve personally contacting school counselors at Mississippi community college, making personal connections, and providing the counselor with recruitment materials (i.e., the professional brochures). Division faculty attended the recruitment functions listed below. All recruitment functions were productive, except the first one that is listed. Due to the fact that the students were not directed to attend the recruitment fair after the Youth Leadership Conference (instead they were told to load their buses), setup and faculty attendance on a Saturday was a waste of time and effort. However, the Memphis Area College Night Fair was large and well attended by serious students from the Memphis area. The division plans to attend this fair on an annual basis.

1. Division Recruitment, (2011, March 5) Career Services Fair, Annual Statewide Youth Leadership Conference, DSU BPAC, Cleveland, MS
2. Division Recruitment, (2011, August 31) Career Services Majors Fair, Lasso a Major, Cleveland, MS
3. Division Recruitment, (2011, October 1) Career Services, DSU Day College Fair, Cleveland, MS
4. Division Recruitment, (2011, November 8) Bolivar County High School Recruiting Fair, Cleveland, MS
5. Division Recruitment, (2012, March 3) Junior Visit Day, Office of Admissions, Cleveland, MS
6. Division Recruitment, (2011, October 1) Memphis Area College Night Fair, Agcenter, Memphis, TN
7. Division Recruitment, (2011, March) Graduate Studies Social, Cleveland, MS

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Results will be used to evaluate effective methods of recruitment in order to strengthen the Counselor Education and Psychology Programs. The division will work closely with the Graduate Office and Admissions to develop recruitment plans and develop retention plans through advisement and monitoring.

**Related Items**

[SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

[SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

[SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

[SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_02: Division Increase CHP**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Increase credit hour production (CHP) in Counselor Education and Psychology Programs by a minimum of 1% (through expanded/new [Ed.S.] programs and innovative program/course offerings, as well as vigorous recruiting practices).

**Evaluation Procedures**

Review of CHP reports from Institutional Research and Planning. Track the number and type of productive recruitment efforts.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Review of CHP reports from Institutional Research and Planning indicated the following: CED CHP three-year trend data indicate a 21% decrease from 2009 (1863) to 2011 (1467); two-year trend data indicate a 6% decrease from 2010 (1563) to 2011 (1467). The decrease in CHP in CED is associated with a decrease in enrollment. PSY CHP three-year trend data indicate a 15% decrease from 2009 (3159) to 2011 (2694); two-year trend data indicate a 9% decrease from 2010 (2961) to 2011 (2694). The decrease in PSY CHP in the two-year trend data is due to the fact that fewer courses were offered due to having a vacant faculty position in 2011-2012. Also, it may be the case that students are taking fewer hours due to the current economic climate. EPY CHP three-year trend data indicate a 1% decrease from 2009 (1041) to 2011 (1032); two-year trend data indicate a 9% decrease from 2010 (1134) to 2011 (1032). The division worked with the DSU Office of Communications and Marketing to develop three different professional brochures (Psychology program, Counselor Education master's program, and education specialist's program). The counseling EDS program was approved in August 2011, an admissions requirement policy was put in place, and advertising was started in spring 2012 with the development of a professional brochure and website announcement. Also, in summer 2012, an electronic announcement about the EDS program (including the brochure) was sent to the Mississippi Counseling Association list

serve. All school counselors and clinical mental health counselors in Mississippi receive the list serve. Students will be admitted into the program during the summer of 2012 and start in fall 2012. Also, in fall 2011 the division implemented an enrollment and retention plan developed by CEAC. This involves academic advisors personally contacting all advisees for early registration and then following up with advisees who do not sign up for advising. The practice will be continued every semester. Moreover, another CEAC enrollment plan to better recruit students from community colleges will be launched in 2012. This will involve personally contacting school counselors at Mississippi community college, making personal connections, and providing the counselor with recruitment materials (i.e., the professional brochures). Division faculty attended the recruitment functions listed below. All recruitment functions were productive, except the first one that is listed. Due to the fact that the students were not directed to attend the recruitment fair after the Youth Leadership Conference (instead they were told to load their buses), setup and faculty attendance on a Saturday was a waste of time and effort. However, the Memphis Area College Night Fair was large and well attended by serious students from the Memphis area. The division plans to attend this fair on an annual basis.

1. Division Recruitment, (2011, March 5) Career Services Fair, Annual Statewide Youth Leadership Conference, DSU BPAC, Cleveland, MS
2. Division Recruitment, (2011, August 31) Career Services Majors Fair, Lasso a Major, Cleveland, MS
3. Division Recruitment, (2011, October 1) Career Services, DSU Day College Fair, Cleveland, MS
4. Division Recruitment, (2011, November 8) Bolivar County High School Recruiting Fair, Cleveland, MS
5. Division Recruitment, (2012, March 3) Junior Visit Day, Office of Admissions, Cleveland, MS
6. Division Recruitment, (2011, October 1) Memphis Area College Night Fair, Agicenter, Memphis, TN
7. Division Recruitment, (2011, March) Graduate Studies Social, Cleveland, MS

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Results will be used to evaluate effective methods of recruitment in order strengthen the Counselor Education and Psychology Programs. The Division will work closely with Graduate Office and Admissions to develop recruitment plans and develop retention plans through advisement and monitoring. The Division will focus on market analysis and course offerings to ensure strategic delivery of courses.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

---

#### CEDP 2012\_03: Division Increase Graduates

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Unit Goal

Increase the number of graduates for Counselor Education and Psychology Programs by a minimum of 1% (through expanded/new [Ed.S.] programs and innovative program/course offerings, as well as vigorous recruiting practices).

#### Evaluation Procedures

Review of graduation numbers reported by Institutional Research and Planning. Track the number and type of productive recruitment efforts.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

Note – 2011-2012 overall division graduation numbers are the same from the previous 2010-2011 year to the 2011-2012 year (i.e., 29). CED decreased from 16 to 12 (25%) while PSY increased from 13 to 17 (24%). CED three-year trend data indicate a 50% decrease from 2009-2010 (24) to 2011-2012 (12). PSY three-year trend data indicate a 23% decrease from 2009-2010 (22) to 2011-2012 (17). The division experiences a significant amount of attrition due to the rigor of the psychology and counselor education programs. In order to help increase retention, the CED program increased the fall and spring new student orientation from three hours to a day-long orientation and included a workshop on writing and plagiarism in order to address noticeable weaknesses in student writing. The orientation also gives students a clear program description in the spirit of thorough informed consent in order for the students to gain a better understanding of the nature of the program and expectations concerning rigor. However, the CED program will continue to have some attrition due to the gate-keeping function inherent in the ethics of counselor education. The PSY program also continues to host a writing and plagiarism workshop (fall 2010 and 2011) to address noticeable student writing weaknesses. The division worked with the DSU Office of Communications and Marketing to develop three different professional brochures (Psychology program, Counselor Education master's program, and education specialist's program). The counseling EDS program was approved in August 2011, an admissions requirement policy was put in place, and advertising was started in spring 2012 with the development of a professional brochure and website announcement. Also, in summer 2012, an electronic announcement about the EDS program (including the brochure) was sent to the Mississippi Counseling Association list serve. All school counselors and clinical mental health counselors in Mississippi receive the list serve. Students will be admitted into the program during the summer of 2012 and start in fall 2012. Also, in fall 2011 the division implemented an enrollment and retention plan developed by CEAC. This involves academic advisors personally contacting all advisees for early registration and then following up with advisees who do not sign up for advising. The practice will be continued every semester. Moreover, another CEAC enrollment plan to better recruit students from community colleges will be launched in 2012. This will involve personally contacting school counselors at Mississippi community college, making personal connections, and providing the counselor with recruitment materials (i.e., the professional brochures). Division faculty attended the recruitment functions listed below. All recruitment functions were productive, except the first one that is listed. Due to the fact that the students were not directed to attend the recruitment fair after the Youth Leadership Conference (instead they were told to load their buses), setup and faculty attendance on a Saturday was a waste of time and effort. However, the Memphis Area College Night Fair was large and well attended by serious students from the Memphis area. The division plans to attend this fair on an annual basis.

1. Division Recruitment, (2011, March 5) Career Services Fair, Annual Statewide Youth Leadership Conference, DSU BPAC, Cleveland, MS
2. Division Recruitment, (2011, August 31) Career Services Majors Fair, Lasso a Major, Cleveland, MS
3. Division Recruitment, (2011, October 1) Career Services, DSU Day College Fair, Cleveland, MS
4. Division Recruitment, (2011, November 8) Bolivar County High School Recruiting Fair, Cleveland, MS
5. Division Recruitment, (2012, March 3) Junior Visit Day, Office of Admissions, Cleveland, MS
6. Division Recruitment, (2011, October 1) Memphis Area College Night Fair, Agicenter, Memphis, TN
7. Division Recruitment, (2011, March) Graduate Studies Social, Cleveland, MS

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Results will be used to evaluate effective methods of recruitment in order strengthen the Counselor Education and Psychology Programs. The Division will work closely with the Graduate Office and Admissions to develop recruitment plans and develop retention plans through advisement and monitoring. Note - Immediate impact on graduation numbers will likely not be seen--as candidates who are not currently on track for graduation may not meet requirements even with enhanced advisement. It will, also, take time (i.e., at least two years) to measure the effect of vigorous recruitment efforts on graduation rates).

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate](#)

---

#### CEDP 2012\_04: Division Teacher Observation Mentorship

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Unit Goal

Continue to refine In-Class Chair Observation and Mentorship Program for faculty.

#### Evaluation Procedures

Quantitative and qualitative assessment outcomes will be discussed with each division faculty member after an in-class observation. Annual chair evaluations may be used to further assess the success of this goal.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

All division faculty were observed at least once in the academic year. Subsequently, they met with the chair and received detailed feedback/recommendations about their teaching and classroom management skills. Faculty were encouraged to use the feedback/recommendations to increase their teaching effectiveness as they progressed toward tenure and promotion. This should ensure teaching quality and rigor and ultimately lead to more faculty obtaining tenure and promotion. One faculty member was recently granted tenure and promoted to Associate Professor of Psychology. Note – CEAC agreed to use a uniform evaluation form.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

The Chair In-Class Observation and Mentorship Program will continue to be used to develop and strengthen the division faculty and promote effective and innovative teaching. Division faculty will be observed in 2012-2013.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

➤ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

➤ [SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

---

#### CEDP 2012\_05: Division External Funding

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Division faculty will examine external funding sources to supplement program initiatives.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Number of grant-writing workshops attended by faculty and number of faculty in attendance; meetings with the DSU grant office; number of grant applications.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The division had a successful year obtaining external funding. Division faculty met with Robin Boyles in the DSU Grant Office to seek information about applying for discipline-related grants several times throughout the year. The Counselor Education Program faculty and division chair (Drs. Barnes and McNichols spearheaded the effort) met several times to brainstorm and reapplied for an International Baxter Foundation grant to create a play therapy training clinic. The proposal was funded at \$70,038 for one year. The development of the play therapy training clinic will benefit the community. Also, Dr. Beals applied for funding through the Scholarships for Disadvantaged Students (#HRSA-11-074) program. The project title was Increasing Counselor Education Retention through Scholarships and was funded at \$117,583. Moreover, three division faculty and staff (i.e., Dr. Hutchens, Dr. Drury, and Ms. Calvin) individually applied for and received five funded awards for professional development from the Dulce Fund supported by Dr. Leila Wynn and the Bryce Griffis President's Endowment Fund. The combined amount funded was \$1,300. The funds will be used to purchase two classroom whiteboards and counseling laboratory equipment (DVD recorder and headphones).

##### Use of Evaluation Results

The Division will continue to seek additional funds from potential grants and other funding sources.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP4.Ind03: External resources](#)

---

#### CEDP 2012\_06: Division Data Integrity

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

The Division will research what needs to be done for it to be in compliance with the University's "Data Integrity" Policy and provide the appropriate procedures and training for data entry and use in order to insure that the data are good, secure, and used appropriately.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Provide training for all personnel who enter, collect, and analyze data. Provide confidentiality training for all who have access to confidential information. Maintain training session agendas and sign-in sheets.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

Faculty participated in data entry training. However, more training needs to take place. This goal will be continued for next year.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Division capacity will be increased through effective use of data to make data-driven decisions.

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

---

#### CEDP 2012\_07: CED CACREP Reaccreditation

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Prepare the CACREP reaccreditation Self-Study to be submitted by June 30, 2011 and prepare to respond to any addendum required by CACREP. Prepare for the site visit in fall 2012.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Self-Study accepted and addendum submitted and accepted with site visit scheduled.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The Self-Study was submitted in June 2011 and the program received a request for Addendum due on April 16<sup>th</sup> 2012. The program has submitted the Addendum to CACREP and waits for a site visit to be scheduled during the fall of 2012.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

The program will continually use the CACREP standards to improve and adjust to better serve and generate high quality professional counselors. The Addendum efforts created substantial changes in the CED program. These efforts that will be reflected in the 2012 goals.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

---

#### CEDP 2012\_08: CED EDS Curriculum

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Program faculty will clarify the curriculum, create the necessary course work, and create the necessary documentation for the Ed.S. in School Counseling awaiting approval by the Mississippi Department of Education in July of 2011. Assuming its approval, beginning fall of 2011 the program faculty will submit the finalized curriculum and admissions requirements to the College of Education's CEAC committee, the dean, and Academic Council for final approval with the intension of commencing classes to serve this program in spring of 2012.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Course curriculum, admissions process and enrollment.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The Ed.S. program was not ready as planned for the spring 2012. However, all approvals have been obtained, courses and syllabi are ready and an admissions procedure is now ready to admit up to 15 students in the fall of 2012.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The Ed.S degree program will admit its first students in fall of 2012.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind04: Degrees](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_09: CED Scholarship Efforts**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Program faculty will engage in regular discussions about current research and publication efforts including but not limited to: Journal article submissions and potential submissions, conference presentations, book chapters, and involvement of students in scholarly efforts.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Minutes of bi-weekly faculty meetings, presentations, and publication submissions.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Faculty presented at state, regional, and/or national conferences this year. Dr. McNichols had a publication in the Journal of Professional Counseling. While publications remain few, the regular research discussions at program meetings have made the faculty members more aware of actively pursuing publication opportunities: 1) Drs. McNichols and Witt are working on an article entitled "Economic implications for counseling in the Mississippi Delta;" 2) Dr. Beals is working on an article reporting research on counselor awareness and compliance of the ethical mandate for counselors to leave "professional wills;" and 3) Dr. Barnes will complete IRB approval for data collection to be a regular part of the Play Therapy Training Center in order to publish from that data.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The program will engage in the refinement of the support system in order to facilitate individual and collaborative scholarship efforts.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_10: CED Admissions Qualified Students**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Program faculty in conjunction with the Division Chair, the Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Studies will seek to design and implement more effective admissions criteria in a effort to attract the most highly qualified graduate students in the immediate area and beyond.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Minutes of bi-weekly faculty meetings. Curricular adjustments. Admissions process review with subsequent adjustments.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The faculty collaborated and chose to use a non-invasive strategy to implement changes. The faculty decided to require the Verbal Proficiency Test Score to be in evidence before admissions to the program. This required no changes in policies; however, it was discussed with the Dean of the College of Education and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The program now requires a Verbal Proficiency Test score to be evident before admitting students to the Masters in Counseling Program. This has been implemented effective spring 2012 and the results will be monitored and reported in future annual reports.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_11: CED Online Hybrid Course Offerings**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Program faculty will identify at least two courses that are suitable for hybrid or full on-line offering and will have syllabi and faculty review for offer in spring of 2012.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Scheduling and Review of at least two hybrid or on-line classes.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The program has established processes to develop courses and course syllabi in a collaborative way to ensure that student needs and CACREP and/or NCATE standards are met as current and new courses are updated to incorporate technological resources. As a result, at least four courses will be available in 2012 as hybrid and online courses: 1) CED 606 Career Development and Placement; 2) CED 620 Human Growth and Development; 3) CED 711 Crisis Intervention; and, 4) CED 718 Counseling and Spirituality.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The creation of procedures to use as the faculty serves its function as a curriculum committee should empower and streamline efforts to create updated, high-quality courses across the curriculum. The faculty will continue to use these methods and will identify a minimum of two courses to move toward on-line and hybrid offerings.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_12: CED Student Orientation Program**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Modify the fall and spring new student orientation program from three hours to a day-long orientation and include a workshop on writing and anti-plagiarism.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Retention and graduation data

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Students were given a clear program description in the spirit of thorough informed consent in order for the students to gain a better understanding of the nature of the program and expectations concerning rigor. Noticeable weaknesses in student writing and communication skills were addressed as the students entered the program. A total of 40 students completed the orientation in fall of 2011. The program retained 62% of those students. This is a shift up. Three students chose to leave the program and not begin classes based on this thorough informed consent process. Faculty report that students better understand expectations and seem better motivated.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The day-long orientation will be continued in future semesters and refined based on student and faculty feedback.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_13: PSY Research Methods Redesign**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Continue the process of assessing the redesign of PSY 102 (Psychological Tools) and PSY 201 (Research Methods).

**Evaluation Procedures**

Grade distributions of PSY 332 (formerly PSY 201) in fall 2011 and spring 2012 as compared to previous semesters; chair and student evaluations; higher graduation rates.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The redesign of PSY 102 (Psychological Tools) and PSY 201 (Research Methods) took place in spring 2010 and was partially implemented in fall 2010 with PSY 330 (Research Methods I) PSY 331 (Statistics) in spring 2011 and PSY 332 (Research Methods II) in fall 2011. Grade distribution data from 2006 to 2009 compared to data from 2010 to fall 2011 indicate that the redesign has been ineffective in increasing student pass rates (pre-redesign 75% pass rate compared to post-redesign 73% pass rate). Also, due to the fact that PSY 330 and PSY 332 require intense writing and research components and the fact that many students have limited writing skills, it has become apparent that the redesign needs to be recalibrated to narrow the field of possible research topics for student research proposals. The recalibration will also explore the use of canned research projects (e.g., using CogLab) to ensure that students conduct appropriate, doable projects. By doing so, students will be provided with more scaffolding needed to write a research proposal.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Results will be used to modify the curriculum and PSY program in the future.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_14: PSY Online Course Offerings**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Encourage faculty to increase the number of online course offerings.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Number of online courses offered, enrollment, and CHP.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

There were two more online courses offered this year than last year. Total PSY enrollment over the last three years was 165 in 2009-10, 204 in 2010-11, and 192 in 2011-12. This three-year and two-year trend data indicate that PSY enrollment increased 14% from 2009-10 to 2011-12 and decreased 6% from 2010-11 to 2011-12. PSY CHP three-year trend data indicate a 15% decrease from 2009 (3159) to 2011 (2694); two-year trend data indicate a 9% decrease from 2010 (2961) to 2011 (2694). The decrease in PSY CHP in the two-year trend data is due to the fact that fewer courses were offered due to having a vacant faculty position in 2011-2012.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Results will be used to consider offering more online courses in order to make it more convenient for nontraditional students and distance students to take psychology courses. As a result, enrollment and CHP may increase slightly.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_15: PSY Faculty Development**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Continue to attend the Southeastern Conference on the Teaching of Psychology as a faculty retreat (faculty teaching development).

**Evaluation Procedures**

A report will be sent to the Provost's Office as a follow-up to the requested funds from the Kent and Janice Wyatt faculty development funds received. Faculty will also improve in their teaching as measured by annual chair evaluations and in-class chair observations.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Three psychology faculty attended the conference. Dr. Scott Hutchens was invited by the conference chair, Dr. Bill Hill, to speak on the challenges of teaching the psychology of human sexuality online, and he and two other faculty also presented a poster. The conference was very beneficial (faculty follow-up reports were filed in the Provost's Office). As measured by annual chair evaluations, the three faculty gained experience and developed professionally as a result of attending the conference. New teaching techniques to engage students were learned, shared, and implemented (effective uses of clickers and screencasting). By implementing these teaching techniques, the faculty will become more effective teachers.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Results will be used to consider attending a similar conference as a group again.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_16: PSY Scholarship Efforts**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

PSY Program faculty will engage in regular discussions about current research and publication efforts, including but not limited to: Journal article submissions and potential submissions, conference presentations, book chapters, and involvement of students in scholarly efforts.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Minutes of faculty meetings, presentations, and publication submissions.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Faculty presented at various professional conferences this year. While publications remain few, the regular research discussions at program meetings have made the faculty members more aware of actively pursuing publication opportunities. These discussions led to a collaborative effort to conduct a research project generated by Dr. Drury to (i.e., interview world renowned social psychologist, Dr. Zimbardo, reading the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Stanford Prison Experiment). The interview was recently published in the APA journal the History of Psychology. Dr. Drury and Dr. Hutchens have also continued to involve undergraduate psychology majors in faculty-mentored research. Dr. Hutchens' fall 2011 PSY 315 (Social Cognition) students conducted 5 empirical research projects. Three were presented as professional research presentations in 2012 at The Mid-South Psychology Conference (one student was awarded first place for Best Research Poster). One of Dr. Drury's students also conducted a research project in 2011 and presented it as a professional research presentation at The Mid-South Psychology Conference in 2012.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The program will engage in the refinement of the support system in order to facilitate individual and collaborative scholarship efforts.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

---

**CEDP 2012\_17: PSY Quality Online Hybrid Courses**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Peer-review all online and hybrid courses using the Quality Matters rubric.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Quality Matters rubric ([www.qualitymatters.org](http://www.qualitymatters.org)) used to peer-review all online and hybrid courses.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The Quality Matters rubric ([www.qualitymatters.org](http://www.qualitymatters.org)) was used to peer-review all online and hybrid courses. This process has become standard practice. Faculty were given recommendations for improvement and course redesign. One major recommendation given to all faculty was to use the "Learning Module" tool in Blackboard to organize course materials, assessments, assignments, and discussions. As a result, the PSY online/hybrid curriculum has become stronger and more organized.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Results will be used to modify online and hybrid curriculum in the future.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

▶ [SP3.Ind08: Evaluations](#)

▶ [SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings](#)

---

**Family and Consumer Sciences**

**FCS Mission Statement**

**Mission statement**

The mission of the Division is to provide professional education in Family & Consumer Sciences and to provide complementary educational experiences for other disciplines, and to provide individuals opportunity for developing competencies that enhance the quality of life.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

---

**BS-FCS-CD 01: LO Understanding of life development stages**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Identify and assess the stages of human development from conception through adolescence in areas of physical/motor, social, and emotional growth.

GE 1, GE 4, GE 5

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

**Lab evaluations:** Using the Child Development Student Assessment form, students are evaluated by child development teachers on their ability to interact well with children and to recognize developmentally appropriate practices when working with children of various ages (Appendix 1). Evaluations are reviewed by faculty to determine areas for improvement.

**Objective examinations:** Students are given exams and asked to write reports to determine their content knowledge concerning the stages of human development. These exams and reports determine the students' basic knowledge of child development. If they do not have at least 70% knowledge of the material, they will not be able to effectively apply the knowledge with children. The students are required to repeat the course until content and application portions of the course are mastered.

[appendix 1](#)

**Results of Evaluation**

Final analysis of the points on the student assessment tool over the past three years indicated that at least 70% of the students received an average rating of at least 3 on the assessment tool, which is considered acceptable, safe to practice. 25% of the students received an average rating of over 3.5, with a 4 rating being considered outstanding, effective practice. The remaining five percent of the students were considered marginal or unacceptable.


Results of examinations and written reports over the past three years demonstrate that at least 70% of the students are meeting desired content knowledge thresholds.


**Use of Evaluation Results**

Lab evaluation forms were last modified to allow consistency in evaluation procedures throughout the student's course of study. These forms, filed in the student's personal folder in the Division office, are used to determine improvement throughout the course of study. This model has been effective for four years. Students continue to be evaluated at midterm so that they are informed before the semester's end of any difficulties they may be having. The Child Development Student Assessment tool is being reviewed for expansion, to incorporate more of the variables that are assessed for the student interns. More space for written comments will also be included in the revised form.

Instructional materials are reviewed annually; this year the curriculum committee chose to continue with the current textbook.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

 [GE 05: Self](#)

---

#### BS-FCS-CD 02: LO Developmentally appropriate practices

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Plan and implement activities and administer programs for children that incorporate early childhood principles and are based on developmental needs and characteristics of children.

GE 1, GE 4, GE 5, GE 8

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

##### Lab evaluations:

Using the Likert-type Child Development Student Assessment form, students are evaluated by child development teachers on their ability to recognize and apply appropriate practices when working with children of various ages (Appendix 1). Evaluations are reviewed by faculty to determine areas for improvement. This model has been used for several years.

#### Development and implementation of developmentally appropriate projects and activities:

In the courses 377 Methods and Materials for Preschool Programs and FCS 378 Principles and Procedures of Preschool Programs, students are required to demonstrate that they understand and can apply developmentally appropriate practices to the projects and activities that they create and use with young children. Students' activities are reviewed by child development teachers and peers to determine the level of appropriateness of activities. Child development faculty members also indicate the amount of assistance required by the students in the development of such activities and lesson plans. Students must revise their plans until they receive at least a satisfactory instructor evaluation before the activity is implemented with children.

#### Internship Evaluations:

During their capstone internship experience, students spend 200-400 hours in an early childhood classroom setting. The students observe, interact, teach, and perform all other requirements expected of a teacher. The student is evaluated by the supervising teacher at midterm and the end of the term. The supervising teacher completes the four point Likert-type Student Internship Assessment form when the student teaches a unit of instruction (Appendix 2). The internship academic supervisor collects the evaluations from the supervising teachers. These forms are filed in the office of the internship supervisor for future reference. At midterm the evaluations are used to give feedback to the student in areas that need improvement. The internship supervisor meets with the individual students to review their progress. At the end of the term the internship supervisor assigns a grade according to the performance of the student. Students are given copies of the evaluations and meet individually with the internship supervisor. Recommendations for improvement are made to help improve students' ability to work with children.

 [appendix 2](#)

#### Results of Evaluation

According to lab evaluations,

students needed more classroom instruction on the development of age appropriate activities.

Lab evaluation findings further indicated that students need more opportunities to participate in and/or implement activities and programs that they had developed for children in the classroom.

Results of faculty evaluations of student projects indicated that 80% of the child development students in these courses were able to develop their activities without instructor assistance; 10% of the students required activity review by the instructor one or two times before it was satisfactory; 10% required three or more instructor reviews before their projects/activities were satisfactory.

85% of the students in the past four years have achieved at least a rating of 3 on the 4-point Likert-type scale on their first assessment during their internship experience. This is defined as acceptable, safe to practice. Students who failed to meet these acceptable expectations were required to repeat until acceptable performance was achieved. At the end of the internship experience, 95% of the student interns received a rating of at least 3 (acceptable, safe to practice) on the assessment. Based on findings over the past four years from the internship evaluations, the following recommendations were made and changes implemented accordingly:

1. In the area of dependability, students need to understand the importance of their consistency in working with children and employers.
2. Students need to work with less supervision during their internship experiences.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Additional opportunities were created for participation in activities and programs with young children and for implementation of activities and programs for young children. Students designed and implemented developmentally appropriate activities for children of various age groups. Students also spent more lab hours in all classrooms to develop a better understanding of developmentally appropriate activities for children birth to four years of age. Increased opportunities were created for students to visit local kindergarten classrooms and share activities on particular topics related to evaluation findings, such as the need for exposure to age-appropriate activities.

Additional class time is dedicated to the instruction of creating developmentally appropriate activities. Blackboard is used to hold student discussions, and additional web resources for students are utilized to locate developmentally appropriate activities for children.

Faculty determined several years ago that students cannot successfully take over 12 semester hours, including the internship hours, during their internship semester. Student interns are now required to meet as a group six times with the internship academic supervisor to receive detailed instructions regarding internship requirements, which is an increase from the earlier requirements.

Before reporting to the internship site, interns must meet once individually with the academic supervisor to discuss specific requirements and to address questions. Internship rubric and evaluations have been modified to help students understand the expectations prior to their evaluations. A packet of expectations that the student must meet has been developed for the supervising teacher. The supervising teacher is encouraged to allow the student to work independently. Meetings are held by the internship academic supervisor and the supervising teacher when an adequate level of independence is not being allowed. The evaluation form was revised this last year to accommodate more written comments from the Child Development teachers.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)



GE 05: Self

GE 08: Perspectives

---

**BS-FCS-CD-03: LO Professional Development**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Identify and assess the level of professionalism that students possess and identify knowledge and skills needed in the workforce.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

**Portfolios:** Students in FCS 447 Professional Development are required to compile a professional portfolio composed of assignments that showcase the skills and knowledge they have acquired during their program of study. Each portfolio is evaluated by two instructors in the Division in addition to the course instructor. A 100 pt. rubric is used for evaluation and all three reviewer scores are averaged. The purpose of a professional portfolio is to provide evidence of professional skills and knowledge, including organizational skills, communication skills, presentation skills, teaching skills, and marketing skills. Documents include examples of assignments, internships, and work experiences completed during college.

**Results of Evaluation**

The results of the portfolio over the past three years demonstrate that at least 70% of the students achieved a grade of at least 80% on the portfolio.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

The instructional materials, rubrics, and other evaluative materials are reviewed annually.

Assignments are added and existing assignments are modified as areas of deficiency are identified at the end of the capstone Professional Development course.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

---

**BS-FCS-FM 01: LO Requirements and skills**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Identify responsibilities and demonstrate skills necessary for a variety of positions in the fashion industry.

GE 1, GE 2, GE 4, GE 5

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Internship Evaluation; Internship Manual; Research papers;

Using specific competencies that have been suggested by our Division's Advisory Council over the years, the employment supervisors rate each student intern using a 4-point Likert-type scale and provide feedback comments. (Appendix 3). An objective evaluation form is used by the instructor and the employment supervisor to evaluate internship manuals. An objective rating sheet is used by the instructor to objectively evaluate research papers.

 [appendices](#)


**Results of Evaluation**

Over the past twelve years, 90% of the student interns have been rated above average or higher on their evaluation forms by employment supervisors. 90% of these students were also rated satisfactory or higher on their internship manuals by their academic advisor and employment supervisors. Based on an evaluation rating sheet, 80% of students earned a grade of 80% or higher from the instructor on their career research papers.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

An in-depth research project was added to enhance their knowledge base and improve their written communication skills.

**Related Items**

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

 [GE 05: Self](#)

---

**BS-FCS-FM 02: LO Merchandise selection**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Correctly evaluate and select merchandise based on individual and family values and lifestyles.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students develop a style and design portfolio and perform a wardrobe analysis, creating an accompanying portfolio. Class projects and case studies are assigned. An objective evaluation form is used to evaluate portfolios and projects.


**Results of Evaluation**

80% of students produced portfolios and projects that earned a grade of 80% or higher by the instructor.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Wardrobe analysis project was amended to incorporate revised software.

**Related Items**

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

 [GE 06: Social Institutions](#)

 [GE 10: Values](#)

---

**BS-FCS-FM 03: LO Consumer acceptance theories**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Correctly identify theories of change which have impact on consumer acceptance.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Trend board development; portfolios; Style portfolio; An objective evaluation form is used to evaluate trend boards, portfolios and projects. Some trend boards are submitted to Dallas Fashion Career Day, where they are judged by professionals.

#### Results of Evaluation

Trend boards and projects required all students to satisfactorily design or construct products that incorporated their content knowledge and research. Photoshop technology was incorporated into Trend Board design last year. At least 80% of students earned a grade of 80% or higher on the trend board assignment.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Current assessment methods are satisfactory.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

[GE 06: Social Institutions](#)

[GE 07: Cultural Awareness](#)

[GE 08: Perspectives](#)

---

#### BS-FCS-FM 04: LO Apparel industry roles

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Correctly identify the roles of manufacturers, retailers and consumers as related to the apparel industry.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

Internship evaluation; Internship manual; Research papers; Using specific competencies that have been suggested by our Division's Advisory Council over the years, the employment supervisors rate each student intern using a 4-point Likert-type scale and provide feedback comments (Appendix 3). An objective evaluation form is used by the instructor and the employment supervisor to evaluate internship manuals. An objective evaluation form is used to evaluate papers.

[appendices](#)

#### Results of Evaluation

Over the past twelve years, 90% of student interns have been rated 3 (above average) or higher on their 4-point Likert type evaluation forms by employment supervisors. 95% of student interns were rated above average or higher on their internship manuals by their academic advisor. At least 80% of the students have earned a grade of at least 75% on their research papers.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Additional readings were assigned to enhance knowledge base for research papers.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

[GE 06: Social Institutions](#)

[GE 08: Perspectives](#)

---

#### BS-FCS-FM 05: LO Business and creative concepts

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Effectively design, prepare and present activities which incorporate business and creative concepts.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

Design portfolio; Historic costume portfolio; Style portfolio; Historic costume project; Trend board project; Apparel Design workshop. An objective evaluation form is used to evaluate portfolios and projects by the instructor. Professional Development Portfolios are evaluated by three faculty members in the Division, using an objective evaluation form.

[appendices](#)

#### Results of Evaluation

80% of students earned at least a grade of 80% or higher from their instructor on class portfolios and projects; 90% of students earned a very satisfactory or higher rating on class portfolios and projects; The results of the portfolio over the past three years demonstrate that at least 90% of the students achieved a grade of at least 80% on the Professional Development portfolio.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Students who earned less than 80% on portfolios and projects received additional instructions for increasing their knowledge and improving their skills in areas of deficiency.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

[GE 07: Cultural Awareness](#)

[GE 08: Perspectives](#)

---

#### BS-FCS-FM 06: LO Product knowledge

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Effectively evaluate the impact of fabrication, design and the function of apparel and/or textile products on human behavior and lifestyles.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

Lab notebook; Exams;

An objective evaluation form is used to evaluate notebooks.

#### Results of Evaluation

80% of students earned a grade of 80% or higher from their instructor on lab notebooks. 70% of students earned at least an 80% or higher on exams.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Students who earned less than an 80% grade on notebooks received additional instructions for increasing their knowledge in areas of deficiency.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

---

**BS-FCS-ND 01: LO Nutritional care process**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Effectively perform the Nutrition Care Process and use standardized nutrition language for individuals, groups and populations of differing ages and health status, in a variety of settings. Assess the nutritional status of individuals, groups and populations in a variety of settings where nutrition care is or can be delivered.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

95% of students will receive a mean average  $\geq 4$  out of 5 on the preceptor evaluation for patient assessments.

95% of students will receive a mean average of  $\geq 4$  on the preceptor evaluation for nutrition diagnosis in assessments.

 appendix 4



**Results of Evaluation**

95% of students met the benchmark for both assessment and diagnosis.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Faculty members are pleased with the results of the 2011 evaluations. Faculty will continue to bring new knowledge and technology to the program and incorporate these into student learning activities to allow attainment of required competencies. The total number of hours in FCS 479 (clinical aspect of Supervised Practice) was formerly increased from 360 to 540 in order to provide for adequate hands-on experience in medical nutrition therapy.

**Related Items**

  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

  **GE 05: Self**

---

**BS-FCS-ND 02: LO Nutrition interventions**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Effectively plan and implement nutrition interventions to include prioritizing the nutrition diagnosis, formulating a nutrition prescription, establishing goals and selecting and managing intervention.

CRD 3.1.d Monitor and evaluate problems, etiologies, signs, symptoms and the impact of interventions on the nutrition diagnosis

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students complete a minimum of 10 nutrition assessments and case studies during Supervised Practices (FCS 477 and FCS 479), and formally present one of these case studies to faculty, preceptors, and local registered/licensed dietitians. Using specific competencies developed by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (A.N. D.) the facility preceptors (in each Supervised Practice location) rate each student and provide feedback comments.


**Results of Evaluation**

95% of students will receive a mean average of  $\geq 4$  on the preceptor evaluation for nutrition diagnosis in assessments.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Faculty members are pleased with the results of the 2011 evaluations. Based on the results of evaluations, the faculty may increase the number or specific types of nutrition assessments and case studies required (specify the number of cases with diabetes, cardiovascular disease, digestive disorders, inborn errors of metabolism, etc.).

**Related Items**

  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

  **GE 02: Communication**

  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

  **GE 05: Self**

---

**BS-FCS-ND 03: LO Nutritional cultural diversity**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Successfully develop and evaluate recipes, formulas and menus for acceptability and affordability that accommodate the cultural diversity and health needs of various populations, groups and individuals

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Class assignments include role-playing of employee disputes, problem-solving steps, employee scheduling and other foodservice management functions. Students develop a professional portfolio with written documentation of these experiences as well as accounts of their onsite experiences within the Supervised Practice in Foodservice Management (FCS 478). Portfolio contents are evaluated in concert with the A.N.D. competencies for the specific Supervised Practice rotation.

**Results of Evaluation**

95% of students will receive a mean average of  $\geq 4$  on the preceptor evaluation for nutrition diagnosis in assessments. Faculty preceptors indicated that student experiences in commercial/institutional kitchens/bakeries prior to beginning the rotation are very helpful.

Students have been successfully utilizing the Ada Swindle Mitchell Foods Laboratory since the beginning of the spring semester 2006 to gain foodservice experience.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Based on the results of the 2011 evaluations, faculty have determined that there may be a need for more "hands-on" projects within foodservice organizations prior to the beginning of the Supervised Practice. To facilitate this, more hands-on experiences have been integrated into the program. These will allow the students to gain experiences and apply content in both retail and institutional foodservice operations. A standardized third-party evaluation process will be developed (similar to that used in the Supervised Practice rotations).

**Related Items**

  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

  **GE 02: Communication**

---

»  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

»  **GE 05: Self**

---

**BS-FCS-ND 04: LO Guidelines and literature**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Appropriately apply evidence-based guidelines, systematic reviews and scientific literature (such as the Academy's Evidence Analysis Library and Evidence-based Nutrition Practice Guidelines, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, National Guideline Clearinghouse Web sites) in the nutrition care process and model and other areas of dietetics practice.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students complete a minimum of 10 nutrition assessments and case studies during Supervised Practices (FCS 477 and FCS 479), and formally present one of these case studies to faculty, preceptors, and local registered/licensed dietitians. Using specific competencies developed by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (A.N.D.), the facility preceptors (in each Supervised Practice location) rate each student and provide feedback comments.


**Results of Evaluation**


95% of the students received scores of "met" or "exceeded entry-level requirements" on their nutrition assessment competency. 85% of the students received a grade of 80% or higher on their written case study and on their case study presentation.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Faculty members are pleased with the results of the 2011 evaluations. Based on the results of future evaluations, the faculty may increase the number or specific types (specify the number of cases with diabetes, cardiovascular disease, digestive disorders, inborn errors of metabolism, etc.) of nutrition assessments and case studies required. The total number of hours in FCS 479 (clinical aspect of Supervised Practice) was increased from 360 to 540 in order to provide for adequate hands-on experience in medical nutrition therapy.

**Related Items**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

»  **GE 05: Self**

---

**BS-FCS-ND 05: LO Food service plan**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Develop a realistic plan to provide or develop a product, program or service that includes a budget, staffing needs equipment, and supplies.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students develop a business plan and budget for a mythical business of their choosing. Students develop a professional portfolio with written documentation of the business plan, budget and other necessary elements. The contents of the portfolio are evaluated by the instructor using a rubric that is in concert with the ACEND competencies for the specific Supervised Practice rotation. Additionally, content knowledge from this experience is evaluated as part of the students' onsite experiences within the Supervised Practice in Foodservice Management (FCS 478).


**Results of Evaluation**

80% of the students received a grade of 75% or higher on their business plan portfolio. 95% of the students in Supervised Practice rotations received scores of "met" or "exceeded entry-level requirements" on this competency.


**Use of Evaluation Results**

Based on the results of the 2011 evaluations, faculty members determined that there may be a need for increased exposure to business planning from a grant/regulatory standpoint. Additional experiences will be added to the course FCS 460 Management in Nutrition/Dietetics. These will allow the student to gain experiences and apply content knowledge in both retail and institutional foodservice operations. Faculty preceptors indicated that students would benefit from information integrated from Small Business Administration for business development, financial sustainability and market demand. A standardized third-party evaluation process will be developed (similar to that used in the Supervised Practice rotations).

**Related Items**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 03: Quantitative Skills**

»  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

»  **GE 05: Self**

»  **GE 06: Social Institutions**

---

**BS-FCS-ND 06: LO Environment**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Propose and use procedures as appropriate to the practice setting to reduce waste and protect the environment

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students in FCS 360 Quantity Foods participate in laboratory experiments, menu design for catering, and produce catering events for DSU and Cleveland community events. Students include these events in the professional portfolio, in which written documentation of the menu, budget and other necessary elements can be found. Additionally, content knowledge from this experience is evaluated as part of the students' onsite experiences within the Supervised Practice in Foodservice Management (FCS 478). Portfolio contents are evaluated in concert with the A.N.D. competencies for the specific SP rotation

**Results of Evaluation**


At least 80% of the students in FCS 360 earned an average grade of 80% on these projects in the course. 95% of the students received scores of "met" or "exceeded entry-level requirements" on this competency in their Supervised Practice rotation. Students have been successfully utilizing the Ada Swindle Mitchell Foods Laboratory since the beginning of spring 2006 to gain foodservice experience.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Facility preceptors indicated that students would benefit from prior exposure to commercial/institutional kitchens/bakeries prior to beginning the SP rotation.

Based on the results of the 2011 evaluations, faculty members have determined that there may be a need for more "hands-on" projects within foodservice organizations prior to the beginning of the Supervised Practice. Students are now utilizing the Foods Laboratory to provide catering for a number of functions on campus. A standardized third-party evaluation process will be developed (similar to that used in the Supervised Practice rotations) so that the recipient of the catered function can provide objective and subjective (taste and presentation) feedback.

**Related Items**

▶  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

▶  **GE 02: Communication**

▶  **GE 03: Quantitative Skills**

▶  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

▶  **GE 05: Self**

---

**BS-FCS-ND 07: LO Sanitation**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Effectively perform management functions related to safety, security and sanitation that affect employees, customers, patients, facilities and food.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

Students participate in laboratory experiences that include food preparation, sanitation and service. Many of these experiences are linked to catering events, which are documented in the professional portfolio. Content knowledge from this experience is evaluated as part of the students' onsite experiences within the Supervised Practice in Foodservice Management (FCS 478) and by the completion of the ServSafe® Certification. Portfolio contents are evaluated in concert with the A.N.D. competencies for the specific SP rotation.


**Results of Evaluation**

At least 90% of students in the SP will receive a mean average score of 3 out of 5 or higher on evaluation for a safety and sanitation inspection. In addition, all students become ServSafe® Certified prior to or during the Supervised Practice FCS 478. The ServSafe® program has become the industry standard in food safety training and is accepted in almost all United States jurisdictions that require foodservice employee certification. The ServSafe® program provides accurate, up-to-date information for all levels of students/employees on all aspects of handling food, from receiving and storing to preparing and serving.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Faculty members are pleased with the results of the 2011 evaluations, in which all of students successfully completed the ServSafe® program certification the first time. Based on future results, the faculty will determine necessary changes in laboratory experiences.

**Related Items**

▶  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

▶  **GE 03: Quantitative Skills**

▶  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

▶  **GE 05: Self**

▶  **GE 06: Social Institutions**

---

**FCS 2013\_01: Strategies to simulate career-related situations**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2013

**Unit Goal**

Increase strategies in upper-level classes to simulate career-related situations.

COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

#### Evaluation Procedures

An analysis was made of the upper-level FCS courses that utilize role playing techniques and mock interviews. Exit interviews solicited information from graduates regarding their laboratory, internship, field study, and supervised practice experiences.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

Increase strategies in upper-level classes to simulate career-related situations.

Strategies have been increased to include and enhance the following:

- Students in FCS 447 Professional Development located and reviewed job announcements.
- Students in FCS 488 Internship in Fashion Merchandising located and secured their own internship positions.
- Dietetics students found, reviewed, analyzed and reported on current job announcements.
- Students in all areas worked through case study simulations.
- Role-plays and mock interviews were used effectively for Dietetics students in FCS 460 Management in Nutrition and Dietetics and FCS 350 Basic Skills in Dietetic Practice and in FCS 480 Seminar in Nutrition/Dietetics.
- Students in all other FCS majors practiced role-playing and mock interviews in FCS 447 Professional Development. All students reported in exit interviews and many indicated on class evaluations that these experiences were helpful in simulating reality-based situations.
- All majors are required to participate in internship/supervised practice situations, and concentrated blocks of time are scheduled in all areas to simulate real job situations.
- The internship manual, syllabi and requirements for child development majors were revised to reflect more real life simulations and more relevant internship experiences.
- The internship evaluation for child development majors was further revised to reflect more real life simulations and more relevant internship experiences.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Faculty have continued to utilize role-plays and other simulation exercises, such as mock interviews, in clinical and management courses and in FCS 447 Professional Development, which is required of FCS majors with concentrations in Child Development and Fashion Merchandising. These exercises are used with Dietetics students in FCS 480 Seminar in Nutrition/Dietetics. All students indicated in exit interviews that these real-life experiences have been very helpful in developing their skills and increasing their knowledge for the workplace.

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

---

#### FCS 2013\_02: Technological capabilities

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2013

#### Unit Goal

Add a Blackboard component to identified courses within all FCS concentrations to increase students' computer literacy and to provide a practice forum for the Certification Exam for Registered Dietitians.

COE GP#1, GP#5

COE 2010 Plan #1: Quality; Capacity: Continue to increase enrollment in online and off-campus programs and expand field experiences, including virtual experiences.

#### Evaluation Procedures

All courses within the Division that now utilize online components were tabulated. Usage of online components within programs was identified. Online courses were also evaluated, using the Quality Matters score sheet.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

- The National Certification Exam for Registered Dietitians (RD) Practice Exam website was originally made available for Nutrition/Dietetics majors in August 2005. The number of practice exams that have been placed in Blackboard for Dietetics students has now been increased to over 20, and these exams contain over 1300 sample review questions.
- Recommendations for enhancements to online classes were made based on the review of these classes and completion of the Quality Matters score sheet.
- Blackboard (Canvas) components have been incorporated into all classes.
- Blackboard (Canvas) has been effectively utilized in the majority of FCS classes for the provision of PowerPoint programs, notes, study guides, quizzes and exams.
- A compilation of FCS course formats revealed that over 30% of the FCS courses are offered online and approximately ten percent are offered in a hybrid format.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Blackboard (Canvas) provides a communication venue for students and a user-friendly online format to access materials and quizzes. Blackboard (Canvas) was utilized for PowerPoint programs, notes, study guides, quizzes and exams and to continually update the RD Practice Exam website. The RD practice quiz website was used for the completion of over 100 practice exams. RD first-time exam scores need to be raised, and the faculty will continue to utilize Blackboard for practice testing.

Through Blackboard (Canvas) and Wimba, we are strengthening the RD Exam review component of the Nutrition/Dietetics curriculum.

Blackboard (Canvas) will continue to include computerized testing to decrease test anxiety with new testing format.

Blackboard (Canvas) reinforces knowledge base for use in supervised practice (theory to practice).

Through Blackboard (Canvas) and Wimba, review sessions will be opened to graduates who have not yet passed the RD exam, thus promoting good customer service to students and alumni.

Blackboard and Wimba will include more problem based learning to enhance critical thinking skills.

To provide additional review for the RD Exam, a professional review course has been ordered to be integrated into the curriculum and will provide the following:

- include computerized testing to decrease test anxiety with new testing format
- reinforce knowledge base for use in supervised practice (theory to practice)
- include problem based learning to enhance critical thinking skills

#### Related Items

➤ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind07: Resources: access to appropriate library and learning resources](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind04: Degrees](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind06: Technology infrastructure](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind08: Area Priorities \(Delta, IHL, or state\)](#)

---

#### FCS 2013\_03: Recruitment

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2013

**Unit Goal**

Continue to enhance and update recruiting materials and the website, meet with DSU Admissions/Recruiting staff about Family & Consumer Sciences programs and maintain presence at recruitment fairs.

COE GP#5

COE Goal #3 Increase overall enrollment in the College of Education by a minimum of 1%.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Compare enrollment data for the current academic year to enrollment data from the prior year.

Evaluate website on a regular basis.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

There were 98 Family & Consumer Sciences majors in Fall 2012 compared to 104 majors in Fall 2011. These represents a 16% decrease. There were 94 Family & Consumer Sciences majors in Spring 2013 compared to 95 majors in Spring 2012. This is nearly level enrollment. The enrollment in Family & Consumer Sciences courses is nearly even, and the number of majors remained fairly even. Faculty in the Division have continued to evaluate, enhance, and update recruiting materials and the website, meet with DSU Admissions/Recruiting staff about Family & Consumer Sciences programs and maintain presence at recruitment fairs.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

- Flyers and brochures for all three concentrations were updated and reprinted as needed.
- The Division website was reviewed on a regular basis, enhanced and updated. This site provides information on programs to prospective students.
- Faculty in the Division have participated in all on-campus recruiting events, and as many off-campus events as possible.
- Recruitment cards were completed by forty prospective students. Letters were sent to these from the Division. These cards were then delivered to Admissions for them to send out information.
- At least one to two students per month visited the Division, spoke with faculty, and toured the facilities.
- Faculty always take time to speak with prospective students.
- Recruiting information has been provided to recruitment personnel to distribute to high schools and community colleges across the state.
- Students have been asked to help with recruitment at various events, and they will continue to be included in recruiting efforts.
- The data in the system continues to be analyzed and corrected.
- Faculty continue to work with personnel in the DSU Public Relations department to increase and improve their presence on the social network sites and on the website.
- We have requested the campus graphic designer to create fighting Okras for the website that depict our three areas.
- The Dietetics students and faculty set up a table at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Dietetic Association. This received a very good response. Most of the dietetics students also attended the meeting.
- The Dietetics director set up a table at the national meeting of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (A.N.D.) in Philadelphia, PA.
- A faculty representative set up a recruiting table at a recruiting fair that was coordinated by the Cleveland Career Development and Technology Center.
- The number of students accepted into the Coordinated Program in Dietetics for 2013-14 has reached thirteen out of its potential capacity of fifteen. Several inquiries from other potential students have been answered.

Recruiting efforts need to continue. The strategies noted above will be continued. These results will be used in setting goals and improving recruitment efforts. Several of the FCS faculty members met with members of the recruiting staff to discuss collaboration and increasing exposure of the Division. These kinds of efforts will continue. One faculty member taught a GST class to freshmen at DSU. This will be continued. The Division Chair went with other College of Ed chairs to discuss our programs at Hinds Community College. A 2+2 agreement for the Child Development concentration was created and will be available in fall 2013 to students at Hinds Community College. Inquiries were also made regarding purchasing a Google account that would make it easier to locate our programs. The fashion merchandising faculty member and some students are investigating the feasibility of designing Okra printed fabrics and a DSU tartan plaid as a fundraiser. The university Communications and Marketing Department will design fighting Okra this summer to represent the three FCS concentrations on the website.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

▶ [SP2.Ind04: Degrees](#)

▶ [SP4.Ind07: Website](#)

▶ [SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

▶ [SP4.Ind14: Marketing and Publicity](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings](#)

---

**FCS 2013\_04: Visibility**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2013

**Unit Goal**

The Division of Family & Consumer Sciences will have increased visibility because of its curricula and its impact on individuals, families, consumers, and the community.

COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

**Evaluation Procedures**

Identify presentations made by students and faculty to community colleges, high schools, vocational/technical centers, and community groups, providing information about FCS programs and increasing the public awareness of FCS programs at DSU.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Faculty members in all areas work toward participation in events on campus, in the community, region and state and nation to increase visibility.

**Child Development students and faculty participation:**

- The Director of the Child Development Center applied for accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in 2009 and the site visit occurred during 2010. The Center was granted accreditation for five years from NAEYC. Publicity materials now include information about this achievement.
- Parents of children in the Child Development Center are very active in participating with various events and increasing visibility. Publicity is always sent to local media regarding all of these activities.
- The Child Development Center was selected by the readers of the *Bolivar Commercial* as the best place in Cleveland for child care.
- The faculty in the Division have sponsored and participated in numerous workshops/events in various areas to improve visibility. These are further outlined under Goal #7.
- Service-Learning Courses within the Division included: FCS 330 Infant Development, FCS 377 Methods & Materials for Preschool Programs, FCS 378 Principles & Procedures for Preschool Programs, FCS 444 Child Nutrition, and FCS 476 Practicum in Child Development Administration. Numerous activities of DSU students in these classes increased the FCS exposure within the schools and community. Service Learning activities are further delineated in another section.
- Plans are being developed to offer the annual DSU A – Z Early Childhood Conference next year.
- Delta State provides quality training for providers and child care for children, infants through Pre-Kindergarten, promoting the importance of quality education for the very young.

**Nutrition/Dietetics students and faculty participation:**

- The Nutrition/Dietetics students participated in the Fit-Tastic Fridays at Bell Academy, providing nutrition screening, and lessons and activities. They also participated in the physical fitness aspect on an as-needed basis. Publicity information on all events was sent to the Delta State University Public Relations office.

- Students assisted the Healthy Campus/Healthy Community Registered Dietitian with National Nutrition Month activities in the DSU cafeteria and student union.
- Students assisted the Healthy Campus/Healthy Community Registered Dietitian with the C.O.R.E. program at Bell Academy.
- Several of the Dietetics students and both faculty members attended the annual meeting of the Mississippi Dietetic Association (MDA).
- The Dietetics program had an informational table at the national meeting of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (A.N.D.).
- Delta State had a recruiting exhibit booth at the MDA meeting.
- Ms. Draughon McPherson and two Nutrition/Dietetics students were asked to participate again with the Art of Living Smart Camp at the B.B. King Museum in 2012, with funding nearly \$10,000. Dietetics students were paid to assist with the camp.
- The Dietetics students set up an informational table at Bolivar County's Annual Rice Luncheon at DSU, which was attended by about 2,000 people.

**Fashion Merchandising students and faculty participation:**

- The Fashion Merchandising students were visible at the student design competition at the Mississippi Association of Family & Consumer Sciences state meeting in February 2012. Three students each submitted an original apparel design. Delta State students won first, second, and third place awards in the competition
- Talented fashion merchandising students entered designs at Dallas Fashion Career Day, April 2013, sponsored by Fashion Group International and Texas Natural Fiber Producers Association. This event attracts the finest university educators and students from over 40 schools across more than 12 states. The design contest is extremely competitive, and it is a huge honor to win an award of any kind, or to be shown on the runway. Seven fashion merchandising students entered a total of ten designs. Three of these were shown on the runway and two were shown in the mounted exhibit.
- One DSU fashion merchandising student won third place in the annual Fiber Trend Board Competition at the Dallas Fashion Career Day for his cotton trend board.
- One student had her original menswear design accepted for show in the juried design live gallery at the annual meeting of the International Textile and Apparel Association (ITAA) in 2012. The acceptance rate is about 34%.
- Two fashion merchandising students and the faculty member designed several and coordinated all of the costumes for two campus-wide productions of Delta State's theatre department.
- With a grant from the Cotton Board of Cotton Incorporated, DSU fashion merchandising students produced a large campus-wide fashion show, featuring many original apparel designs. This was televised several times on the local channel. Students also were on a local television channel in the morning to promote the event.
- The Fashion Merchandising students and faculty set up an exhibit of original cotton apparel designs at the Bolivar County Annual Rice Luncheon.
- The Fashion Merchandising faculty set up an exhibit of original cotton apparel designs at the annual meeting of the Delta Council, which is attended by over 1,000 people.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Students and faculty made a valuable contribution in marketing Family & Consumer Sciences programs. Successful initiatives were identified and will be continued and expanded and enhanced. The results will be used to continue to impact individuals and families in a positive way. More effort needs to be made to encourage roles of leadership among students and to involve other campus leaders in efforts to improve the quality of life for individuals and families.

**Related Items**

[SP4.Ind07: Website](#)

[SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

[SP4.Ind14: Marketing and Publicity](#)

[SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

[SP5.Ind07: Economic Development](#)

**FCS 2013\_05: Faculty**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2013

**Unit Goal**

The Division of Family & Consumer Sciences will maintain a strong faculty. The faculty will have excellent communication skills and technological capabilities, facilitating productivity. Each faculty member will also have the necessary depth of professional knowledge in a specific area of specialization, and will exhibit above satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Annual faculty activity records provide an assessment of the prior year's goal achievement. These indicate credentials acquired, faculty development participation, successful activities in the classroom, and productivity in the areas of scholarly activities and service.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

The faculty attended a number of professional meetings at the district, state and national levels. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members made refereed presentations at national meetings. They also attended some faculty development workshops or trainings on various topics. Each semester students complete an evaluation of all classes in Family & Consumer Sciences. These assessments are used in faculty evaluations to establish goals when needed. Most student evaluations were very good. Several faculty members submitted grant proposals. The grants that were funded were primarily DSU internal grants. The faculty provided service to the university and to the public through presentations to a variety of groups on various topics. One faculty member is a licensed Marriage and Family Therapist. He provided consultations to the public. The Registered Dietitians also provided consultations to various individuals, groups and agencies on food and nutrition topics. The faculty member in the Food Science area made several presentations at university and community events. One faculty member served on the Board of the Mississippi Association of Family & Consumer Sciences (MAFCS) for 2012. She also served as Secretary of the Collegiate Assembly of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Each faculty member benefits from the knowledge gained and skills acquired at each meeting or workshop attended. In turn, the Division and the University benefit from the faculty member's knowledge and skills as demonstrated in the classroom and in various service activities around the state. The implementation of a performance-responsive reward structure encouraged the faculty to maintain a high level of productivity, and to document all activities. One tenured faculty resigned in 2011, one resigned in 2012, and one other retired in 2012. All of these positions were filled for the 2012-13 year by qualified applicants. The two tenure-track positions were filled by faculty members with doctorates who also are Registered Dietitians.

**Related Items**

[SP3.Ind01: Faculty and staff hiring](#)

[SP3.Ind07: Credentials](#)

[SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

[SP3.Ind10: Personnel Training -- HR and other](#)

**FCS 2013\_06: Electronic journaling and documentation**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2013

**Unit Goal**

Use technology for the journaling process in practicum/internship/supervised practice experiences and for the completion of the senior level portfolio in FCS 447 Professional Development, required of all Family & Consumer Sciences majors.

COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5



#### Evaluation Procedures

The use of technology for the journaling process in practicum/internship/supervised practice experiences and for the completion of the senior level portfolio in FCS 447 Professional Development will be documented.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

Child Development and Fashion Merchandising students record electronic journals on a daily/weekly basis throughout their internship experiences. Nutrition students in supervised practice also record journals electronically for each practice rotation.

The Child Development and Fashion Merchandising students complete electronic and hard copy versions of their senior level portfolio in FCS 447 Professional Development, making it easier to store and to communicate with potential employers. Students who participate in the fashion merchandising field study experiences are required to keep reflective journals.

The Dietetics majors have specific guidelines from the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND) for completion of a hard copy of their portfolio.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

All Family & Consumer Sciences students will continue to write reflective journals of their supervised practice rotations. This benefits the communication process between the student, the faculty member and the preceptor or facility supervisor(s). In FCS 447 Professional Development and in the internship experiences, the evaluations of students' performances will be partially based on this electronic documentation.

#### Related Items

▶ [SP1.Ind07: Resources: access to appropriate library and learning resources](#)

---

#### FCS 2013\_08: Foods laboratory

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2013

#### Unit Goal

Continue to utilize Ada Swindle Mitchell Foods Laboratory for community and university educational and outreach programs.

COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

#### Evaluation Procedures

Evaluate faculty's lists of yearly accomplishments.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

Numerous events were conducted by students and faculty in the foods laboratories, including:

- The Christmas party for the Division of Family and Consumer Sciences was catered by the FCS 312 Meals classes.
- Several Lunch n' Learn classes were sponsored through continuing education and were open to the public as well as the university. Original recipes were demonstrated and then served to the participants.
- The February meeting of the Student Association of Family and Consumer Sciences was catered by the FCS 360 Quantity Food Procurement and Production class, featuring healthy and economical meals.
- The spring initiation of Kappa Omicron Nu, national honor society for Family and Consumer Sciences, was catered by the FCS 360 class.
- The College of Education Recognition of Achievement Program was catered by the FCS 360 Quantity Foods class.
- "Junior Chefs" was taught as a weeklong class for Kids' College.
- Continued Education has used the laboratory for some of their continuing education classes.
- The meeting of the Delta Center for Culture and Learning was catered by the FCS 360 Quantity Food Procurement and Production class.
- The March Dietetic and Nutrition Workshop held at the Alumni Center was catered by the FCS 360 Quantity Food Procurement and Production class with assistance from dietetic students.
- The ServSafe food safety training and certification examination was open to the community as well as DSU dietetic students and met in the foods laboratory.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

Plan collaborative efforts for the future. Continue the Lunch n' Learn Programs. Develop more classes for Kids' College. Explore student engagement opportunities that utilize the laboratory and enhance student learning. Explore the possibility of offering credit classes on cooking for non-majors.

#### Related Items

▶ [SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

---

#### FCS 2013\_09: Wellness

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2013

#### Unit Goal

Develop an annual wellness program, collaborating with representatives from industry, campus, and nonprofit organizations, and invite the public to attend. This will include participation in the Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi Foundation's Healthy Campus/Health Community Initiative Nutrition Counseling Center.

COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

COE 2010 Plan/Strategies: [Identity](#):

- Continue to build health emphasis through infusion of healthy schools curriculum, delivery of fitness programs, education, and support for campus and local community
- Host Healthy Schools Best Practices Conference for Cleveland School District (fall 2010)
- Continue to provide services to the campus and larger community through the Forest E. Wyatt Health and Wellness Center

#### Evaluation Procedures

Determine accomplishments of the campus wellness program.

#### Actual Results of Evaluation

Students in the Division, particularly in the Coordinated Undergraduate Program in Dietetics and faculty were involved in a number of health screenings, health fairs, and community speaking engagements on the subject of nutrition and health/wellness. The benefits from the Nutrition Counseling Center, and other health and wellness programs on campus, as well as those through the Healthy Campus/Healthy Community Initiative were seen on campus and in the community.

Community/public school involvement that was in partnership with the Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi's Healthy Campus/Community Initiative (HCCI):

- The DSU Health and Wellness Committee was initially charged to develop a university-wide program to increase awareness about health and physical fitness. Out of this committee, the DSU Health Challenge emerged and became an ongoing program to promote health and physical fitness among DSU faculty and staff. This was expanded to students and community by the Healthy Campus/Community Initiative.
- Dietetics students participated in health fairs for the parents at each elementary school in conjunction with a school parent program.
- Cleveland School District Showcase: Information on healthy lifestyles was provided at this evening event for all parents and students in the district. Dietetics students had an informational booth.
- Fit-Tastic Fridays: Friday afternoon programs were planned and implemented each week to teach nutrition and physical activity components to students at the Cleveland Career Development and Technology Center. 170 students participated. Dietetics students assisted with these events.
- Dietetics students worked with HCCI and Hayes Cooper Center and Parks Elementary and helped with the C.O.R.E. (Centering on Recreation Education and Nutrition) after school program.
- Dietetics students participated in Delta Health and Wellness Day. This is a community event. Students planned, executed, and collected data. They conducted cholesterol screenings and blood sugar screenings and provided nutrition information. They also aided in planning the event.

- Dietetic students participated in the development of the Nutrition Counseling Center. One student researched software, and another researched educational materials. They also participated in dietetic counseling sessions with the Healthy Campus Dietitian.
- Dietetics students participated in the BEEP Girl Power weekend by providing healthy snacks and educational materials for the Center for Community Economic Development.
- Dietetics students participated in Cafeteria demonstrations for, "eat this not that."
- Dietetics students assisted with the BELL Academy Health Awareness Day and the Walk to School Day by educating parents and children on nutrition.
- Dr. Jan Haynes served as Chair of the Walk it Out Cleveland campaign for 2012.

Dietetics students also had an informational booth at the annual Delta Rice Luncheon held at DSU. Nearly 2,000 people attend this event.

Many of these accomplishments are further delineated above in Goal #7

**Use of Evaluation Results**

An expanded Health Challenge and wellness program on the DSU campus will be continued, collaborating with representatives from industry, campus, and nonprofit organizations and the public will be encouraged to participate.

**Related Items**

▶ [SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

▶ [SP5.Ind08: Area Priorities \(Delta, IHL, or state\)](#)

**Field Experience**

**FE Mission Statement**

**Mission statement**

**Program Mission:** The primary mission of the Office of Field Experiences is to provide a high quality field experience program for teacher education candidates and other future practitioners prior to and during internship. Field experiences and internships are considered by many to be the most important phases of professional preparation. Engaging in field experiences allows the prospective teacher/practitioner to apply and test the principles, theories, and methods learned throughout the various programs. A second mission of the Office of Field Experiences is to provide information and support regarding licensure to teacher education candidates, graduates, public school personnel, faculty, and the public and university community. For most endorsements and graduate programs as well as licensure in other states, institutional recommendation is provided based on completion of state-approved and NCATE accredited programs.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

**FE 01: UO Field experiences and internship placements**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**User Outcome**

Field experiences and internship placements will be provided for all teacher education candidates.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

An exit survey is given to all student teachers/interns at the conclusion of the internship semester. Questions 12 – 15 relate directly to the Office of Field Experiences. Data from these questions are analyzed by the Director of Field Experiences at the end of each semester.

**Results of Evaluation**

**Instructions:** Rate the following survey items on a scale of 1 to 5. 5 indicates very good and 1 indicates very poor.

**Survey items:**

12. Rate your overall internship experience.
13. Rate your overall internship placement.
14. Rate your support from your DSU supervisor.
15. Rate your support from your cooperating teacher.

Spring 2011 = 61 interns

	Rating of 5	Rating of 4	Rating of 3	Rating of 2	Rating of 1
Question 12.	74%	20%	3%	3%	0%
Question 13.	79%	12%	5%	1%	3%
Question 14.	89%	4%	6%	1%	0%
Question 15.	79%	10%	7%	3%	1%

Fall 2011 = 35 interns

	Rating of 5	Rating of 4	Rating of 3	Rating of 2	Rating of 1
Question 12.	77%	21%	0%	2%	0%
Question 13.	83%	15%	2%	0%	0%
Question 14.	81%	12%	5%	2%	0%
Question 15.	77%	12%	9%	2%	0%

**Use of Results and Recommendations**

Ratings indicate that overall candidates were very satisfied with placements. A very small percentage (3%) was not satisfied with their internship placement and another small percentage (1%) was not satisfied with support from cooperating teachers. Relationships and responsibilities of supervisors and cooperating teachers continue to be an emphasis for supervisor and cooperating teacher trainings held each semester. Each semester, the Director of Field Experiences will continue to monitor placements and will adjust the list of placements for the future as needed. It is noted, as well, though, that occasionally a placement is not working simply due to a personality clash between candidates and cooperating teachers and/or supervisors. Also, candidates do not always receive the exact placement that they want due to specific qualifications of cooperating teachers. Sometimes a particular school may not have a cooperating teacher that meets the criteria in a specific subject area.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind04: Job placement](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP3.Ind06: Diversity](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

**FE 2012\_01: High quality field experience program**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

To provide a high quality field experience program for teacher education candidates in all majors during the last semesters of their teacher preparation program.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Methods course syllabi, agendas and minutes from faculty meetings, and agendas and minutes from Teacher Education Council were examined. Internship syllabi were reviewed, and methods course instructors, university supervisors, clinical faculty and candidates were asked to provide constructive feedback regarding field experiences this year. Field experience request forms and Task Stream reports from methods course instructors, supervisors, and cooperating teachers were analyzed for effectiveness of field experiences.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Candidates are well prepared for real classrooms. There was an 8% increase in the number of undergraduate teacher education graduates in 2010-2011 than in 2009-2010. This resulted in an increase in the number of graduates entering the teaching profession this year. Even though there was a 3% decrease in the number of actual field experiences for teacher education candidates, reports from candidates and faculty indicate that field experiences have increased in terms of quality.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Use data regarding quality field experiences as a marketing tool in order to attract quality candidates to teacher education and to retain those teachers as they begin their teaching careers.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind04: Job placement](#)

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind08: Area Priorities \(Delta, IHL, or state\)](#)

**FE 2012\_02: Monitoring field experiences for collaboration**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

To continue to monitor field experiences to ensure continued collaboration with P-12 school partners and clinical faculty by meeting with program coordinators, supervisors, principals, methods course faculty, and clinical faculty at least once each semester.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Informal discussions and a focus group session was held with P-12 school partners and clinical faculty. Meetings were held with program coordinators, supervisors, and methods course faculty. Minutes and agendas from these meetings were examined as well as results from exit surveys in order to make data-driven decisions.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Methods course syllabi reflect partnerships with local districts. According to survey results, placements for interns were in quality settings to ensure quality experiences for candidates. Interns had successful internships in quality schools and are on the way to becoming master teachers in their respective areas. Due to survey results and indications of quality partnerships, it is anticipated that most graduates will remain in the teaching profession.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Preferred sites were used for field experiences and especially for internship placements.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

---

**FE 2012\_03: Increase of leadership skills**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Continue to increase my leadership skills by working to improve collaboration and cohesiveness between elementary and secondary education programs. General information meetings with candidates will be held each semester as well as Teacher Work Sample (TWS) trainings throughout the year. Workshops for Praxis I, the PLT, and the elementary content area will be provided each semester. Resources and assistance will be offered to secondary faculty to conduct workshops in respective content areas for Praxis. Continue to offer advisement support regarding redesign within the secondary education programs. The purpose of this goal is to attract and maintain quality individuals for the teaching profession.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Candidate exit surveys were examined and analyzed and reports were run in Task Stream concerning Praxis pass rates. Course evaluations and training evaluations were examined. Formal and informal feedback was received from faculty.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

As indicated by Task Stream reports and feedback from candidates and faculty, candidates are better prepared for their respective programs, for field experiences, and for internship. Failure rates on Praxis examinations have begun to drop and all programs are working together for the common goal of attracting and retaining quality candidates for the teaching profession.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Continue to lower the number of candidates who fail to meet program requirements due to Praxis scores and continue to ensure that candidates are better prepared for the teaching profession.

**Related Items**

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs

SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

SP3.Ind08: Evaluations

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP5.Ind08: Area Priorities (Delta, IHL, or state)

**Health, Physical Education and Recreation**

**HPER Mission Statement**

**Mission statement**

The Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation has a two-fold responsibility. The first is to develop a campus-wide program of health, safety, physical education, and recreation experiences to help all students achieve and maintain a high level of mental, physical, and social competence. The second is to train teachers, coaches, and fitness leaders, athletic trainers, and recreation leaders capable of advancing high standards in their profession.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

---

**BS-AT 01: Clinical Decision-Making**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Graduates of the Athletic Training Education Program have the working knowledge sufficient to make clinical decisions required of Certified Athletic Trainers.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. The Board of Certification Examination results is used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.
2. The Board of Certification Examination results were collected and reported by the Board of Certification, Inc. office to the Athletic Training Education Program Director.
3. The Athletic Training Education Program Curriculum Committee performed a program analysis in light of the certification examination results.

**Results of Evaluation**

The Athletic Training Education Program had six athletic training graduates. These individuals took the examination and five of the six (83.3%) passed on the first attempt. One student is scheduled to attempt examination on the next available examination date. The analysis revealed that conducting frequent formal evaluations requiring clinical decision making application within the didactic component over the year was necessary.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. The Athletic Training Education Program integrated more critical thinking and problem-solving exercises in the didactic component of the Athletic Training Education Program based on feedback from the Board of Certification Examination results and student feedback.
2. One course, HSE 451: Senior Seminar in Athletic Training was restructured to include more comprehensive examinations in order to give students more opportunities to improve cognitive skill application and be better prepared for the Board of Certification Examination. Changes to the HSE 254: Foundations of Athletic Training course were implemented to promote student comprehension on the basics in athletic training. These courses are pivotal for continual improvement in the cognitive area of the national examination.

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 05: Self

**BS-AT 02: Practical Ability**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Graduates of the Athletic Training Education Program have the practical ability to provide appropriate treatments, prescribe therapeutic exercise programs, and incorporate injury prevention management strategies for athletes and patients.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. Completed Clinical Experience Evaluations of the Athletic Training Students by the Clinical Supervisors for on-campus clinical assignments are used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.
2. The Athletic Training Education Program Director collects all clinical experience evaluations on the athletic training students by the clinical supervisor and they are housed in the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in the Athletic Training Students' portfolios.
3. The Athletic Training Education Program Curriculum Committee performed a program analysis of this information.

**Results of Evaluation**

The Athletic Training Education Program had 22 athletic training students assigned to clinical experiences during the fall term 2011 and 16 in the spring term 2012, at on-campus sites. Six students were off-campus at internship sites during the spring term 2012. Each student was evaluated twice during each the on-campus clinical assignment, respectively. The evaluations measured the students' abilities to perform practical skills appropriate for each level of the clinical component of the program. Additionally, the evaluations scored students' behavioral attributes. According to the Clinical Supervisors' comments, the athletic training students demonstrated skills consistent with those at the same level. Behavioral attributes were also consistent with those at the same level and across levels. The analysis revealed that conducting frequent formal evaluations requiring athletic training students to demonstrate practical skills on athletes and patients showed no improvement from the first evaluation to the second evaluation for most students during the on-campus clinical experience for the students within the clinical component of the program.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. The Athletic Training Education Program provided a formal evaluations of practical skill application and assessment of behavioral attributes for each student during the on-campus clinical experience throughout the year.
2. Training sessions are needed to address the specific areas that clinical supervisors need to continually evaluation and note improvements.

**Related Items**[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)[GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)[GE 10: Values](#)

---

**BS-AT 03: Clinical Skills**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Graduates, upon completion of the Internship in Athletic Training course, achieved the appropriate level of clinical skills necessary to perform the duties of an Athletic Trainer in the appropriate chosen setting.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. Internship Experience Evaluations were used to determine clinical performance of athletic training students.
2. The Internship Coordinator collected the data from the Internship Supervisor and they are housed in the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in the Athletic Training Students' portfolios.
3. The Athletic Training Education Program Curriculum Committee performed a program analysis of this information.

**Results of Evaluation**

The athletic training students met qualifications to correctly perform all clinical skills necessary for Entry-Level Athletic Trainers. According to the Internship Supervisors' comments, athletic training students made progress and improved their clinical skills and exhibited an appropriate professional demeanor, respectively. Additional comments confirmed that the athletic training students demonstrated competence at his/her skill level.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. The Athletic Training Education Program provided quality internship experience placement to athletic training students based on his/her personal and professional attributes and job setting goals.
2. A minimum of 40 hours per week was required during the 15-16 week internship.

**Related Items**[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)[GE 02: Communication](#)[GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)[GE 07: Cultural Awareness](#)

---

**BS-HPER-ES 01: Exercise Program Design**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Assess clients, interpret test results, and design appropriate exercise programs for the general population.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. A client profile was designed for PER 461 Exercise Prescription that included programs for cardio-respiratory fitness, muscle fitness, flexibility, and body composition.
2. This data is collected by the instructor of PER 461 Exercise Prescription.
3. This data is analyzed by the instructor of PER 461 Exercise Prescription.

#### Results of Evaluation

Over 82.1% of students (23/29) were rated at the acceptable level or above.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

- 1.Changed book
- 2.Changed order the information was presented
3. Increased practice time for skills
4. Last year changed to a more refined scoring rubric and outcome expectations incorporated helped to determine deficiencies so students could be remediated.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

---

#### BS-HPER-ES 02: Group Exercise Leadership

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Prepare and teach a group exercise class ag an acceptable level.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Students Planned, choreographed, and produced a group exercise class in PER 361 Clinical Experience in Exercise Science II.
2. This data is collected by the instructor of PER 361 Clinical Experience in Exercise Science II Exercise Prescription.
3. Data is analyzed by the Coordinator of the Exercise Science Program.

#### Results of Evaluation

100% of all students (8/8) were rated at the acceptable level or above.

Pre-test

5/8= 62.5%

Post test 8/8 = 100%

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Added exercise modifications unit to improve skill with working with diverse levels of fitness.
2. Curriculum change requested to allow further skill development by including both group and individual exercise

#### Related Items

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

---

#### BS-HPER-ES 03: Integration of Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Integrate acceptable content knowledge related to exercise testing and prescription, as well as the health benefits of physical activity.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. A capstone course was developed called PER 465 Internship in Exercise science that includes work experiences in the health and fitness field.
2. This data is collected by the instructor of PER 465 Internship in Exercise Science.
3. This data is analyzed by the instructor of PER 461 Exercise Prescription.


#### Results of Evaluation

89% (8 of 9) of students were found to have acceptable or above levels of professional knowledge at the pre-test point in the internship experience. 100% (9 of 9) students were at the acceptable level at the end of the experience

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Implemented an internship manual to make sure students had a better understanding of expected outcomes.
2. Qualitative from the pre and post evaluation feedback was used to help inform improvements to the curriculum.

#### Related Items

 [GE 05: Self](#)

---

#### BS-HPER-ES 04: Fitness Testing

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Administer a fitness test at an acceptable level of competence.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. A practical examination was administered in PER 460 Exercise Testing that measured cardio-respiratory endurance, body composition, muscular strength, flexibility, and muscle endurance.

2. This data is collected by the instructor of PER 460 Exercise Testing.

3. This data is analyzed by the instructor of PER 460 Exercise Testing.

**Results of Evaluation**

85.7% of students (24/28) were rated at the acceptable level or above.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Increased more practice time for skills

2. Students were remediated on skills where they performed below the acceptable level.

3. Updated practical exams as well as a more experienced faculty were used for a more rigorous assessment process. It has allowed us to improve the identification of students that are lacking proficiency in an area and remediate them.

**Related Items**

 **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

**BS-HPER-HPE 01: Historical Concepts**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300.

**Results of Evaluation**

During the summer 2011 online section of PER 300 students averaged 3.5/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.25/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the fall 2011 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.67/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the spring 2012 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.75/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

The analysis of data revealed that the grading rubric was adequate but could be revised to include more specific details for HPER majors.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. PER 470 Sports Administration was taken out of the current curriculum and PER 300 History and Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education was added.

2. Four main assignments were included in PER 300, including an oral presentation, a written philosophy, and two full color posters that include heroic achievements of the past contrasting those with the world of sport today.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

**BS-HPER-HPE 02: Organization and Administration**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. PER 391 ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL

EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391.

**Results of Evaluation**

The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the assignments making the grading process subjective and inconsistent. Furthermore, the analysis showed inconsistencies in instructions and assignments among sections with different instructors.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Ensured that the content and the assignments of each section are consistent.

2. Include a resume design project for each class and use those resumes for the staffing project.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

**BS-HPER-HPE 03: Skill Set assessment**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

The physical education teacher candidates will be physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. Skill assessment tests are administered in PER 314/315: Teaching Team/Individual Sports. These skill assessments are based on the topics covered in the courses and may include; volleyball skills (serve, bump), basketball skills (offensive /defensive strategies), and racquet sports (tennis, badminton). Individual Fitness tests are administered twice throughout the teacher candidates program of study

2. Skill assessment-PER 314/315: Each teacher candidate will be required to demonstrate proficiency in movement and skill performance. Individual score reports are provided by the course instructors. These reports are collected and analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator. Data is collected at the end of each year and is prepared for this report and Data Summary Reports.

Fitness test-CUR 300: Survey of Field Experiences and/or PER 487: Methods of PE, PER 103: Weight Training. Each teacher candidate will be fitness tested during the semester of CUR 300. Individual score reports are provided by the Fitness Testing Administrator. These reports are then analyzed by the program coordinator.

3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is then placed into an electronic format that is stored in the HPER Department. The data is also presented to the College of Education Assessment Committee.

#### Results of Evaluation

The Skill tests were given as part of their assigned courses. This was the first time these tests were used to satisfy Learning Outcome (2). The data findings revealed the majority of HPER teacher candidates were considered Proficient or at the "Acceptable level within the established scoring guide. At this point test takers are required to retest to meet Proficient levels.

\*Candidate expectations for each skill are established in the Scoring Guide/Rubric.


Fitness tests were given as part of their assigned courses. Each candidate was fitness tested and passed 3 out of 5 fitness areas. Cardio vascular endurance and Body Composition were areas of noted weakness. Findings also revealed a need for an educational component to increase awareness of the teacher candidates' health/fitness.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. If students are found not proficient, they will be put on an improvement plan that may include taking certain activity courses for remediation.

2. These assessments were implemented in the Spring 2011 semester because of new state and national standards. Changes were made to CUR 300 requiring all HPER teacher candidates to be fitness tested. The NASPE Standard requires teacher candidates to achieve and maintain fitness levels; therefore a second fitness test was implemented in PER 487 and /or PER 103.

#### Related Items

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

---

#### BS-HPER-REC 01: Historical Concepts

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300.

#### Results of Evaluation

During the summer 2011 online section of PER 300 students averaged 3.5/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.25/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the fall 2011 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.67/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the spring 2012 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.75/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.


The analysis of data revealed that the grading rubric was adequate but could be revised to include more specific details for HPER majors.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. PER 470 Sports Administration was taken out of the current curriculum and PER 300 History and Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education was added.

2. Four main assignments were included in PER 300, including an oral presentation, a written philosophy, and two full color posters that include heroic achievements of the past contrasting those with the world of sport today.

#### Related Items

 **GE 02: Communication**

 **GE 07: Cultural Awareness**

 **GE 08: Perspectives**

---

#### BS-HPER-REC 02: Organization and Administration

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. PER 391 ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL

EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391.

#### Results of Evaluation

The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the assignments making the grading process subjective and inconsistent. Furthermore, the analysis showed inconsistencies in instructions and assignments among sections with different instructors.



**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Ensured that the content and the assignments of each section are consistent.
2. A resume design project was included for each class and those resumes were used for the staffing project.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- ▶ [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

**BS-HPER-REC 03: Planning and Implementation**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Plan and implement a recreational activity based on current discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. PER 435 RECREATION SEMINAR was redeveloped to be taught in the spring of 2012. This is a capstone class for Recreation Leadership. The project for this course will be to plan and implement a recreational activity.
2. This assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 435. .
3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 435.

**Results of Evaluation**

During the spring 2012 semester 16 students took this course. All students were required to participate in the class project. This was the first time this course had been taught since it was included in the Recreation Leadership concentration. The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the assignments. Each student did do a reflection on the activity.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. A final project was included in this course.
2. This course was included in the instructional plan of the recreation leadership degree program as the capstone course.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- ▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)
- ▶ [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

**BS-HPER-SI 01: Historical Concepts**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.
2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.
3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300.

**Results of Evaluation**

During the summer 2011 online section of PER 300 students averaged 3.5/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.25/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the fall 2011 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.67/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the spring 2012 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.75/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

The analysis of data revealed that the grading rubric was adequate but could be revised to include more specific details for HPER majors.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. PER 470 Sports Administration was taken out of the current curriculum and PER 300 History and Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education was added.
2. Four main assignments were included in PER 300, including an oral presentation, a written philosophy, and two full color posters that include heroic achievements of the past contrasting those with the world of sport today.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)
- ▶ [GE 07: Cultural Awareness](#)
- ▶ [GE 08: Perspectives](#)

**BS-HPER-SI 02: Organization and Administration**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk

management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. PER 391 ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL

EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391.

**Results of Evaluation**


The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the assignments making the grading process subjective and inconsistent. Furthermore, the analysis showed inconsistencies in instructions and assignments among sections with different instructors.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Ensured that the content and the assignments of each section are consistent.

2. Include a resume design project for each class and use those resumes for the staffing project.

**Related Items**

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

---

**BS-HPER-SI 03: Professional Dispositions**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of sports information professionals by engaging in professional activities.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. The Internship Evaluation Form will be used for this assessment.

2. The internship coordinator will collect these forms.

3. This data will be analyzed by the internship coordinator.

**Results of Evaluation**

There were no student interns.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Sought new off campus sites for internships.

2. A new internship manual was created for HPER.

**Related Items**

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 02: Communication**

 **GE 10: Values**

---

**BS-HPER-SM 01: Historical Concepts**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300.

**Results of Evaluation**

During the summer 2011 online section of PER 300 students averaged 3.5/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.25/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the fall 2011 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.67/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

During the spring 2012 section of PER 300 students averaged 3.75/4 on the content knowledge section of the grading rubric and 3.0/4 on the past/current relationship to the field of HPER.

The analysis of data revealed that the grading rubric was adequate but could be revised to include more specific details for HPER majors.

**Use of Evaluation Results**


1. PER 470 Sports Administration was taken out of the current curriculum and PER 300 History and Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education was added.

2. Four main assignments were included in PER 300, including an oral presentation, a written philosophy, and two full color posters that include heroic achievements of the past contrasting those with the world of sport today.

**Related Items**

 **GE 02: Communication**

»  **GE 07: Cultural Awareness**

»  **GE 08: Perspectives**

---

**BS-HPER-SM 02: Organization and Administration**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. PER 391 ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.
2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.
3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391.

**Results of Evaluation**

The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the assignments making the grading process subjective and inconsistent. Furthermore, the analysis showed inconsistencies in instructions and assignments among sections with different instructors.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Ensured that the content and the assignments of each section are consistent.
2. Include a resume design project for each class and use those resumes for the staffing project.

**Related Items**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

---

**BS-HPER-SM 03: Professional Dispositions**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of sport managers by engaging in professional activities.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. The Internship Evaluation Form will be used for this assessment.
2. The internship coordinator will collect these forms.
3. This data will be analyzed by the internship coordinator.


**Results of Evaluation**

There were two interns spring 2012 semester. Both interns successfully completed their internship. Strengths of the interns included being able to manage an office alone, and being able to solve problems. Weaknesses included being timid at times and not being strong with computer graphics. Both interns were motivated and rated an 8 out of 9 for professional knowledge and a 9 out of 9 for practical skills.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Sought new off campus sites for internships.
2. A new internship manual was created for HPER.

**Related Items**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 02: Communication**

»  **GE 10: Values**

---

**BSE-HPER 01: NASPE Standard 1**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

The physical education teacher candidates will know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1. PRAXIS II Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0091)
2. Individual score reports are sent to the office of the Director of Field Experiences who collects all score reports. Field Experiences then forwards the Praxis score reports to the HPER Department Chair and the HPER Program Coordinator. All teacher candidates are required to pass the Praxis physical education content knowledge test prior to admission to CUR 498: Directed Teaching (Internship)
3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is then placed into an electronic format that is stored in the HPER Department. The data is also presented to the College of Education Assessment Committee. The data is then analyzed by the assessment committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends among HPER teacher candidates and across disciplines.

**Results of Evaluation**

Analysis of the results for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012: There were seven (7) HPER teacher candidates who completed their directed teaching internship. All seven interns passed the Praxis Physical Education: Content Knowledge exam and met Mississippi State requirements for beginning teachers prior to being admitted to their directed teaching internship. PRAXIS (0091) data showed a mean of 151 out of a possible 200. The low score was 140 and the high score was 163. The mean scores were 12 points and 13 points respectively above the MS required passing score of 138. A noted weakness was collaboration, reflection, technology. This was the first year sub-scores were examined. Sub-scores were analyzed to determine if teacher candidates were stronger/weaker in any of the four content categories from the Praxis exam. This was also the first year to analyze the data collected on the candidates' first attempt at the PRAXIS.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

##### 1. Specific Recommendation:


Analyze Praxis sub-scores to determine strengths, weaknesses and/or areas that need improvement.

Analyze first time pass rates on the PRAXIS and identify strategies to increase those pass rates.

2. The HPER Program Coordinator changed the procedures for storing and analyzing program praxis data. A centralized data base has been established to store electronic data and hard data is stored in the HPER Department. Also Praxis sub-scores are now analyzed along with passing scores.

The Blackboard course management system is required for use in all courses. Current technology is used for instructional purposes.

#### Related Items

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

---

#### BSE-HPER 02: NASPE Standard 2

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

##### Learning Outcome

The physical education teacher candidates will be physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness.

##### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Skill assessment tests are administered in PER 314/315: Teaching Team/Individual Sports. These skill assessments are based on the topics covered in the courses and may include; volleyball skills (serve, bump), basketball skills (offensive /defensive strategies), and racquet sports (tennis, badminton). Individual Fitness tests are administered twice throughout the teacher candidates program of study

2. Skill assessment-PER 314/315: Each teacher candidate will be required to demonstrate proficiency in movement and skill performance. Individual score reports are provided by the course instructors. These reports are collected and analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator. Data is collected at the end of each year and is prepared for this report and Data Summary Reports.

Fitness test-CUR 300: Survey of Field Experiences and/or PER 487: Methods of PE, PER 103: Weight Training. Each teacher candidate will be fitness tested during the semester of CUR 300. Individual score reports are provided by the Fitness Testing Administrator. These reports are then analyzed by the program coordinator.

3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is then placed into an electronic format that is stored in the HPER Department. The data is also presented to the College of Education Assessment Committee.

##### Results of Evaluation

The Skill tests were given as part of their assigned courses. This was the first time these tests were used to satisfy Learning Outcome (2). The data findings revealed the majority of HPER teacher candidates were considered Proficient or at the \*Acceptable level within the established scoring guide. At this point test takers are required to retest to meet Proficient levels.

\*Candidate expectations for each skill are established in the Scoring Guide/Rubric.

Fitness tests were given as part of their assigned courses. Each candidate was fitness tested and passed 3 out of 5 fitness areas. Cardio vascular endurance and Body Composition were areas of noted weakness. Findings also revealed a need for an educational component to increase awareness of the teacher candidates' health/fitness.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

1. If students are found not proficient, they will be put on an improvement plan that may include taking certain activity courses for remediation.

2. These assessments were implemented in the Spring 2011 semester because of new state and national standards. Changes were made to CUR 300 requiring all HPER teacher candidates to be fitness tested. The NASPE Standard requires teacher candidates to achieve and maintain fitness levels; therefore a second fitness test was implemented in PER 487 and /or PER 103.

#### Related Items

 **GE 05: Self**

---

#### BSE-HPER 03: NASPE Standard 3

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

##### Learning Outcome

The physical education teacher candidate will plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students.

##### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (1-9): These sections of the TIAI demonstrate the Teacher Candidates ability to plan and organize instruction to accommodate individual student needs and diverse developmental needs. Each teacher candidate must score in the Acceptable or Target level to be considered meeting the learning outcome.

2. The TIAI (1-9) will be completed during CUR 498: Teaching Internship. Each teacher candidate is scored three times on the TIAI during their internship. The program coordinator scores each candidate and the data is stored in Task Stream.

3 Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

##### Results of Evaluation

Analysis of the results for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012: A weakness of selecting appropriate technology was identified and strength of Selecting developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices was found.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Teacher candidates should increase the use of technology in classroom activities and lessons.

2. A more concerted effort is being placed on teacher candidates using technology within their lessons. Teacher candidates are now required to video themselves teaching an individual lesson in the physical education environment (during CUR 498: Directed Teaching Internship). The video is viewed by the college supervisor and the teaching candidate.

#### Related Items

 **GE 07: Cultural Awareness**

---

#### BSE-HPER 04: NASPE Standard 4

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

##### Learning Outcome

The physical education teacher candidate will use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.

##### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. TIAI (10-34): These sections show the teacher candidates ability to communicate, subject knowledge, and management of learning environment to enhance social relationships.

2. The TIAI (10-34) will be collected during the CUR 498: Teaching Internship and stored in Task Stream.

3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

#### Results of Evaluation

Analysis of the results for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012: Each teacher candidate scored in the acceptable or target range for all indicators. A teacher candidate weakness was identified in using higher order questions and engaging student in analytic and critical thinking. A noted strength of the teacher candidates was knowledge of subject matter and subject taught.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Increase higher order questioning and engaging students in critical thinking.

2. Changes were made in PER 487 and CUR 498 (two required courses) to improve higher order questioning and critical thinking. Teacher candidates are now more aware of using critical thinking and cognitive development within physical education lessons. The teacher candidates were given specific feedback regarding these areas from the BSE Program Coordinator. They then implemented these types of questioning and critical thinking into individual physical education lessons during their teacher internship. The BSE Program Coordinator observed the candidates after giving feedback to ensure they had an understanding of those areas.

#### Related Items

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

### BSE-HPER 05: NASPE Standard 5

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

The physical education teacher candidates will utilize assessments and reflection to foster student learning and inform instructional decisions.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. Teacher Work Sample (TWS) was used.

2. This data was collected during the CUR 498: Teaching Internship and stored in Task Stream. Teacher candidates are required to submit the TWS twice during their internship.

3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

#### Results of Evaluation


Analysis of the results for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012: All seven (7) teacher candidates were rated at an acceptable level or higher.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Specific COE Recommendation-Review the TWS scoring rubrics to discriminate among teacher candidates expectations for each level of the rubric.

2. The teacher work sample is now being reviewed within the COE Assessment Committee and the proposed changes should be implemented in the Fall 12 or Spring 13 semester.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

### BSE-HPER 06: NASPE Standard 6

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

The physical education teacher candidate will demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The College of Education Dispositions Rating Scale is used.

2. During CUR 300 the teacher candidates complete a disposition self-assessment and the instructor of the course completes a disposition assessment. HPER faculty rate teacher candidates at the time of entrance to teacher education on their dispositions. During CUR 393 Teacher Internship the teacher candidates do another disposition self-assessment, the cooperating teacher does a disposition assessment, and the supervising faculty from DSU does a disposition assessment. The data is stored in Task Stream.

3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

#### Results of Evaluation

Analysis of the results for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012: All seven (7) teacher candidates were rated at an acceptable level or higher.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Monitor candidate performance on the College of Education Dispositions Rating Scale to determine if poor performance may indicate needed curricular changes.

2. The assessment was evaluated by the HPER assessment committee to determine if it meets current standards.

#### Related Items

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [GE 07: Cultural Awareness](#)

 [GE 10: Values](#)

### MED-HPER 01: Teaching Principles

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Collaborate with program and community members to advocate and promote teaching principles that aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students in physical education.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Item 1 were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The TWS and TIAI were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation


The MED in HPER program had six graduates. Of these individuals two were certified teachers; however, none of the six completed a TWS or TIAI. No data was collected or analyzed.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.

2. PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation was where the TWS and TIAI were assigned; however, the course was not a required course in the program. PER 685 was reassigned as a required course for all graduates to ensure that all students complete the TWS and are evaluated using TIAI.

#### Related Items

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 02: Communication**

---

#### MED-HPER 02: Sequencing Curriculum Content

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Apply the pedagogical knowledge when selecting, assigning and sequencing curriculum content.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Items 1-4 and lesson plans were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The TWS, TIAI and lesson plans were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation


The Med in HPER program had six graduates. Of these individuals two were certified teachers; however, none of the six completed a TWS, TIAI or lesson plans. No data was collected or analyzed.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.

2. PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation was where the TWS, TIAI and lesson plans were assigned; however, the course was not a required course in the program. PER 685 was reassigned as a required course for all graduates to ensure that all students complete the TWS and lesson plans and are evaluated using TIAI.

#### Related Items

 **GE 02: Communication**

---

#### MED-HPER 03: Professional Development

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of Physical Educators by engaging in continual professional development activities.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Service Learning Form was used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Service Learning Forms were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 611: Current Trends and Topics in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation


The Med in HPER program had six graduates. Of these individuals all participated in a minimum of one professional development activity; however, none of the six were required to complete a Service Learning Form. Additionally, the PER 611 course syllabus did not include the activities as part of the grading criteria for the class. No data was collected or analyzed.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.

2. PER 611: Current Trends and Topics in Health, Physical Education and Recreation was where the professional development activities were assigned; however, the assignment was not clearly defined on the syllabus. As a result the assignment was not part of the grading criteria and was not assigned a grade. The PER 611 course syllabus was revised to clearly reflect the Service Learning project and a grading rubric was developed to ensure that all students completed the assignment and they were evaluated using the grading rubric.

#### Related Items

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 02: Communication**

 **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

---

#### MED-HPER 04: Instruction for Physical Activity Skill

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Evaluate, analyze and provide appropriate instructions for physical activity skill performance in order to provide continual student practice and learning opportunities.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Domain III were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The TWS and TIAI were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation

The MEd in HPER program had six graduates. Of these individuals two were certified teachers; however, none of the six completed a TWS or TIAI. No data was collected or analyzed.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.

2. PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation was where the TWS and TIAI are assigned; however, the course was not a required course in the program. PER 685 was reassigned as a required course for all graduates to ensure that all students complete the TWS and are evaluated using TIAI.

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

---

#### MS-SHP-ES 01: Knowledge-Based Expertise

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Demonstrate knowledge-based expertise in the areas of health, fitness and recreation activities required for Sport Managers or Sport Administrators.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Comprehensive Examinations were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Comprehensive Examination results were collected and reported by the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted examination results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation


The MS in SHP had four graduates. These individuals took the Comprehensive Examination in this area and all passed with the minimum requirement of 80%. The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the examinations making the grading process subjective and inconsistent across all areas and between student responses. Furthermore, the analysis showed inconsistencies in instructions and number of items across all areas.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.

2. The Comprehensive Examinations were restructured to streamline the process and allow all students to respond to and be evaluated on the same questions in each subject area. However, the grading rubric was not developed due to multiple instructors teaching the same area. It was decided to phase in the grading rubric when inconsistencies in questions selection were resolved.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

---

#### MS-SHP-ES 02: Tests and Measurements

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Design, conduct and analyze tests and measurements in health, fitness and recreation activities research in order to provide evidence-based programs for athletes, recreationalists or fitness clients.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Comprehensive Examinations were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Comprehensive Examination results were collected and reported by the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted examination results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation

The MS in SHP had four graduates. These individuals took the Comprehensive Examination in this area and all passed with the minimum requirement of 80%. The analysis revealed that a standardized grading rubric was not used in scoring the examinations making the grading process subjective and inconsistent across all areas and between student responses.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.

2. The Comprehensive Examinations were restructured to streamline the process to allow all students to respond to and be evaluated on the same questions in each subject area. However, the grading rubric was not developed due to multiple instructors teaching the same area. It was decided to phase in the grading rubric when inconsistencies in questions selection were resolved.

#### Related Items

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

---

#### MS-SHP-ES 03: Professional Development

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### Learning Outcome

Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of Physical Educators by engaging in continual professional development activities.

#### Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Service Learning Form was used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Service Learning Forms were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 611: Current Trends and Topics in Health, Physical Education and Recreation

course to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### Results of Evaluation

The MS in SHP program had four graduates. Of these individuals all participated in a minimum of one professional development activity; however, none of the six were required to complete a Service Learning Form. Additionally, the PER 611 course syllabus did not include the activities as part of the grading criteria for the class. No data was collected or analyzed.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. The Graduate Coordinator and Faculty agreed to establish a Graduate Curriculum Committee to address weaknesses in the graduate program, make recommendations for revisions to curriculum and to analyze data on an annual basis.
2. PER 611: Current Trends and Topics in Health, Physical Education and Recreation was where the professional development activities were assigned; however, the assignment was not clearly defined on the syllabus. As a result the assignment was not part of the grading criteria and was not evaluated as a separate assignment. The PER 611 course syllabus was revised to clearly reflect the Service Learning project and a grading rubric was developed to ensure that all students completed the assignment and they were evaluated using the grading rubric.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 02: Communication](#)

[GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

---

#### HPER 2012\_01: Recruitment

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Increase recruitment efforts and increase HPER majors over the 2011-2012 year.

##### Evaluation Procedures

Review enrollment figures for 2011-2012 and have HPER representation at 75% or more of Delta State University recruitment events.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

This goal has been met and will continue to be a goal for the future in HPER. The Division of HPER had a representative at every recruiting event hosted at Delta State University and had representation at the majority of off campus recruitment events also. The faculty of the division has made extensive efforts to meet individually with all prospective students who visited the campus. Representatives from HPER have met individually and with groups of athletic department recruits over the past year. Mr. Todd Davis developed specific recruitment materials for the Mississippi Community and Junior Colleges. He made contact with a representative from each one and sent a letter and promotional materials to them. He was also able to visit some campuses and interact via Skype with health, physical education, and recreation classes at others. Enrollment has increased in the division by over 9% and was the second highest enrollment HPER has had over the past five years.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Enrollment results will be used for the annual report and as a baseline for recruitment and retention efforts for the next year. Over the next year HPER will continue to make all efforts possible to assist and lead in recruitment efforts at the university. Several new minors have been approved within the division that should make the HPER programs more attractive and produce more marketable students. The division will attempt to convert multiple programs into online formats to keep up with the demand for online education options.

#### Related Items

[SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

---

#### HPER 2012\_02: Retention

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Increase retention efforts for HPER majors through advisement and early recognition of problematic students.

##### Evaluation Procedures

This goal was met but more will be done over the next year to ensure retention efforts will continue. Enrollment numbers increased by over 9% and existing students continue to change majors to HPER from others on campus.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

The main emphasis with retention in HPER is focused on the advisement process and getting students to have face to face meetings with their advisors prior to registration sessions and at other times of the year when the students are having academic problems. It is important that the academic advisors understand the goals of the students and work with them in order to achieve their goals.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Academic advisement training and help sessions will be conducted over the next year for HPER faculty.

#### Related Items

[SP2.Ind02: Retention](#)

---

#### HPER 2012\_03: Data standards/integrity policy

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### Unit Goal

Develop a written data standards/integrity policy and train all employees in data entry.

##### Evaluation Procedures

This goal has not been met currently.

##### Actual Results of Evaluation

This process is still underway and hopefully will be concluded over the next year.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

Complete a written data standards/integrity policy and train all employees in data entry.

#### Related Items

There are no related items.

---

#### Recreational Facilities and Aquatics Center

##### RFAC

##### Mission statement

The Department of Recreational Facilities and Aquatics mission is emphasizing health and recreation for faculty, staff, students and the citizens of Mississippi's Northern



Delta counties. Emphasis is also placed on service, with special attention to a friendly environment.

**Related Items**

There are no related items.

---

**RFAC 2012\_01: Further enhancement of the DSU Fitness Trail**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Further enhancement of the DSU Fitness Trail – Water fountains,, shade stations, bathrooms, and fitness stations.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Sources and amounts were identified and ranked in order of amount.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Encourage more campus and community to utilize the fitness trail.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

New – Water fountains, shade stations, bathrooms, and fitness stations will document success.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind04: Facilities Management](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind07: Economic Development](#)

---

**RFAC 2012\_02: improve the Forest Wyatt Center.**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

. Goal #2: Strive to continually update and improve the Forest Wyatt Center.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Updates completed

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Attractiveness will encourage Faculty, Staff, students and community to utilize Center.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

: Improvements to facility will document success.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind04: Facilities Management](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind07: Economic Development](#)

---

**RFAC 2012\_03: Renovate Aquatic Center**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Renovate Aquatic Center

**Evaluation Procedures**

Updates completed.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Attractiveness will encourage Faculty, Staff, students and community to utilize Aquatic Center

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Uses of Evaluation Results: Improvements to facility will document success.

**Related Items**

➤ [SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs](#)

➤ [SP2.Ind01: Enrollment](#)

➤ [SP4.Ind04: Facilities Management](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents](#)

➤ [SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach](#)

Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

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.

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

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

Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 27) The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 167.07, with a median score of 165; the minimum passing score is 158. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 161.22 and the median 168; the minimum passing score is 152. Seventeen candidates passed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, which indicates a 63% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on the first attempt, with the exception of two candidates, which indicates a 93% 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 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 11) The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 166.45, with a median score of 165; the minimum passing score is 158. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 164.54 and the median 166; the minimum passing score is 152. Seven candidates passed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, which indicates a 64% first-time pass rate. All students successfully passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on the first attempt. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 166.44, with a median score of 166; the minimum passing score is 158. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 165.11 and the median 162; the minimum passing score is 152. Twelve candidates passed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, which indicates a 67% first-time pass rate. Five students did not successfully complete the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on the first attempt, which 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.

Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 177.37, with a median score of 176; the minimum passing score is 158. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 167.12 and the median 166; the minimum passing score is 152. Six candidates passed the Praxis II Subject area test on the first attempt, which indicates a 75% first time pass rate. Seven candidates successfully passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on the first attempt, which indicates a 95% 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 rate on the Praxis II Subject Area Test had dropped in previous years. Workshops prior to test taking have been implemented.

Related Items

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 03: Quantitative Skills

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

BSE-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate mastery of content knowledge

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

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**

The following results are reported on four groups of candidates. Group one consisted of on-campus students taking the C-Base test in March 2011. Group two consisted of candidates enrolled in the Hinds 2 + 2 Program who took the test in March 2011. Group three consisted of on-campus candidates taking the C-Base test in September 2011, and group four consisted of candidates enrolled in the Hinds 2 + 2 Program who took the test in September 2011.

#### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 24) Averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 268 and 51; mathematics, 269 and 46; science 236 and 46; and social studies, 210 and 37. The composite score for candidates was 248. The highest average performance was in the area of mathematics. The math score was 21 points higher than the composite score of 248, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in mathematics, and their overall performance on the C-Base. The second highest average performance was in the area of English. The English score was 20 points higher than the composite score of 248. Because this group of candidates' English score and math score exceeded the composite score, they demonstrated a relative strength in English and mathematics as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in English was 51, which is the largest standard deviation for the group on the administration of the C-Base test. While the math scores are the highest of this group of candidates, the standard deviation indicates that English is the area where the greatest variance of student scores lie.

For this group of candidates, social studies scores were the lowest at an average of 210, which was 38 points lower than the group composite score of 248. This represents a meaningful difference, thus this group of candidates showed a minor weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for social studies scores was 37, the lowest for this group. This indicated the smallest variance for this group was in the area of social studies.

#### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 11) Averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 276 and 52; mathematics, 278 and 48; science 243 and 58; and social studies, 199 and 47. The composite score for candidates was 268.

The highest average performance for these candidates was in the area of mathematics. The math score was 10 points higher than the composite score of 268, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-Base. The English score also exceeded the composite score, but only by 8 points. Because this group of candidates' English scores and mathematics scores exceeded the composite score, they demonstrated a relative strength in these areas as compared to other areas in which they were tested.

For this group of candidates, social studies scores were the lowest at an average of 199, which is 69 points lower than the group composite score of 268. This represented a meaningful difference and indicated a significant weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas.

-

#### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 46) Averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 237 and 48; mathematics, 232 and 57; science 232 and 42; and social studies, 205 and 44. The composite score for candidates was 234.

The highest average performance was in the area of English. The English score was only 3 points higher than the composite score of 234, which did not indicate a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in English and their overall performance on the C-Base. Because this group of candidates' English scores exceeded the composite score, they demonstrated a small strength in English as compared to other areas in which they were tested.

For this group of candidates, math and science scores were the same at an average of 232, which was 2 points lower than the group composite score of 234. This indicated a relative weakness in math and science.

#### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 22) Averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 279 and 40; mathematics, 268 and 50; science 248 and 48; and social studies, 235 and 38. The composite score for candidates was 256.

The highest average performance was in the areas of English and mathematics. The English and mathematics scores were 23 and 12 points higher than the composite score of 256, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in English and mathematics and their overall performance on the C-Base. Because this group of candidates' English and mathematics scores exceeded the composite score, they demonstrated a relative strength in English and mathematics as compared to other areas in which they were tested.

For this group of candidates, social studies scores were the lowest at an average of 235, which is 21 points lower than the group composite score of 256. This represented a meaningful difference and indicated a weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for social studies scores was 38, and the lowest for this group. It indicated the smallest variance for this group is in the area of social studies.

#### Trends Noted

On the C-Base candidates typically score highest in the area of English and lowest in the areas of social studies and science. However, when compared to the national norms, the candidates demonstrated low to marginal content knowledge of science, social studies, English, and math.

#### **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. However, the 2011 scores are beginning to show an increase from all scores since the 2006 scores. Actions based upon those trends have been to conference with candidates regarding their individual scores. Faculty will continue to meet with candidates and offer tutoring advice. Candidates may use the writing lab and the Office of Academic Support Services. .

It appears that candidates in both the campus program and the Hinds program performed strongest on measures related to Association for Childhood Education International Standards 2.1 (Reading, Writing, and Oral Language); and 2.3 (Mathematics); with 2.2 (Science) and 2.4 (Social Studies) being areas of weakness. The Hinds candidates performed better than the on-campus students in all areas with the exception of the spring 2011 group in 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**

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate the [ability to plan an integrated unit of instruction](#) for a diverse student population.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

1.a. 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.

2.a. Data was collected in TaskStream, the online information technology system used by the College of Education.

3.a. TaskStream reports I provided means and score distributions.

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

1.b. The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument Indicators 1 – 9 were used to assess the candidates' ability to plan instruction.

2.b. 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.

3.b. 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 2011- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N = 15)

Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in 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 Spring 2011, 14% of the candidates scored at the emerging or unacceptable level in this category.

Spring 2011 Hinds 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 Teaching in 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 assessment planning. In Spring 2011, 9% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

Overall, the candidates in both groups demonstrated that they were able to effectively and appropriately plan for elementary students.

Spring 2011 - Campus Group – CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 15)

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 knowledge of student skills and prior learning. In Spring 2011, 66% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

Spring 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 11)

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 using a variety of instructional activities. In Spring 2011, 27% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

With the exception of using a variety of instructional activities, the candidates in both groups demonstrated that they were able to effectively and appropriately plan for elementary students.

Fall 2011- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N = 20)

Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in 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 the incorporation of health and physical education. In Fall 2011, 50% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

Fall 2011 Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*

(N = 16)

Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in 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 Fall 2011, 60% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

Overall, the candidates in both groups demonstrated that they were able to effectively and appropriately plan for elementary students.

Fall 2011 - Campus Group – CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 20)

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 implications for instruction. In Fall 2011, 56% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

Fall 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 16)

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 implications for instruction. In Fall 2011, 58% of the candidates scored at the emerging level in this category.

While there are some areas of concern for both groups of candidates, in the majority of categories, candidates demonstrated that they were able to effectively and appropriately plan for middle school students.

Methods Courses

Spring 2011- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 15) – Indicators 1-9 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument were used, with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*, mean ratings ranged from 1.62/3 on "Integrates knowledge from several subject areas" to 2.0/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives, selects appropriate materials and technology, uses knowledge of student interests, and uses a variety of strategies to open and close lessons". The overall mean was 1.86/3. For CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*, mean ratings ranged from 1.87/3 on "Uses a variety of strategies to open and close lessons" to 2.73/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". The overall mean was 1.98/3.

Spring 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 11) – Indicators 1-9 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument were used, with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*, mean ratings ranged from 1.82/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives, using assessment information, and incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons" to 2.09/3 on "Plans appropriate teaching procedures and selects a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons". The overall mean was 1.96/3. For CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*, mean ratings ranged from 1.82/3 on "Incorporating diversity" to 2.64/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". The overall mean was 2.11/3.

Fall 2011- Campus Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 20) – Indicators 1-9 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument were used, with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*, mean ratings ranged from 1.75/3 on "Incorporates diversity" to 2.25/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". The overall mean was 2.04/3. For CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*, mean ratings ranged from 1.82/3 on "Plans appropriate teaching procedures" to 2.35/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". The overall mean was 2.01/3.

Fall 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*

(N = 16) – Indicators 1-9 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument were used, with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*, mean ratings ranged from 1.847/3 on "Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons" to 2.60/3 on "Prepares appropriate assessments and uses assessment information". The overall mean was 2.40/3. For CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*, mean ratings ranged from 1.63/3 on "Prepares appropriate assessments" to 2.50/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". The overall mean was 2.01/3.

For the methods courses, 2011 data identified a strength in "Selecting developmentally appropriate objectives". A weakness was identified in "Integrating knowledge from several subject areas".

Teaching Internship

Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) – On the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.84/3 on "Appropriate materials and technology" to 3.00/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.88/3 on "Incorporating diversity" to 3.0/3 on all other indicators in this section (1-9) with the exception of "Strategies to open and close lessons"(2.96/3).

Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 10) – On the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.80/3 on "Planning appropriate teaching procedures, preparing assessment procedures, knowledge of student interests, integrating subjects, and incorporating diversity" to 3.00/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices" and "Using assessment information". On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.90/3 on "Uses assessment information to plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs, using knowledge of student backgrounds, integrating subject areas, and opening and closing lessons" to 3.0/3 on the remainder of indicators in domain I.

Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) - On the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.72/3 on "Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons" to 3.00/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices". On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.82/3 on "Preparing assessments, uses assessment information to plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs, integrating knowledge, and incorporating diversity" to 3.0/3 on "Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices, plans appropriate teaching procedures, using knowledge of student needs, and "Introducing and closing lessons".

Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) - On the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.88/3 on "Selects appropriate material and technology, prepares appropriate assessment procedures, uses knowledge of student backgrounds, integrating subject areas, incorporating diversity, and introducing and closing lessons" to 3.0/3 on the remaining three indicators in this domain. On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors rated all nine indicators in this domain at the target level of 3.0/3.

For the internship, 2011 data identified a strength in "Selecting developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices" by the Cooperating Teachers and the Delta State University Supervisors. It should be noted that all indicators (1-9) were in the Acceptable or Target range by both Cooperating Teachers and Delta State University Supervisors for 2011.

#### Trends Noted

In 2009 and 2010 differentiated instruction was identified as an area of concern. In 2011, this continued to be an area of concern. Evidence indicated that students made some progress in this area. 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 have been implemented. Assessment was noted as a slight weakness in terms of the Hinds candidates. Hinds instructors have been notified of this.

Data from 2009 and 2010 identified incorporating diversity into planning and teaching as a weakness and this seems to be improving with the 2011 data. Field trips to diverse settings and seminars regarding diversity are continuing to be implemented.

#### 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 2011 data. Field trips to diverse settings and seminars regarding diversity are continuing to be implemented.

Candidates' performance in several areas showed an increase from 2010. Faculty will closely monitor these areas to determine any long term trends.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 09: Cross-disciplinary Appreciation](#)

[SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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. For this

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 Communication and Interaction*

#### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) – Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Establishing opportunities for communication with parents and guardians" (2.64/3) and a strength in "Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning and providing opportunities for cooperating and interaction" (2.96/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified a weakness in "Communicating high expectations for learning to all students" (2.92/3); a strength was identified in "Providing clear directions, conveying enthusiasm for teaching and learning and providing opportunities for student cooperation and interaction" (3.0/3).

#### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 10) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Using acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication" (2.80/3) and a strength in "Providing clear directions and conveying enthusiasm for teaching and learning" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified a weakness in "Providing opportunities for student interaction" (2.80/3); a strength was identified in "Providing clear directions, communicating high expectations for learning, conveying enthusiasm for teaching and learning and establishing opportunities for communication with parents" (3.0/3).

#### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) – Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Establishing opportunities for communication with parents and guardians" (2.61/3) and a strength in "Communicating high expectations for learning to all students, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning and providing opportunities for cooperating and interaction" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified a weakness in "Providing opportunities for student interaction" (2.76/3); a strength was identified in "Providing clear directions, and communicating high expectations for learning" (3.0/3).

#### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) – Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Establishing opportunities for communication with parents" (2.75/3) and a strength in the other four areas (2.88/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors did not identify any weaknesses. All six indicators had a score of 3.0/3.

*Domain III focuses on Teaching for Learning*

#### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) – Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Using higher order questions" (2.76/3) and a strength in "Responding to and elicits student input during instruction" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors also identified a weakness in "Using higher order questions" (2.88/3) and identified a strength in the remaining indicators in this domain (3.0/3).

#### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 10) – Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Providing opportunities to for problem solving and critical thinking and using higher order questions" (2.70/3) and a strength in "Eliciting student input during instruction" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors also identified those same two weaknesses as listed

above for cooperating teachers at 2.80/3 and they also identified a strength in "Using a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and using sufficient wait time" (3.0/3).

#### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) - Cooperating Teachers identified weaknesses in "Using community resources" (2.72/3) and a strength in "Responding to and eliciting student input" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors also identified a weakness in "Using higher order questions" (2.76/3); a strength was identified in "Using appropriate wait time" (3.0/3).

#### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) - Cooperating Teachers identified weaknesses in "Knowledge of subject, problem solving and critical thinking, wait time, and higher order questions" (2.75/3) and a strength in "Variety of teaching strategies, diverse learners, eliciting student input, and using community resources" (2.88/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors did not identify any weaknesses. All eight indicators had a score of 3.0/3.

#### Domain IV focuses on Management of the Learning Environment

##### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Adjusting lessons and using instructional time effectively" (2.88/3), and a strength in "Monitoring and adjusting the classroom environment, attending to routine tasks, and being fair and supportive" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified a weakness in "Attending to routines (2.84/3), and identified a strength in "Monitoring the environment, adjusting lessons, and being fair and supportive" (3.0/3).

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 10) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Adjusting lessons" (2.70/3) and a strength in "Fairness and supportiveness (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified weaknesses in "Using instructional time effectively" (2.80/3), and a strength was identified in "Monitoring the classroom, adjusting lessons, attending to routine, and being fair and supportive" (3.0/3).

##### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Using instructional time effectively" (2.72/3), and a strength in "Adjusting lessons, using a variety of strategies, and demonstrating fairness and supportiveness" (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified weaknesses in "Monitoring and adjusting the environment" (2.82/3) and a strength was identified in "Adjusting lessons, using a variety of strategies, and demonstrating fairness and supportiveness" (3.0/3).

##### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Routine tasks, and using a variety of behavior strategies" (2.88/3) and a strength in the other four areas (2.88/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors did not identify any weaknesses. All six indicators had a score of 3.0/3.

#### Domain V focuses on Assessment of Student Learning

##### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) – Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Developing and using formal assessments and providing timely feedback" (2.80/3) and a strength in "Maintaining records of student work" (2.92/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified a weakness "Communicating assessment criteria" (2.88/3) and a strength in "Using formal and informal assessments and maintaining records" (3.0/3).

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 10) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Communicating assessment criteria" (2.80/3) and a strength in the other four areas (3.0/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors identified a weakness in "Developing and using formal and informal assessments" (2.80/3) and a strength in "Communicating assessment criteria and providing timely feedback" (2.90/3).

##### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) - Cooperating Teachers identified a weakness in "Communicating assessment criteria" (2.83/3) and a strength in "Maintaining records" (2.94/3). On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors rated all five areas the same (2.82/3).

##### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) - Cooperating Teachers rated all areas except for "Informal assessment" as 2.88/3 and it was rated as 3/0/3. On the final observation, Delta State University Supervisors did not identify any weaknesses. All five areas were rated at 3.0/3.

#### Trends Noted

All ratings were in the Acceptable range. No trends were identified in Domains II, III, IV, or V as all areas were rated as acceptable.

#### 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.

#### Related Items

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 15) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 2.80/3, Learning Goal 2.77/3, Assessment Plan 2.62/3, Design for Instruction 2.87/3, Instructional Decision Making 3.0/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.63/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.71/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.98/3.

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 11) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 2.89/3, Learning Goal 2.73/3, Assessment Plan 2.65/3, Design for Instruction 2.82/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.73/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.66/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.65/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.55/3.

##### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 20) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 2.77/3, Learning Goal 2.71/3, Assessment Plan 2.61/3, Design for Instruction 2.76/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.87/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.54/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.53/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.67/3.

##### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 16) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 3.0/3, Learning Goal 2.83/3, Assessment Plan 2.81/3, Design for Instruction 2.89/3, Instructional Decision Making 3.0/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.80/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.99/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.63 /3.

#### Internship

##### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 2.99/3, Learning Goals 3.0/3, Assessment Plan 3.0/3, Design for Instruction 2.99/3, Instructional Decision Making 3.0/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.0/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.99/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 3.0/3.

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 10) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 2.98/3, Learning Goals 2.98/3, Assessment Plan 3.0/3, Design for Instruction 2.98/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.93/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.0/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.98/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.94/3.

##### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 2.84/3, Learning Goals 2.90/3, Assessment Plan 2.80/3, Design for Instruction 2.90/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.93/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.88/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.83/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.85/3.

##### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 8) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:

Contextual Factors 3.0/3, Learning Goals 3.0/3, Assessment Plan 3.0/3, Design for Instruction 3.0/3, Instructional Decision Making 3.0/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.0/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 3.0/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 3.0/3.

#### 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 2.83 – 3.0, with many of the ratings at 3.0. The lowest evaluation was for the campus group of interns on Reflection and Self-Evaluation.

#### 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

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

 [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012



### 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 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 28) Candidates scored 100% (target) in Describing Student Data. For this group, 96% were at the target level for Gathering Background Information and 86% were at the target level for General Observations. Ninety-six percent were at the target level for Tests Administered and Results and 64% were at the target level for Summary and Recommendations. In the area of Field Experiences, 25% were at the target level and 64% were at the acceptable level. For the area of analysis, 39% were at the target level while 54% scored at the acceptable level.

#### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 13) Seventy-seven percent of Hinds candidates scored at the target level in describing student data and background information. For this group, 84% were at the target level for general observations, 69% at the target level for tests administered and results and 46% were at the target level for summary and recommendations. In the area of field experiences, 15% were at the target level and 77% were at the acceptable level. For the area of analysis, 31% were at the target level while 54% scored at the acceptable level.

#### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 11) One hundred percent of candidates scored at the target level in background information, general observations, administering tests and summary and recommendations. For this group, 73% were at the target level for student data, 82% at the target level for analysis of data and only 16% at the target level for field experiences/teaching with 73% at the acceptable level on the teaching and 11% at the unacceptable level for teaching.

#### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 23) One hundred percent of candidates scored at the target level in student data, background information, general observations, administering tests and summary and recommendations. For this group, 83% were at the target level for field experiences/teaching and 35% were at the target level for analysis of data. An additional 61% were at the acceptable level for analysis of data.

-

### Trends Noted


Overall, the candidates demonstrated that they were able to impact student learning through the gathering and interpretation of student data. One area that continues to be an area of weakness is that of analysis. However, candidates in the Fall 2011 semester (on-campus) scored much higher in this area. This is an area that will continue to be watched. An area of concern, though, is the very low ratings in field experiences/teaching for the fall group of on-campus candidates.

### 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.

The instructors of the course will continue to emphasize presentation of test data, summarizing case study findings, and making appropriate recommendations for further instruction. Particular emphasis will be placed upon analyzing results of data. Faculty will conference with instructor of the Fall 2011 group to inquire as to the nature of the low scores in field experiences/teaching for that group.

### Related Items

 GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

 GE 02: Communication

 SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

### 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 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 23) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.09 on Dependability to 2.22 on Professionalism to 2.30 on Fairness, the Belief that All Students Can Learn and Resourcefulness. The overall mean score was 2.24.

#### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 11) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.0 on Fairness to 2.10 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn and Resourcefulness to 2.20 on Professionalism and

Dependability. The overall mean score was 2.12.

#### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 43) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 1.95 on Professionalism to 2.22 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn. The overall mean score was 2.07.

-

#### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 21) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.10 on Fairness and the Belief That All Students Can Learn to 2.30 on Resourcefulness. The overall mean score was 2.17

### Internship

#### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 25) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 3.68 on Resourcefulness to 3.76 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn and Professionalism to 3.80 on Fairness to 3.88 on Dependability, with an overall mean of 3.78. DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 3.32 on Fairness, Professionalism and Dependability to 3.36 on Resourcefulness to 3.40 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn, with an overall mean of 3.34.

#### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N= 10 ) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 3.50 on Professionalism and Resourcefulness to 3.60 on Fairness and the Belief That All Students Can Learn to 3.70 on Dependability, with an overall mean of 3.58. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 3.20 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn to a 3.40 on all other indicators, with an overall mean of 3.36.

#### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 18) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 3.50 on Resourcefulness to 3.67 on The Belief That All Students Can Learn and Professionalism to 3.78 on Fairness to 3.83 on Dependability. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 3.39 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn and Professionalism to 3.44 on Fairness to 3.50 on Dependability to 3.56 on Resourcefulness.

#### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

Hinds (N= 8) - Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 3.63 on Professionalism and Dependability to 3.75 on the Belief that All Students Can Learn and Resourcefulness to 3.88 on Fairness. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 3.63 on Dependability to 3.75 on all four of the other indicators.

-

#### 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 marginal or unacceptable ratings ranging from 4% - 23.08 % on all indicators. Of particular concern is the marginal ratings related to professionalism and dependability for all semesters.

Data summaries related to the evaluation of dispositions during CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship*, for the campus groups revealed several patterns. First, percentages indicated that candidates performed at the target or acceptable levels according to results of Cooperating Teachers and Delta State University Supervisors on the majority of indicators. On all indicators, a marginal rating was shown for 5.88% - 16.67% of candidates on scores from either supervisors or cooperating teachers, but not by both on any indicator. 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*. It is significant to note that the Hinds CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship* candidates did not receive any marginal or unacceptable ratings from neither Cooperating Teachers nor Delta State University Supervisors.

#### 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

 [GE 10: Values](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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 2011 – Campus Group

(N= 23) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.0/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.65/3 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.44/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N= 11) Mean ratings ranged from 2.64/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.82/3 on Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate and Professionalism. The overall mean rating was 2.73/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

##### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N = 43) Mean ratings ranged from 1.78/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.22/3 on the Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.04/3.

-

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N = 21) Mean ratings ranged from 2.37/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.79/3 on Professionalism. The overall mean rating was 2.63/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

-

##### Trends Noted

Spring ratings were at much higher levels than previous semesters. All areas were at the acceptable level. Overall, candidates were successful in addressing all components associated with the Philosophy Statement assessment. While the majority of candidates performed at the acceptable level on most indicators, a greater percentage performed at the target level on indicators related to the teaching rationale and the appropriate teaching/learning climate. The same holds true for the CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* group.

Composition/Mechanics has traditionally been a weakness. However, that area as well as other areas did drastically improve with the spring group of candidates.

#### Internship

##### Spring 2011 – Campus Group

(N= 25) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.28/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.83/3 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.56/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

##### Spring 2011 – Hinds Group

(N= 10) Mean ratings ranged from 2.29/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 3.0/3 on Teaching Rationale and Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate. The overall mean rating was 2.76/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

##### Fall 2011 – Campus Group

(N= 18) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.44/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Teaching Rationale, Content, and Composition/Mechanics to 2.55/3 on Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate. The overall mean rating was 2.47/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

-

##### Fall 2011 – Hinds Group

(N= 8) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.62/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Professionalism to 2.87/3 on Teaching Rationale, Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate, and Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 2.79/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.


##### Trends Noted

All areas were at the acceptable level for spring. With composition/mechanics being at the lowest rating for both the intro group and internship groups, it continues to be identified as an area of weakness.

##### Use of Evaluation Results


Continue to track Praxis I scores to identify first-attempt pass rates, as the writing subtest links to the previous weakness in Composition/Mechanics. Implement grammar/writing workshops with elementary education candidates.

##### Related Items

 GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

 GE 05: Self

 GE 10: Values

 SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

#### EDD 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### 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.

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

See results below.

When, Where, and with Whom Were Results Disseminated:

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

Analysis of Results:

**Ed.D. Admission Portfolio Summary**

Semester	Average Score	Number Submitted	# Pass		# Marginal Pass		# Fail		# Repeaters
Fall 2011	1.97	11	4	36%	2	18%	5	45%	1 (F)
Spring 2011	2.02	12	4	33%	5	42%	3	25%	1 (F)
Fall 2010	2.14	8	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%	0
Spring 2010	2.09	11	4	36%	2	18%	5	45%	4 (4 F)
Fall 2009	1.89	15	6	40%	1	7%	8	53%	2 (2 P)
Spring 2009	2.14	35	18	51%	7	20%	10	29%	1 (F)
Fall 2008	1.88	10	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	1 (P)
Spring 2008	2.19	11	7	64%	1	9%	3	27%	0
Fall 2007	1.83	10	3	30%	4	40%	3	30%	1 (F)

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

Program faculty reviewed the portfolio instructions, rubric, and tips for success. The instructions, rubric, presentation, and tips remain on the Ed.D. website.

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

Submissions are pretty stable, except for the 2009 bubble. 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). Anecdotal data from faculty suggest that there were quite a few submissions from applicants who seemed to be underprepared for doctoral work. Possibly the economic conditions are encouraging students who are not ready for doctoral work to apply to programs anyway. Those who submit a second time were not successful.

**Related Items**

**GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

**GE 02: Communication**

**SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

**EDD 02: LO Program Specific Content**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 rather small group of candidates in spring 2011. The pass rate was high. Pass rate has increased dramatically since spring 2006. Faculty and candidates attribute this to increased number and quality of research and statistics courses as well as faculty study sessions and online tutorials. Since some students were detected attempting to cheat on comps in another program, the computers where the test is administered no longer allow internet access or USB port access during testing. All candidates are encouraged to sit for comps during the spring before they hope to take ELR 888 *Dissertation Seminar* since they must pass all three sections of comps before they may take this annually offered course. This gives them the following summer for any needed retakes. Therefore, comps are not usually need during the fall semesters.

**Summary of Results:**

	Fall 2011			Summer 2011			Spring 2011			Fall 2010			Summer 2010			Spring 2010		
Doctor of Education	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R
Number Passed	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	7	0	0	0	2	3	17	15	14	
Number Failed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	

\* C= Curriculum section; S= Supervision section; R= Research section

	Fall 2009			Summer 2009			Spring 2009		
Doctor of Education	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R
Number Passed	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	1
Number Failed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Fall 2008			Summer 2008			Spring 2008			Fall 2007			Summer 2007			Spring 2007		
Doctor of Education	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R
Number Passed	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	5
Number Failed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

	Fall 2006			Summer 2006			Spring 2006			Fall 2005			Summer 2005			Spring 2005		
Doctor of Education	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R	C	S	R
Number Passed	1	1	0	1	2	6	14	15	7	6	4	2	9	9	7	3	3	2
Number Failed	0	0	3	0	0	4	2	5	10	0	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	2

#### Use of Evaluation Results

##### Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

Will continue to re-vamp questions to match the tracks of the candidates. The majority of new candidates are in the higher education track. Continued use of the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council, a group of faculty and staff from across the university to help with decision making for the program. Earlier analysis revealed that our comprehensive examination was not demanding enough and that our students were weak in the area of research. We have added a required research course, strengthened our comprehensive examination, and added study courses and tutoring for our students who are retaking sections of the comprehensive examination. We have seen an increase in our pass rate on the Research section of the comprehensive examination. Faculty felt that it was time to add additional objective questions to the research section. A data base of true/false and multiple choice questions has been developed for ease of random item selection and multiple test question construction. Additional questions continue to be added to the database and are used for the research section in addition to the article analysis sections.

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

We are please that the pass rate has improved, especially in the area of research.

##### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 02: Communication](#)

[SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

#### EDD 03: LO Ability to Plan

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### 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.

##### Results of Evaluation

Analysis of Results:

Overall, the candidates are performing very well on this assessment (89.4% average correct of total possible). The highest scores for this group were section 7 (Narrative/Reflection) (94%) and section 1 (Identify the Problem) (97%). The lowest scores were on section 2 (Describe Hunches and Hypotheses) (87%), section 3 (Identify Questions and Data) (87%), and section 6 (Analyze Political Realities and Root Causes) (87%). These results are consistent with those from previous years. It should be noted that with such a small N the effects were great from the 1 student who did not follow directions for sections 5 and 7.

##### Summary of Results:

The Needs Assessment Project is completed in CUR 812 *Comprehensive Assessment and Data Analysis* which is offered for doctoral students each Fall. The N for Fall 2008 was 22, for Fall 2009 was 19, for Fall 2010 was 14, and for Fall 2011 was 15.

Area	Possible Score	Average Score 2008	Percent 2008	Average Score 2009	Percent 2009	Average Score 2010	Percent 2010	Average Score 2011	Percent 2011
1. Identify the Problem	15	13.5	90%	14.6	98%	14.5	97%	13.8	92%
2. Describe	10	8.6	86%	9.1	91%	9.2	91%	8.7	87%

Hunches and Hypotheses									
3. Identify Questions and Data	10	9.2	92%	9.0	90%	8.6	86%	8.7	87%
4. Analyze Multiple Measures	20	17.5	87.5%	17.7	89%	18.7	93.5%	17.6	88%
5. Analyze Political Realities and Root Causes	10	8.8	88%	9.3	93%	9.2	92%	8.7	87%
6. Develop an Action/ Implementation Plan	20	18.1	90.5%	18.0	90%	18.2	91%	17.7	89%
7. Narrative (Reflection)	15	14.6	97.3%	14.4	96%	14.3	95.3%	14.1	94%
Total	100	90.3	90.3%	92.1	92.1%	92.7	92.7%	89.4	89.4%

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

The instructions were improved to more closely reflect candidate ability to impact student learning. These results seem to be in alignment with the DSU Delta P<sub>3</sub> Model since the Unit believes that education is interactive and reflective (Guiding Principle 2). There has been an emphasis on reflective learning.

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

It is good to see that Analyze Multiple Measures increased. One student in particular had difficulty with sections 2, 3, & 6 and since this is such a small N, it affected the results. Overall, it is felt that this project provides candidates with much needed practice with real world problem solving and data analysis

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 03: Quantitative Skills

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

**EDD 04: LO Clinical Practice**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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:

Student	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4	Review of Literature	Mentor Evaluation	Final
1	98	98	88	92	88	90	91
2	98	98	92	98	94	99	96
3	95	93	89	0	0	0	55

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Analysis of Results:

There were (3) candidates in the class. The candidates in the course had previously taken AED 636 *Practicum in School Administration* and AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration*, so they were very familiar and comfortable with the format and nature of the course. There was 1 student who received a failing grade and therefore has been dismissed from the program because she did not submit 3 assignments. The other 2 performed well (1 A and 1 B).

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 10: Values

**EDD 05: LO Ability to Support Student Learning and Development**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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**

Overall the scores have remained rather consistent. There are some issues with students following directions carefully, especially in the Instructional Goals section.

Summary of Results: This assessment is completed as part of the course, CUR 819 *Curriculum Construction and Coordination*. It is taught each summer.

Student	Introduction (20 points)	Instructional Goals (20 points)	Learning Activities (20 points)	Evaluation Techniques (20 points)	List of References and Resources (20 points)	Overall (100 points)
1	18	12	20	20	16	86
2	20	20	20	20	20	100
3	18	10	20	20	15	83
4	20	15	19	19	20	93
5	20	20	20	20	20	100
6	20	20	20	20	20	100
7	20	12	20	20	20	92
8	20	15	20	20	19	94
9	18	10	18	20	17	83
10	15	20	20	15	20	80
11	20	16	20	20	19	95
<b>Average</b>	<b>19.0/20 (95%)</b>	<b>17.3/20 (87%)</b>	<b>19.7/20 (99%)</b>	<b>19.5/20 (98%)</b>	<b>18.7/20 (94%)</b>	<b>91.5 (91.5%)</b>
<b>2010 (N=10)</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>92.5%</b>	<b>97.5%</b>	<b>94.2%</b>
<b>2009 (N=8)</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>

Summary of Results:

Number / %	A	B	C	D	F
Summer 2011	5/45%	3/27%	3/27%		
Summer 2010	7/70%	2/20%	1/10%		
Summer 2009	8/100%				
Summer 2008					
Summer 2007	6 / 67%	2 / 22%	1 / 11%		
Summer 2006	1 / 25%	3 / 75%			

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Analysis of Results:

The program faculty are pleased with the scores. It is positive that the highest scores are in the Learning Activities category.

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

None at this time.

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

The scores have improved over those from 2006 and 2007.

**Related Items**

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 02: Communication](#)

[GE 10: Values](#)

[SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

**EDS-EAS 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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 – Three candidates submitted scores. The average was 4.00 and the scores ranged from 3.5 to 4.75.
- GRE Analytic Writing – Four candidates submitted scores. The average was 3.375 and the scores ranged from 3.0 to 4.0.

- Praxis Writing Score-

The mean from the 2012 CAAP was somewhat higher than that of the past two past years. The mean from the 2012 GRE Analytic Writing assessment was lower than that of the previous year.


CAAP Scores 2011							
Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	2009 Calendar Year	2010 Calendar Year	2011 Calendar Year
3.75	3.5	3.25	4.0	3.5	4.00	3.75	4.75
3.0	3.5	5.5	3.5	4.5	5.00	3.50	3.5
3.0	3.25	4.5		5.	3.00	4.00	3.75
3.5	4.0	4.0		3.5	3.75	3.25	
3.75	4.5	3.0		4.0	3.25	3.75	
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)

GRE Analytical Writing		
2009	2010	2011
430	500	3.0
410	380	4.0
360	550	3.5
420	310	3.0
550	330	
390	390	
430		
290		
460		
670		
330		
430.91 (avg)	410 (avg)	3.375 (avg)

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. In late 2010, the Educational Leadership faculty considered adding the Praxis I Writing Assessment as a choice for the test of verbal/written ability. A score of 174 was suggested; this would bring the program admissions test into line with those used by other Ed.S. programs in the College of Education. No action was taken on this proposal during 2011 because of changes in federal financial aid requirements regarding admission status.

2. None at this time.

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 02: Communication**

 **GE 03: Quantitative Skills**

 **SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**



**EDS-EAS 02: LO Program Specific Content**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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 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 2012, 11 candidates took comprehensive examinations, in the Spring, and 11 in the Summer and Fall. The average score was 1.40. The average scores on each question ranged from 1.0 (Q2) to 1.8 (Q4).

Data have been collected by question to provide diagnostic information. The overall average score of 1.40 was slightly lower than the overall average scores of 1.56 in 2009 and 1.50 in 2010.


**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. No specific trend was found when compared with scores from previous years.
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**

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

**EDS-EAS 03: LO Ability to Plan**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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**

In 2012, 26 candidates completed the Curriculum Alignment Project.

The average score for the project was 4.65 with the lowest score being 3.6 and the highest being 5.0. 12 candidates received a score of 5.0. The highest score was in Planning (4.73). The lowest scores were in Creativity (4.54), Compilation (4.54), and Impact on Student Learning (4.54).

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Faculty will review the assignment to address student weaknesses in Creativity, Compilation, and Impact on Student Learning. Course content will be reviewed to ensure that knowledge and skills related to management of a school or school district are addressed appropriately.

**Related Items**

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

**EDS-EAS 04: LO Clinical Practice**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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 2012, Mentor Evaluation Forms were completed on 17 candidates in AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration*. Fifteen candidates received the grade of A (88%) and 2 received the grade of B (12%). An A was identified as the average grade.

The average grade was somewhat higher than that of past years, but the number of candidates in past years was smaller than in 2011.

Grades	Grade Distribution		
1 = A			
2 = B			
3 = C			
N = 17	Grade	N	%
3	A	15	88
2	B	2	12
1	C	0	0
<b>Mean</b>			
<b>2.8</b>			

**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**

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 08: Perspectives](#)

▶ [GE 10: Values](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

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

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 2012, 20 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.

2011 ratings were much higher than those of 2008, 2009, and 2010.


2008 (Baseline Year) N = 27	2009 N = 43	2010 N = 22	2011 N = 20
100	63	100	100
100	53	95	100
97	58	90	100
97	63	95	92
97	91	92	95
97	85	95	94
97	89	85	100
97	93	95	100
97	56	89	99
94	50	100	100
94	80	90	93
94	75	98	100
94	78	90	100
93	80	92	98
93	75	87	100
93	92	100	100
93	60	95	75
93	77	95	100
90	78	100	99
90	93	92	100
90	67	87	
87	72	100	
87	98		
84	80		
83	84		
80	49		
80	76		
	70		
	70		
	65		
	86		
	76		
	74		
	76		
	66		
	65		
	71		
	91		
	87		
	88		
	93		
	66		
	71		
<b>Mean 92.26</b>	<b>Mean 75.12</b>	<b>Mean 93.7</b>	<b>Mean 97.25</b>

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. No changes recommended at this time.


2. It should also be noted that the project requirements were revised for 2010, and continue to be examined in 2011 to match the curriculum management cycle used in many Mississippi school districts.

**Related Items**

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 02: Communication**

 **GE 10: Values**

 **SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

---

**EDS-EAS 06: LO Dispositions**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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**

Nineteen candidates were reviewed at application to the comprehensive exam. No candidates received below a rating of 3 (meets expectations).

The results are comparable to those of past years.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. It is recommended that the Dispositions Rating Scale be administered as a self-assessment in CUR 701 *Philosophy of Education*. This will begin with the Fall 2012 semester. 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**

GE 02: Communication

GE 10: Values

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

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

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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**

In 2011, a total of 18 Ed.S. majors took the comprehensive examination. Ninety-five percent passed the examination. All of the candidates responded to questions for CEL 705 *Early Childhood Education Practicum* & CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum*. These questions are required for the comprehensive examination. Of the 18 responses for CEL 705 *Early Childhood Education Practicum*, 4 received target ratings, 13 received acceptable ratings, and 1 received an unacceptable rating. Of the 18 responses for CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum*, 8 received target ratings, 8 received acceptable ratings, and 2 received unacceptable ratings. Candidates chose to answer questions related to CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education*, CEL 712 *Leadership Roles in Elementary Education*, or CSP 616 *Behavior Management*. Eighteen of the candidates responded to prompts for CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education* with three 3 receiving target ratings, 12 receiving acceptable ratings, and three receiving unacceptable ratings. Fifteen responded to prompts from CEL 712 *Leadership Roles in Elementary Education* with four receiving a target rating, 10 receiving acceptable ratings, and one receiving an unacceptable rating. Two of the candidates responded to prompts for CSP 616 *Behavior Management* with one receiving an acceptable rating and one receiving an unacceptable rating.

The majority of the candidates (95%) demonstrated comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the important concepts and topics encountered throughout the Ed.S. program of study.

**Trends Noted**

Performance has remained consistent. The pass rate for the 2011 candidates is slightly less than the 2010 candidates but the number of 2011 candidates is greater.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1 & 2. No changes will be made.

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

**EDS-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate skill in verbal ability**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 choose 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

Twenty-two candidates gained full acceptance in the Ed.S. program in 2011. Their Praxis writing scores ranged from 174-179. CAAP writing scores ranged from 3-4. NTE scores ranged from 653-675. All candidates demonstrated acceptable verbal ability.

#### Trends Noted

No trends are apparent.

#### 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. It was agreed to petition the Curriculum Committee to allow the Ed.S. program to align with the State Department of Education's writing requirement. The outcome of the petition is not yet known.

#### Related Items

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

Candidates in CEL706 *Middle Grades Practicum* (N=8) during the Spring 2011 demonstrated the following abilities at the listed rates: selected developmentally appropriate objectives (95.83%), planned appropriate teaching procedures (100%), selected a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons (100%), prepared appropriate assessment materials and procedures (95.83%), used assessment information (91.67%), used knowledge of students' background to make instruction relevant (100%), integrated knowledge from several subject areas (100%), incorporated diversity (100%), and used a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons (95.83%).

Candidates in CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education*, Fall 2011 (N=9) demonstrated the following abilities at the listed rates: selected developmentally appropriate objectives (96.30%), planned appropriate teaching procedures (85.19%), selected a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons (77.78%), prepared appropriate assessment materials and procedures (85.19%), used assessment information (88.89%), used knowledge of students' background to make instruction relevant (92.59%), integrated knowledge from several subject areas (96.30%), incorporated diversity (96.30%), and used a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons (85.19%).

Though the candidates demonstrated the ability to plan effective lessons, the lowest ratings were noted in the ability to select a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons.

#### Trends Noted

No specific trends are apparent.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Revisit and reteach, if necessary, course content and experiences for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* that involve the selection of appropriate materials and technology for planning lessons.

2. Past deficits in the selection of appropriate materials and technology have not yet been resolved. This topic will be addressed in all courses that require lesson planning. The Graduate Teacher Work Sample was revised to make the use of technology a requirement. This area of lesson planning will continue to be watched.

#### Related Items

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 09: Cross-disciplinary Appreciation

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

The majority of candidates in CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* (N= 8) received either outstanding or acceptable ratings in all areas of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI). Lower scores were noted in the areas of providing learning experiences that accommodate different resources (M= 2.44/3), using a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (M= 2.56/3), and using family and/or community resources (M= 2.56/3). Improvements were noted in the following areas: provide opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking (M=2.67/3, up from 2.00/3 in 2010), and develop and use a variety of formal assessments (M=2.67/3, up from 1.90/3 in 2010).

The majority of candidates in CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum* (N=9) received acceptable ratings in all areas of professional knowledge and skills during clinical practice. The lowest ratings were noted for the candidates' ability to provide learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs (M=2.88/3) and the ability to establish opportunities for communication with parents (M=2.88/3).

Overall, the candidates demonstrated that they have the content and pedagogical content knowledge to implement effective instruction. However, providing learning experiences that accommodate student differences was a weakness for both the early childhood and middle level focus of the practicum experience.

### Trends Noted

Candidates in both practicum experiences showed weakness in accommodating for student differences.

### 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

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

▶ [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

Candidates in CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* (N= 10) were able to interpret assessment data (M= 2.3/3) and demonstrate evidence of impact on student learning (M=2.30/3). They were also able to accurately interpret student learning (M= 2.80/3).

All candidates in CEL 706 *Middle Grades Practicum* (N=9) met the indicators for meaningfully interpreting student data and drawing appropriate conclusions (M=2.89/3) and demonstrating evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal (M=2.89/3).

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. Beginning Spring 2011, the Teacher Work Sample was modified to include more in-depth exploration of the community's impact on contextual factors and task 6 of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample was modified to require candidates to analyze prescribed subgroups which reflect current classroom populations, assessments, and school district policies. Overall ratings for these areas improved. These areas will continue to be monitored.

#### Related Items

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 05: Self](#)

▶ [GE 10: Values](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

In Spring and Summer 2011, candidate dispositions ratings (N=8) revealed an average of 3.20/4 for fairness, 3.73/4 for the belief that all students can learn, 3.66/4 for professionalism, 3.56/4 for resourcefulness, 3.66/4 for dependability, and 3.66/4 for commitment to inquiry. The lowest ratings were for fairness, but the highest ratings were for the belief that all students can learn. According to candidate's self-ratings, most (94%) gave themselves "exceeds expectations" for fairness, belief that all students can learn, professionalism, resourcefulness, dependability, and commitment to inquiry.

Overall, the candidates demonstrated positive dispositions that reflect professionalism.

#### Trends Noted

The information collected shows an overall improvement in the candidates' abilities as measured by the instruments given. Although some minor weaknesses were noted, these were not significant and the faculty is taking steps to correct each weakness.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. No changes will be made.
2. A document with suggestions for types of evidence for each disposition criteria was developed and posted on the webpage. This document contained suggestions for demonstrating fairness. This area will continue to be watched.

#### Related Items

- [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- [GE 02: Communication](#)
- [GE 10: Values](#)
- [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

All of the Cohort VI candidates passed a comprehensive examination during the Spring 2011 semester. The MAT 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 examination. The rubric scoring criteria was represented by 1-Unacceptable, 2-Acceptable and 3-Target. The Cohort VI candidates met all requirements of the MAT program. The Elementary Cohort VI overall average for each course question was as follows: CUR/CEL 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation* (2.63), CUR/CEL 611 *Classroom Management* (2.38), CSP 546 *Advanced Survey of Exceptional Children* (2.38), CUR/CEL 614 *Methods of Instruction* (2.63), and CML 509 *Technology in Education* (2.38).

The Secondary Cohort VI overall average for each course question is as follows: CUR/CEL 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation* (2.00), CUR/CEL 611 *Classroom Management* (2.00), CSP 546 *Advanced Survey of Exceptional Children* (2.25), CUR/CEL 614 *Methods of Instruction* (3.00), and CML 509 *Technology in Education* (3.00).

#### Trends Noted

The students' showed strengths in the area of Development, Assessment and Evaluation and the Methods of Education Courses.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. This is the third year that the MAT 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. Study guides will be provided for students. Instructors will continue to monitor scores from the comprehensive exam to determine curriculum/content weaknesses in the courses.

#### Related Items

- [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- [GE 02: Communication](#)
- [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

In Spring 2011, Cohort VI candidates (14 students) were observed/evaluated using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument to determine their ability to plan, and in Fall 2011 Cohort VII was evaluated using Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument. During the Spring, results showed the averages for each indicator above a 2.00 which indicated that the students were successful in their abilities to plan.

In Fall 2011, Cohort VII candidates (14 students) were observed/evaluated using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument to determine their ability to plan. These students were required to teach a 7-day unit as part of their evaluation. The results showed improvement for each of the three observation/evaluations. Indicator 7 Plans lessons that integrate knowledge from several subject areas and indicator 8 Incorporates multiculturalism and diversity in lessons is the weakest area for the first evaluation. There is an increase in the averages for these indicators during the second and third evaluations.

### Trends Noted

Although all of the candidates scored at the Acceptable or Outstanding level, the data show that some students had lower scores on "incorporates multiculturalism and diversity in lessons". Overall, the candidates demonstrated planning and preparation skills of highly qualified teachers.

### 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. Instructors will provide research that reinforces effective instruction. Saturday classes offer workshop style classes that focus on strategies for incorporating differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners, data analysis and the importance of using a variety of assessments. Candidates are encouraged to attend professional development from their school districts.

### Related Items

- ▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- ▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)
- ▶ [GE 09: Cross-disciplinary Appreciation](#)
- ▶ [GE 10: Values](#)
- ▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

Cohort VI demonstrated average performance over three fall observations/evaluations using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument. The weakest area for these candidates was indicator 23, "Uses family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning". The average across the three observations was 2.21 on a 3.00 scale.

Cohort VII demonstrated average performance over three fall observations/evaluations using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument.

Over the three evaluations for each Cohort, the candidates demonstrated effective practice in the classroom. The areas evaluated were (1) communication and interaction, (2) teaching for learning, (3) managing the learning environment, and (4) assessment of student learning. The data show their weaknesses to be "uses community resources". Most of the districts represented in this cohort are poor districts with limited community resources.

### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Community resources may not be available for the candidates, therefore, being creative in developing lessons should be the focus.
2. The MAT coordinator will provide more opportunities in class to discuss and implement creative ways to use family and community resources in disadvantaged environments.

### Related Items

- ▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- ▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)
- ▶ [GE 09: Cross-disciplinary Appreciation](#)
- ▶ [GE 10: Values](#)
- ▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

#### 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 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

Cohort VI and Cohort VII were required to complete the same assignments during their fall and spring semesters. The candidates used the components of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) to analyze research-based strategies from professional literature, discuss how they would use those strategies in their classrooms, and link the research to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The candidates were required to develop a Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument seven day teaching unit during the fall using student data to develop the lessons. The Graduate Teacher Work Sample folio was completed by Cohort VI during the Spring 2011 semester using the seven day unit that was taught during Fall 2010 semester. All candidates must ultimately receive a rating of 3 on each element.

#### Use of Evaluation Results


1. Faculty will meet to discuss revisions of TWS to reflect the teachers' ability to plan for diverse students.
2. Cohort VI ratings on the first submission of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample in Spring 2011 were higher than those of previous cohorts. As a result, not as much revision will be needed in order to receive acceptable ratings.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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 the average traditional route candidate 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.

The candidates demonstrated the knowledge of the following: (1) readiness to engage in professional experiences, (2) demonstrate commitment, (3) hold high but realistic expectations for students, (4) are committed to developmentally responsive and socially equitable teaching and learning, (5) realize the importance of connecting curriculum and assessment that accommodates and supports the learning of all young adolescents, work with others, and (6) identify opportunities for collaboration and leadership. Trends Noted There was gradual but continued improvement for candidates in all areas related to becoming an effective teacher.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. For Cohort VI and Cohort VII, compare ratings on the first and final administration to identify areas of growth.
2. Discussions/assignments in Saturday classes will promote teacher growth and dispositions.

#### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [GE 05: Self](#)

 [GE 10: Values](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

#### MED-EAS 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

### 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)

1.a. 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.

2.a. The School Leadership Licensure Assessment will be taken by all candidates near the end of their program.

3.a. 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.

3.b. Mean scores and standard deviations will be calculated for the total and each section.

### Results of Evaluation

Cohort XIII School Leadership Licensure Assessment Performance

Six of the nine members of Cohort XIII passed the School Leadership Licensure Assessment examination on the first attempt; all three who did not pass took the examination again and two passed. The third student is currently employed as an administrator in a district but has not reported passing scores on the School Leadership Licensure Assessment.

A summary of results follows:

	2010-11 Cohort XIII	National for YR. (2010-11)
Mean Score	176.81	166.12
Median Score	182	167
Lowest score	158	112
Highest score	185	200
Number included	9	3476
MS Passing score	169	NA
First time pass rate	6/67%	NA

After reviewing and comparing results of both Cohorts XII and XIII, it should be noted that the mean score did not change much from year to year (177.00/176.81); however, the median score did rise for Cohort XIII (178/182) which indicates more students scored higher. In comparing Cohort 13 data to national summary data, Delta State University candidates outperformed candidates on overall scale score by more than ten points (176.81(Delta State University)/166.12 (National) and Delta State University candidates recorded a median score that was 15 points higher than the national average (182/167).


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.

### 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 XIV. 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

2. None at this time.

### Related Items

 [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

 [GE 02: Communication](#)

 [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

### MED-EAS 02: LO Program Specific Content

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

### 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 nine(9) candidates passed the comprehensive examination on the first try by scoring 70% or above.

The overall mean score for Cohort XIII in May 2011 was 14.22 with a standard deviation of 2.22. 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 two years.

Summary of Candidate Performance by Cohort XIII (2010-11)  
Comprehensive Examination

	TOTAL	Section I Evaluation of Actions (Vignettes)	Section II Synthesis & Problem Solving (Case analysis)	Section III Analysis & Decision Making (Documents)
Points Possible	19.00	10.00	3.00	6.00
Mean Score	14.22	7.22	2.00	5.00
Mean % of Total Possible Points	74.8	72.2	66.7	83.3
Standard Deviation	2.22	0.97	0.50	1.22

Assessment Matrix by Standard  
Comprehensive Examination

	ELCC Standard Element																				
	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	5.1	5.2	5.3	6.1	6.2	6.3
Vignette 1		X				X	X			X											
Vignette 2				X	X						X	X		X							
Vignette 3	X								X	X	X										
Vignette 4																X		X	X		
Vignette 5																X	X	X	X		
Case			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Document 1	X	X			X	X	X	X					X	X							
Document 2													X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Document 3			X			X	X		X	X		X			X	X					

Cohort XIII Performance by Test Item  
Comprehensive Examination

Item	Total Possible	Mean	S.D.
Vignette 1	2	1.38	0.52
Vignette 2	2	1.44	0.53
Vignette 3	2	1.56	0.53
Vignette 4	2	1.44	0.53
Vignette 5	2	1.56	0.53
Case	3	1.89	0.60
Document 1	2	1.78	0.44
Document 2	2	1.78	0.44
Document 3	2	1.56	0.53

Cohort XIII Performance by ELCC Standard Measured  
Comprehensive Examination

ELCC Standard	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.3
Avg. % correct	89	67	67	67	67	78	78	78	78	67	67

ELCC Standard	4.1	4.2	4.3	5.1	5.2	5.3	6.1	6.2	6.3
Avg. % correct	67	67	67	89	89	89	78	78	89

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. Consideration should be given to moving the Comprehensive Examination to early April since program will be ending June 30.

Related Items

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 04: Inquiry and Technology

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

**MED-EAS 03: LO Ability to Plan**

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

**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 XIII (2010-11)

Mean: 16.58

SD: 3.51

N = 9

Seven (7) of the (9) candidates demonstrated developing or above performance on the Educational Leadership Constituent Council standard elements assessed by this project. Two (2) candidates were rated as rudimentary on the initial project; all candidates were provided individual remediation and allowed to resubmit the project with the required and suggested changes in order to meet the standards. Additionally, all (9) candidates presented their results to their respective school faculties and also 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. For the past three 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

**Cohort XIII Raw Scores – Data Analysis/School Improvement Plan Project**

Data Analysis Scores	11.00	13.00	15.75	18.00	18.75	19.25	20.00	20.50
Frequency	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Percent	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%	11.1%

**Cohort XIII Candidate Performance by Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standard**

Rating	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	4.1	6.2	Mean	2.47	2.47	3.33	2.47	2.47	1.69	2.47	3.33	3.33
4			4					4	4										
3.75																			
3.5	1	1		1	1		1												
3.25			4																
3	2	2		2	2	1	2	4	4										
2.75	1	1		1	1	1	1												
2.5	1	1		1	1	1	1												
2	2		1	2	2	3	2	1	1										
1	1	2		1	1	3	1												

- 4 - Exemplary
- 3 – Proficient
- 2- Developing
- 1 – Rudimentary

**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**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 02: Communication**

»  **SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

---

**MED-EAS 04: LO Clinical Practice**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 XIII 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 except Standards 1.3, 1.5, 2.4, 3.3, and 4.3. Three of the nine candidates were rated as "meets expectations" on these standards. Three of these standards (1.5, 3.3, 4.3) were given similar ratings for the previous cohort group. 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 XIII 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.

**Internship I – Cohort XIII (2011-12)**

	Above Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Needs Extreme Improvement	Unable to Rate
1.2 Articulate the school's vision	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
1.3 Motivate staff, students and families to implement the school's vision	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
1.4 Steward & build commitment to the vision	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
1.5 Promote community involvement in the vision and school improvement	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
2.1 Promote a positive school culture	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
2.2 Provide an effective instructional program	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
2.3 Apply best practice to student learning	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
2.4 Design comprehensive professional growth plans	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
3.1 Manage the organization	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
3.2 Manage operations	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
3.3 Manage fiscal, human & material resources	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
4.1 Collaborate with families & community members	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
4.2 Respond to community interests & needs	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
4.3 Mobilize community resources	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
5.1 Act with integrity	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
5.2 Act fairly	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			
5.3 Act ethically	5 (56%)	4 (44%)			

6.1 Understand the larger school context	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
6.2 Communicate & respond to the larger school context	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
6.3 Advocate and influence the larger context to benefit students & families	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			

Internship II – Cohort XIII (2010-2011)

	Above Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Needs Extreme Improvement	Unable to Rate
1.2 Articulate the school's vision	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
1.3 Motivate staff, students and families to implement the school's vision	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
1.4 Steward & build commitment to the vision	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
1.5 Promote community involvement in the vision and school improvement	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
2.1 Promote a positive school culture	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
2.2 Provide an effective instructional program	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
2.3 Apply best practice to student learning	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
2.4 Design comprehensive professional growth plans	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
3.1 Manage the organization	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
3.2 Manage operations	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
3.3 Manage fiscal, human & material resources	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
4.1 Collaborate with families & community members	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
4.2 Respond to community interests & needs	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
4.3 Mobilize community resources	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
5.1 Act with integrity	9 (100%)	0 (0%)			
5.2 Act fairly	9 (100%)	0 (0%)			
5.3 Act ethically	9 (100%)	0 (0%)			
6.1 Understand the larger school context	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
6.2 Communicate & respond to the larger school context	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			
6.3 Advocate and influence the larger context to benefit students & families	6 (75%)	3 (33%)			





	Above Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Needs Extreme Improvement	Unable to Rate
1.2 Articulate the school's vision	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
1.3 Motivate staff, students and families to implement the school's vision	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
1.4 Steward & build commitment to the vision	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
1.5 Promote community involvement in the vision and school improvement	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
2.1 Promote a positive school culture	8 (89%)	0 (0%)			
2.2 Provide an effective instructional program	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
2.3 Apply best practice to student learning	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
2.4 Design comprehensive professional growth plans	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
3.1 Manage the organization	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
3.2 Manage operations	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
3.3 Manage fiscal, human & material resources	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
4.1 Collaborate with families & community members	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
4.2 Respond to community interests & needs	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
4.3 Mobilize community resources	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
5.1 Act with integrity	9 (100%)	0 (0%)			
5.2 Act fairly	9 (100%)	0 (0%)			
5.3 Act ethically	9 (100%)	0 (0%)			
6.1 Understand the larger school context	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
6.2 Communicate & respond to the larger school context	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			

6.3 Advocate and influence the larger context to benefit students & families	7 (78%)	2 (22%)			
--	------------	------------	--	--	--

Mean Scores on Intern Performance Assessment for Cohort XIII (2010-2011)


	Item 1 ELCC 1.2	Item 2 ELCC 1.3	Item 3 ELCC 1.4	Item 4 ELCC 1.5	Item 5 ELCC 2.1
Internship 1	3.78	3.67	3.78	3.67	3.89
Internship 2	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.78
Internship 3	3.78	3.67	3.89	3.67	4.00
Average	3.74	3.67	3.78	3.67	3.89
	Item 6 ELCC 2.2	Item 7 ELCC 2.3	Item 8 ELCC 2.4	Item 9 ELCC 3.1	Item 10 ELCC 3.2
Internship 1	3.56	3.78	3.56	3.56	3.56
Internship 2	3.67	3.78	3.67	3.78	3.78
Internship 3	3.89	3.89	3.67	3.89	3.89
Average	3.71	3.82	3.63	3.74	3.74
	Item 11 ELCC 3.3	Item 12 ELCC 4.1	Item 13 ELCC 4.2	Item 14 ELCC 4.3	Item 15 ELCC 5.1
Internship 1	3.56	3.56	3.56	3.56	3.89
Internship 2	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00
Internship 3	3.67	3.78	3.78	3.67	4.00
Average	3.63	3.67	3.67	3.63	3.96
	Item 16 ELCC 5.2	Item 17 ELCC 5.3	Item 18 ELCC 6.1	Item 19 ELCC 6.2	Item 20 ELCC 6.3
Internship 1	3.89	3.89	3.67	3.67	3.78
Internship 2	4.00	4.00	3.78	3.67	3.67
Internship 3	4.00	4.00	3.89	3.89	3.89
Average	3.96	3.96	3.78	3.74	3.78

**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**

 **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

 **GE 02: Communication**

 **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

 **GE 05: Self**

 **GE 10: Values**

 **SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

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 XIII members (n = 9)

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
- 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 XIII**

**Cohort XIII (2011): N=9**

	1. Vision	2. Culture	3. Management	4. Family and Community	5. Ethics	6. Larger Context
Mean	3.91	3.91	3.82	3.73	4.00	3.73
Std. Deviation	.30	.30	.40	.47	.00	.47
Minimum	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00
Maximum	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

	7. Application of Skills in Internships	8. Internship Experiences Accommodate Individual Needs
Mean	3.91	4.00
Std. Deviation	.30	.00
Minimum	3.00	4.00
Maximum	4.00	4.00

**Master's of Education Leadership Program Exit Survey of Graduates(ELPPQ)**

**During Last Semester – Cohort XIII**

**2011 N: 9 (100% response rate)**

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	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
1.2 articulate a school vision of learning	9 (100%)				
1.3 implement a school vision of learning	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
1.4 steward a school vision of learning	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
1.5 promote community involvement in a school vision	9 (100%)				
2. I believe I can:					
2.1 promote a positive school culture	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
2.2 provide an effective instructional program	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
2.3 apply best practice to student learning	9 (100%)				
2.4 design comprehensive growth plans for staff	9 (100%)				
3. I believe I can manage the:					
3.1 organization	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
3.2 operations	8 (89%)	1 (11%)			
3.3 resources	9 (100%)				
4. I believe I can:					
4.1 collaborate with families and other community members	7 (78%)	2 (12%)			
4.2 respond to community interests and needs	7 (78%)	2 (12%)			
4.3 mobilize community resources	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			
5. I believe I can act:					
5.1 with integrity	9 (100%)				
5.2 fairly	9 (100%)				
5.3 ethically	9 (100%)				
6. I believe I can:					
6.1 understand the larger	7 (78%)	2 (12%)			

educational context					
6.2 respond to the larger educational context	7 (78%)	2 (12%)			
6.3 influence the larger educational context	6 (67%)	3 (33%)			

**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 as 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**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 04: Inquiry and Technology

GE 10: Values

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

**MED-EAS 06: LO Exit Portfolio**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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 ISLLC 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 2010-11 program year, three candidates scored "exemplary" and six scored "proficient" on the Vita and Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards 1,2,3,4,5 sections of the portfolio. Seven students scored "exemplary" and two scored "proficient" on the section for Standard 6.

A summary of performance of candidates in Cohort

XIII is shown in tables below.

Candidates showed a particularly strong performance in the areas of Field experiences and Artifacts & Samples which can be correlated with the (3) twelve week internship experiences each candidate received while in the program. Each candidate was able to submit and justify artifacts and samples to support the work in their Exit Portfolio; this was an area in which it was expected that candidates would demonstrate strength since various work samples were required at various points during each internship.

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.

**Cohort XIII Summary of Performance on Exit Portfolio**

Portfolio Sections	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Mean	Standard Deviation
Vita	3	4	3.39	0.31
ELCC Standard 1	2	4	3.06	0.51
ELCC Standard 2	2	4	2.97	0.44
ELCC Standard 3	2	4	3.08	0.56
ELCC Standard 4	2	4	2.92	0.47
ELCC Standard 5	2	4	2.92	0.47
ELCC Standard 6	2	4	3.22	0.79
Field Experiences	2	4	3.64	0.53
Situational Analysis	2	4	3.06	0.46
Artifacts & Samples	3	4	3.92	0.13
TOTAL SCORE	22	40	32.18	0.31

**Cohort XIII Proficiency Ratings on Exit Portfolio  
By ISSLC/ Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standard**

	4 - Exemplary	3 - Proficient	2 - Developing	1 - Rudimentary
<b>Vita</b>	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0	0
ISSLC/ELCC Standard 1	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0	0
ISSLC/ELCC Standard 2	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0	0
ISSLC/ELCC Standard 3	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0	0
ISSLC/ELCC Standard 4	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0	0
ISSLC/ELCC Standard 5	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	0	0
ISSLC/ELCC Standard 6	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0	0

**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**

**GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

**GE 02: Communication**

**SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

**MED-EAS 07: LO Dispositions**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 #1 – Fairness and #3 – Professionalism. Candidates' rating were more varied from 1-4 on the categories of Resourcefulness, Dependability, and Commitment to Inquiry.

**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 XIII (2010-11)**

Disposition	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
#1 (ELCC 2.2, 4.1, 5.2)	9	3.00	4.00	3.22	.44
#2 (ELCC 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.2)	9	2.00	3.00	2.33	.50
#3 (ELCC 4.1)	9	3.00	3.00	3.00	.00
#4 (ELCC 4.3)	9	1.00	4.00	2.67	.87
#5	9	2.00	4.00	2.78	.67
#6	9	1.00	3.00	2.11	.78

**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. *These follow-up results were not available or reported for Cohort XIII.*

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

**Related Items**

[GE 02: Communication](#)

[GE 10: Values](#)

[SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

**MED-EAS 08: LO Clinical Correlations**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 the three sets of Clinical Correlations were 17.03, 16.47, and 17.64, respectively, with 20 representing the highest possible score. This same trend was noted in the proficiency ratings for which the percentage of candidates scoring in the Proficient or above range was 89% on Clinical Correlations I, 78% on Clinical Correlations II, and 87% on Clinical Correlations III.

The increase in the overall mean from Correlations 1 to Correlations 3 is attributed 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.

**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.

**Cohort XIII (2011)**

**Clinical Correlations Summary of Performance**

N=9



	Minimum	Maximum*	Mean	St. Dev.
Clinical Correlations 1 Internship I	15.00	19.25	17.03	1.47
Clinical Correlations 2 Internship II	11.50	19.25	16.47	2.42
Clinical Correlations 3 Internship III	12.25	19.75	17.64	2.23

\*Maximum score is 20

#### PROFICIENCY RATINGS BY STANDARDS

##### Clinical Correlations- Internship I

	4- Exemplary*	3- Proficient*	2- Developing*	1- Rudimentary*
ELCC Standard 1	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 2	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 3	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 4	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 5	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 6	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)	0

##### Clinical Correlations – Internship II

	4- Exemplary	3- Proficient	2- Developing	1- Rudimentary
ELCC Standard 1	56% (5)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0
ELCC Standard 2	56% (5)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0
ELCC Standard 3	56% (5)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0
ELCC Standard 4	56% (5)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0
ELCC Standard 5	56% (5)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0
ELCC Standard 6	56% (5)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0

##### Clinical Correlations – Internship III

	4- Exemplary	3- Proficient	2- Developing	1- Rudimentary
ELCC Standard 1	67% (6)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 2	67% (6)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 3	67% (6)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 4	67% (6)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 5	67% (6)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0
ELCC Standard 6	67% (6)	22% (2)	11% (1)	0

##### 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

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 03: Quantitative Skills

GE 04: Inquiry and Technology

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### 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

In 2011, a total of 75 online M.Ed. majors took the comprehensive examination. Fifty nine candidates passed the examination, thus yielding a pass rate of 79%. All candidates responded to items for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction*, CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, and Revision*, and CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*, which are requirements for the comprehensive examination. Of the responses for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction*, 15 received target ratings, 50 received acceptable ratings, and 10 received an unacceptable rating. Of the responses for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, and Revision*, 17 received target ratings, 51 received acceptable ratings, and 7 received an unacceptable rating. Of the responses for CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*, 17 received target ratings, 45 received acceptable ratings, and 13 received an unacceptable rating. Candidates had choices regarding questions to be answered for the following: CEL 611 *Classroom Management*, CEL 620 *Early Childhood Education*, CEL 621 *Middle Grades Education*, and CEL 630 *Practicum*. Fifty-four candidates responded to CEL 611 *Classroom Management* with 9 receiving target ratings, 40 receiving acceptable ratings, and 5 receiving a rating of unacceptable. Thirty-six candidates responded to CEL 620 *Early Childhood Education* with 5 receiving target ratings, 28 receiving acceptable ratings, and 3 receiving unacceptable ratings. Forty-seven candidates responded to CEL 621 *Middle Grades Education* with 6 receiving a target rating, 35 receiving acceptable ratings, and 6 receiving unacceptable ratings. Forty-seven candidates responded to CEL 630 *Practicum* with 7 receiving a target rating, 35 receiving acceptable ratings, and 5 receiving unacceptable ratings.

During Spring and Summer 2011, a total of 12 Tishomingo Cohort II M.Ed. majors took the comprehensive examination. Eleven candidates passed the exam, thus yielding a pass rate of 91%. All candidates are required to respond to items for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction*, CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, and Revision*, and CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*. Of the responses for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction*, 7 received target ratings and 5 received acceptable ratings. Of the responses for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, and Revision*, 6 received target ratings and 6 received acceptable ratings. Of the responses for CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*, 10 received target ratings and 2 received acceptable ratings. Candidates had choices between the following courses: CEL 611 *Classroom Management*, CEL 620 *Early Childhood Education*, CEL 621 *Middle Grades Education*, & CEL 630 *Practicum*. Twelve candidates responded to CEL 611 *Classroom Management* with 6 receiving target ratings and 6 receiving acceptable ratings. Ten candidates responded to CEL 620 *Early Childhood Education* with 5 receiving target ratings and 5 receiving acceptable ratings. Nine candidates responded to CEL 621 *Middle Grades Education* with 4 receiving a target rating, 4 receiving acceptable ratings, and 1 receiving an unacceptable rating. Twelve candidates responded to CEL 630 *Practicum* with 10 receiving a target rating, 1 receiving acceptable ratings, and 1 receiving unacceptable ratings.

Overall, all of the candidates demonstrated comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the important concepts and topics encountered throughout the M.Ed. program of study. The greatest number of failed responses was noted for CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*. However, the greatest number of target ratings was also noted for CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction* and CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, and Revision*.

#### Trends Noted

The passage rate for the comprehensive examination has improved since the first administration to the online candidates. It appears the dissemination of the comprehensive examination study guide continues to be effective.


#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Graduate faculty will continue to review the content and delivery as well as the comprehensive examination items for CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*. This is being done to ensure that the questions are appropriately constructed and measure the intended learning outcomes for the course.

2. Adjunct faculty teaching CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction* 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.

1. The content of the courses will be carefully examined to ensure that the pass/fail rate for questions in all areas is consistent. The questions will be examined to ensure that they are constructed appropriately and cover the main topics taught in the classes.

#### Related Items

  GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

  GE 02: Communication

  GE 10: Values

  SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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 92 online candidates were admitted to the M.Ed. program in 2011. The verbal ability test scores that were verified indicated that 7 candidates had NTE scores that ranged from 653-675, 82 candidates had Praxis writing scores that ranged from 174-185, and 3 candidates had CAAP scores that ranged from 3-4.

All fully-admitted candidates demonstrated acceptable verbal ability.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty discussions explored the relevance of requiring a score of 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 was agreed to petition the Curriculum Committee to allow the M.Ed. program to align with the State Department of Education's writing requirement. The outcome of the petition is not yet known.

#### Related Items

  GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

  GE 02: Communication

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

**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**

Candidates enrolled in the Spring 2011 Tishomingo Cohort II CEL 630 *Practicum* (N=14) demonstrated the ability to select developmentally appropriate objectives (M=2.93/3), plan appropriate teaching procedures (M= 2.86/3), select a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons (M= 3.00/3), prepare appropriate assessment materials and procedures (M=2.71/3), use assessment information (M=2.71/3), use knowledge of students' background (M=2.93/3), integrate knowledge from several subject areas (M=2.93/3), incorporate diversity (M = 2.86/3), and use a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons (M= 2.93/3).

Weaknesses were noted in the candidates' ability to prepare appropriate assessment materials and use assessment information.

Improvement in technology appears to be sustained. Improvement was also noted in the candidate's use of contextual information to plan lessons.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. Revisit course content and experiences that involve aligning lessons with learning goals and integrating Physical Education and health into lessons.

2. None at this time.

1. Faculty will discuss how to help candidates prepare more appropriate assessment materials and how to use assessment information.

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

**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**

A majority of the Tishomingo candidates (86%) enrolled in CEL 630 *Practicum* during Summer 2011 (N= 14) received either target or acceptable ratings in for TIAI indicators 10-34. The lowest ratings were noted for communicating assessment criteria and performance standards (M=2.71/3), developing and using a variety of informal assessments (M=2.71/3), and developing and using a variety of formal assessments (M=2.71/3).

Overall, the candidates demonstrated that they have the content and pedagogical content knowledge to implement effective instruction.

**Trends Noted**

Candidates have consistently implemented sound instruction and have demonstrated content and pedagogical content knowledge.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1. 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.

2. No changes will be made.

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 04: Inquiry and Technology

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011  
End: 6/30/2012

**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

A majority of the candidates (85%) in CEL 630 *Practicum* Tishomingo Cohort II during Fall 2011 (N= 14) demonstrated the ability to meaningfully interpret student data and draw appropriate conclusions (M= 3.00/3). All were able to demonstrate evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal (M=3.00/3).

Overall, the candidates demonstrated that they were able to positively impact student learning and provide evidence of such impact.

#### Trends Noted

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 learning goal remains consistent.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. No changes will be made.

2. Faculty discussed the rigor of this assessment in regards to the portion of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample which 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. Thus, Spring 2011, Task 6 of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample was modified to require candidates to analyze prescribed subgroups which reflect current classroom populations, assessments, and school district policies.

#### Related Items

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

▶ [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

#### MED-ELE 06: LO Demonstrate appropriate dispositions

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### 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

Spring and summer online candidates (N=66) who applied for graduation were rated by faculty who taught online classes. The following means were noted:

Spring 2011 (N=32)

Fairness- 3.19/4; belief that all students can learn-3.59/4; professionalism- 3.59/4; resourcefulness- 3.44/4; dependability-3.56/4; and commitment to inquiry- 3.34/4.

Summer I 2011 (N=11)

Fairness- 3.36/4; belief that all students can learn-3.45/4; professionalism- 3.45/4; resourcefulness- 3.36/4; dependability-3.45/4; and commitment to inquiry- 3.64/4.

Summer II 2011 (N=17)

Fairness- 3.47/4; belief that all students can learn-3.53/4; professionalism- 3.35/4; resourcefulness- 3.24/4; dependability-3.29/4; and commitment to inquiry- 3.41/4.

According to candidate self-ratings, 100% met or exceeded the criteria for fairness, belief that all students can learn, professionalism, resourcefulness, dependability, and commitment to inquiry.

Overall, the candidates demonstrated positive dispositions that reflect professionalism. A weakness continues to be noted related to the candidates' ability to demonstrate fairness.

##### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Courses that focus on instructional practices will highlight attributes of fairness to ensure our candidates understand the importance of ensuring that all students get the same opportunity to learn.

2. Faculty will develop tips for helping candidates identify and reflect upon their demonstrations of fairness. The tips will be added to the Dispositions Portfolio directions document.

#### Related Items

▶ [GE 10: Values](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

##### 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=69) completed an essay item that evaluated their ability to accept and to meet the diverse needs of students. Thirty-seven candidates received acceptable ratings and 28 received outstanding ratings. Four candidates received marginal or unacceptable ratings. The Tishomingo candidates (N=14) completed the same essay item. Nine received acceptable ratings and 5 received outstanding ratings. None received marginal or unacceptable ratings.

A majority of the candidates (97%) 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.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. No changes will be made.

#### Related Items

▶ [GE 06: Social Institutions](#)

▶ [GE 08: Perspectives](#)

▶ [GE 10: Values](#)

▶ [SP3.Ind06: Diversity](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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 candidates' last semester of enrollment the program.

#### Results of Evaluation

Candidate Data

Program Assessment II Special Education Comprehensive Examination 2011

2011 N=27 Pass 20 74% Fail 7 Met program goal for year Met program goal for every semester			
	Spring	Summer	Fall
Pass/Fail	N=9 Pass 7 Fail 2 78% pass Met program goal	N= 14 Pass 10 Fail 4 71% pass Met program goal	N= 4 Pass 3 Fail 1 75% pass Met program goal
QA CEC Standard 1	Mean 73 Median 80 Range 51-86	Mean 73 Median 78 Range 48-88	Mean 68 Median 68 Range 53-84
QB CEC Standard 2	Mean 73 Median 76 Range 59-86	Mean 74 Median 80 Range 56-91	Mean 75 Median 75 Range 59-94
QC CEC Standard 3	Mean 72 Median 68 Range 64-94	Mean 73 Median 77 Range 41-89	Mean 70 Median 71 Range 51-88
QD CEC Standard 9	Mean 75 Median 74 Range 52-91	Mean 77 Median 80 Range 57-92	Mean 73 Median 74 Range 63-82
Total Test	292/400 Mean 73 Median 72 Range 57-89	296/400 Mean 74 Median 82 Range 50-89	287/400 Mean 72 Median 72 Range 57-87
Mechanics	79%	81%	79%
Organization	73%	70%	75%
Clarity	75%	79%	75%
Content Breadth	67%	70%	61%
Content Depth	76%	74%	76%
Content Standards and accuracy	71%	73%	67%

Program goals are set for a 70% pass rate. This goal was reached in all three semesters.

#### Trends Noted

In 2011, 27 candidates completed comprehensive exams with a 74% pass rate. This met the program goal of 70% of candidates passing. In addition the 70% goal was met for each of the three semesters in 2011. In Spring and Summer 2011, the mean for each question set and for the total test also exceeded the 70% cut off. In Fall 2011 question set A, which addresses Council for Exceptional Children standard 1 fell short of the goal with 68%. All other question sets and the total test exceeded the 70% cut off. Content breadth continues to be the weakest internal area. The median for the overall test was above 70 each semester, but the range was narrower than in 2010. The low scores are not as low; the high scores are not as high. Several factors seem to be creating the flattened scores. There are a number of students who delay taking comprehensive examinations for more than one semester. There are others whose course work was interrupted at critical junctures. With small numbers, these discrepancies affect overall scores. The program is considering time limits after course completion for taking comprehensive examinations, as well as more stringent pre-comprehensive examination clearance including successful completion of one comprehensive examination practice session. Other contributing factors include the back loading of program assessments in the internship. An increasing number of candidates do not have teaching experience of any kind when entering the program and are entering internship less confident. The combination of the intensity of the internship with comprehensive examination preparation is affecting performance across multiple measures. The program is considering moving comp administration to the beginning of the semester following the internship.


#### Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. Recommended changes include the following:


1. We plan to perform correlation study comparing undergraduate GPA, Praxis I scores, specialty scores and comprehensive examination scores to determine a model for

- predicting candidate need for support.
- Faculty will formalize formative questions in the comprehensive examinations in CSP 651 *Foundations of Special Education in Inclusive Settings*, CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*, and CSP 640 *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs*.

**Related Items**

▶  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

▶  **GE 02: Communication**

▶  **SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

---

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

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**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)

	Spring 2011	Fall 2011
<b>Overall</b>	<b>N=10</b> <b>100%</b> <b>passed</b>	<b>N=5</b> <b>100%</b> <b>passed</b>
<b>Contextual factors</b>	<b>10/10</b>  <b>Mean 2.52</b>	<b>5/5</b>  <b>Mean 2.32</b>
Community, school factors	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.40 Median 2.0
Individual student characteristics	Mean 2.7 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Varied approach to learning	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
Skills and prior learning	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Instructional implications	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
<b>Learning goals</b>	<b>10/10</b> <b>100%</b> <b>Mean 2.54</b>	<b>5/5</b> <b>100%</b> <b>Mean 2.25</b>
Significance and variety	Mean 2.54 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Clarity	Mean 2.58 Median 3.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
Appropriateness	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Alignment	Mean 2.5 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
<b>Assessment plan</b>	<b>10/10</b> <b>100%</b> <b>Mean 2.59</b>	<b>5/5</b> <b>100%</b> <b>Mean 2.27</b>
Alignment	Mean 2.82 Median 3.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
Clarity	Mean 2.55 Median 3.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Multiple modes	Mean 2.55 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Technical	Mean 2.73 Median 3.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Adaptations	Mean 2.73 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Record keeping	Mean 2.18 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
<b>Design for instruction</b>	<b>10/10</b> <b>100%</b> <b>Mean 2.62</b>	<b>5/5</b> <b>100%</b> <b>Mean 2.33</b>
Alignment	Mean 2.64 Median 3.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Accurate	Mean 2.55 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Lesson and unit	Mean 2.82 Median 3.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
Variety	Mean 2.82	Mean 2.6



	Median 3.0	Median 3.0
Contextual	Mean 2.55 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Technology	Mean 2.36 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0

In the Spring 2011 semester, 10 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample. The mean score for contextual factors was 2.52, for learning goals 2.54, for assessment plan 2.59, and for design for instruction 2.53. Relative strengths and weaknesses were identified. Strengths were identified as mean scores above 2.75 and weaknesses were defined as means of 2.25 or below. Strengths were in aligning assessment goals with learning goals and instruction (2.82), lesson and unit structure (2.82), and use of variety of instruction, activities, assignments and resources (2.82). Weaknesses were in provision for record keeping and progress tracking (2.18) and contextual implications for instructional planning and assessment (2.20).

Mean scores for each section were higher in Spring 2011 than in Fall 2010. Gains were especially dramatic in contextual factors where there were 4 areas of weakness in the Fall 2010 and only one, implication for instruction (2.0), in the Spring 2011. There were also dramatic gains in design for instruction from a mean of 2.17 for the section to a 2.64 for the section, including new strengths in lesson and unit structure (2.33 Fall, 2.82 Spring) and variety of instruction (2.33 Fall, 2.82 Spring). The total number of weaknesses decreased from 10 to 2. In both semesters record keeping and implications for instruction were relative weaknesses. Gains may be linked to the addition of formative assessment of the Teacher Work Sample in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* beginning in Fall 2010. Each of these sections is now completed in methods classes using the same rubrics and comparable feedback. Candidates enter the internship having already completed two 5-day Teacher Work Samples. Faculty have become more consistent in providing formative feedback in the methods classes, in effect, creating a three tier process of Teacher Work Sample with one each in two methods classes and culminating in the capstone class.

In the Fall 2011, 5 candidates completed the requirements for the Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Pre-planning Section. None of this small group were presently employed as teachers and all had to be placed in an internship. These candidates had very limited experience as a lead teacher with sole responsibility for a group of students. Although the candidates passed every indicator, there were no sections or individual indicators over 2.75. Areas above 2.5 were varied approach to learning in contextual factors (2.6), clarity of learning goals (2.6), alignment of assessment plan (2.6), lesson and unit design (2.6), and variety in unit design (2.6). Weakest areas included skills and prior learning in contextual factors (2.0), significance and variety of learning goals (2.0), multiple modes of assessment (2.0), record keeping (2.0), and contextual design (2.0). These data reinforce the impression by the faculty that field experiences must be expanded to include more group planning, teaching and management for candidates who are not presently employed as teachers and have no previous teaching experience. In the past, the majority of the candidates were employed as teachers or teacher assistants as they progressed through the program. With changes in licensure, fewer candidates are teaching on emergency licenses and fewer teachers with standard licenses are seeking special education endorsement through a master's degree. Consequently, more candidates are full time graduate students without teaching experience. Field experiences may need to be modified to reflect this change.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

The program has begun to collect formative data on the Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Pre-planning Section in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*. These data will be used to track candidate progress through the program, identify program weaknesses, and identify candidates needing support before entering the internship.

#### Related Items

[GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

[GE 02: Communication](#)

[GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)

[GE 08: Perspectives](#)

[GE 10: Values](#)

[SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

	Spring 2011	Fall 2011
<b>Overall</b>	<b>N=10 100% passed</b>	<b>N=5 100% passed</b>
<b>Instructional Decision Making</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.27</b>
Sound professional practice	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0
Modifications based on analysis of student learning	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Congruence between modifications and learning goals	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
<b>Analysis of Student Learning</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.25</b>
Clarity and accuracy	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Alignment with learning goals	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	<b>Mean 2.6 Median 3.0</b>
Interpretation of data	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Evidence of impact on student learning	Mean 2.5 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
<b>Reflection and self-evaluation</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>2.32</b>
Interpretation of student learning	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Insights on effective instruction and assessment	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Alignment among goals, instruction and assessment	Mean 2.3 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Implications for future teaching	Mean 2.3 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Implications for professional development	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0

In Spring 2011, 10 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample. Mean scores for instructional decision making was 2.47. High score was in sound professional practice (2.6). The other subsections scores were 2.4. Mean score for analysis of student learning was 2.53. High scores were in clarity and accuracy of presentation (2.6) and alignment with learning goals (2.6). The other subsections scores were 2.4 or above. Mean score for reflection and self-evaluation was 2.24. High score was in insights on effective instruction and assessment (2.4). Low score was in implications for professional development (2.0). Candidates in Spring 2011 met the standard for this assessment.

Mean scores for each section were higher in Spring 2011 than in Fall 2010. In instructional decision making, scores increased from 2.0 to 2.47. In analysis of student learning, scores increased from 1.92 to 2.53. In reflection and self-evaluation, scores increased from 1.9 to 2.24. Gains may be linked to the addition of formative assessment of the Teacher Work Sample in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* which began in Fall 2010.

In Fall 2011, 5 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample. Mean scores for instructional decision making was 2.27. High score was in congruence between modifications and learning goals (2.6). Low score was sound professional practice (1.8). Mean score for analysis of student learning was 2.25. High score was in alignment with learning goals (2.6). Low scores were in interpretation of data (2.0) and evidence of impact of student learning (2.0). Mean score for reflection and self-evaluation was 2.32. High score was in implications for professional development (2.6). Low scores were in insights on effective instruction (2.2), alignment among goals, instruction and assessment (2.2), and implications for future teaching (2.2). Candidates in Spring 2011 met the standard for this assessment.

This group of candidates represented the weakness of the program in providing adequate quantity and quality of field experience for candidates who are full-time in the program. The program is designed for part time candidates who are working full-time in the schools. As the candidate demographics shift, the program will continue to modify and expand field experience options prior to the internship.

#### Use of Evaluation Results

1. Changes in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*, CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*, and CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment* have increased demand for data collection and analysis

2. The program is planning a drive in conference in cooperation with the Mississippi Department of Education to train teachers in legally defensive Individual Education Plans including monitoring student outcomes.

3. The program is in process of creating a long range curriculum planning committee with public school practitioners to more closely align our methods classes with the demands of inclusion teachers.

#### Related Items

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 09: Cross-disciplinary Appreciation](#)

▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

---

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

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

#### 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

	Spring 2011		Fall 2011	
	1 <sup>st</sup> obs.	2 <sup>nd</sup> obs.	1 <sup>st</sup> obs.	2 <sup>nd</sup> obs.
Composite Results from 2 <sup>nd</sup> observation only				
Lesson Planning Fall 2010 N=7	Mean 1.5 Median 2.0	Mean 2.3 Median 2.0	Mean 1.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Mean 2.39 Spring 2011 N=10	Mean 1.9 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.8 Median 3.0
Mean 2.34 Fall 2011 N=5 Mean= 2.38	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 1.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
	Mean 1.50 Median 1.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 1.2 Median 1.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.70 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 1.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
	Mean 1.9 Median 2.0	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 1.0 Median 1.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.6 Median 1.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 1.2 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.3 Median 1.0	Mean 2.3 Median 2.0	Mean .60 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Instructional delivery Fall 2010 N=7	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 3.0 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
Mean=2.53 Spring 2011 N=10	Mean 2.50 Median 3.0	Mean 3.0 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
Mean 2.55 Fall 2011 N=5 Mean 2.26	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.9 Median 3.0	Mean 1.6 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
	Mean 2.4 Median 2.5	Mean 2.8 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.7 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 0.5 Median 0.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean .4 Median 0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.7 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
	Mean 2.4 Median 2.5	Mean 2.7 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.9 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 1.4 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.9 Median	Mean 2.2 Median	Mean 1.4 Median	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0

	Mean 2.0	Mean 2.0	1.0	
	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.7 Median 2.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 1.4 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.3 Median 1.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0	Mean .60 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Classroom environment	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
Fall 2010 N=7	Mean 2.52 Median 2.0	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Spring 2011 N=10	Mean 2.53 Median 2.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 1.2 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Fall 2011 N=5	Mean 2.37 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
	Mean 2.7 Median 3.0	Mean 2.8 Median 3.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 3.0 Median 3.0
	Mean 2.5 Median 3.0	Mean 2.8 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
Assessment and evaluation	Mean 1.3 Median 1.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 1.0 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Fall 2010 N=7	Mean 2.0 Median 1.5	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean .60 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Spring 2011 N=10	Mean 2.08 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean .60 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Fall 2011 N=5	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.20 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
Mean=2.0	Mean 1.4 Median 1.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean .4 Median 0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0

In Fall 2011 five candidates successfully completed the Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument. Candidates were observed twice and the results of the two observations were compared. Strength areas were those with a mean higher than 2.5, weakness areas were those with a mean lower than 2.0.

Indicators 1-9 represent candidate performance in lesson planning. In the first observation all but one indicator, appropriate teaching procedures (2.2), had a mean less than 2.0. In the second observation all indicators were over 2.0 with strengths in appropriate teaching procedures (first 2.2, second 2.8), variety of materials and technology (first 1.4, second 2.6), and uses assessment information to accommodate differences (first 1.2, second 2.6).

Indicators 10-23 represent instructional delivery. In the first observation, there were no strength areas. Weakness areas included high expectations (1.6), opportunities for interaction (1.8), opportunities for interaction with parents (.4), accommodating instruction (1.4), problem solving (1.4), wait time (1.8), higher order questions (1.4), and family/community resources (.6). In the second observation for spring 2011 strength areas were acceptable communication (first 2.2, second 2.6), clear directions (first 2.0, second 2.6), high expectations (first 1.6, second). There were no indicators below 2.0.

Indicators 24-29 are related to the classroom environment. In the first observation, there were no indicators above 2.5. Weakness areas were monitors and adjusts to enhance social relationships (1.8), adjusts lessons according to student cues (1.8), and attends to routine tasks (1.2). In the second observation strength areas included uses variety of strategies (first 2.0, second 2.6), and demonstrates fairness and support (first 2.4, second 3.0). There were no indicators below 2.0.

Indicators 30-34 relate to assessment. In the first observation, all indicators were below 2.0 except provides timely feedback (2.0). All indicators were 2.0 in the second observation. This is the weakest section across all observations for Fall 2010, Spring 2011 and Fall 2011.

Many interns struggle with the standards of the Special Education Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument. The Mississippi Research to Intervention (RTI) system paired with the practices of inclusion and the emphasis on Mississippi Curriculum Tests has created a blurring of roles in for special education and general education roles. The faculty recognizes that internships need to be structured to more closely align with the actual duties of inclusion teachers and to provide more consistent mentoring from the clinical faculty and local special education staff. The weakest area by far is in assessment. The assessment component in Assessment VII has been expanded to require elements developed in the assessment class, two methods classes and in the internship to give candidates more practice and more incubation time for the complexity of classroom assessment.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

1 & 2. Individual conferences with principals and supervisors will be necessary to emphasize the necessity for formal lesson planning and systematic assessment. Although candidates have sufficient training in each of these areas in their methods classes there is limited generalization to K-12 classroom. Additionally the program is considering a different lesson planning format to make it more compatible with the formats used in local school districts.

2. The program is in process of creating a long range curriculum planning committee with public school practitioners to more closely align our methods classes with the demands of inclusion teachers.

**Related Items**

**GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

**GE 02: Communication**

**GE 03: Quantitative Skills**

**SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

**MED-SE 05: LO Demonstrate skills associated with analyzing student data and developing teaching/learning strategies based on the analyses.**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**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. Candidates will prepare a case study which will be measured by the rubrics for the Individualized Education Case Study. Candidates must score a 3 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)**

1. The Individualized Education Case Study will present candidates with a live case study. They will be given written and live documentation of a student with significant learning, motor, sensory, cognitive, or social needs. They will be asked to gather information about the student and prepare a comprehensive case study.

The case study will contain these five sections: a) Student Characteristics, b) Language Skills, c) Motor Skills, d) Social/Behavioral Skills, and e) Inclusion. Each of the sections will present a task and a series of prompts to guide the candidate through the process of responding to the task. Each section will be tied to specific Council for Exceptional Children competencies.

2. The case study will be completed in CSP 550 *Programming for Individuals with Severe/Multiple Disabilities*.

3. The case study will be rated with a 4-point rubric: 1 – Inadequate, 2 – Emerging Adequacy, 3 – Developing Adequacy, 4 – Achieving Adequacy. The candidate must score at least a 3 on each indicator.

**Results of Evaluation**

The individualized case study was conducted in Summer I and Summer II of 2011.

Individual Case Study Data						
	Student Characteristics	Language plan	Motor plan	Social plan	Inclusion plan	Overall
Summer I 2011	56/60	165/180	165/180	165/180	54/60	605/660
	93%	92%	92%	92%	90%	92%
	3.7	3.66	3.66	3.66	3.6	
Summer II 2011	36/44	117/132	111/132	111/132	37/44	412/484
	81.8%	88.6%	84%	84%	84%	85%
	3.27	3.54	3.36	3.36	3.36	

Performance was stronger in Summer I than in Summer II. Overall scores for Summer I was 92%, for Summer II, 85%. The scores for all sections for Summer I exceeded 90% with medians above 3.5. The strongest section was student characteristics with a score of 93% and a median of 3.7. In Summer II, scores ranged from 81.8% to 88.6%, with medians ranging from 3.27 to 3.54. The high score was in language plan with 88.6% and a mean of 3.54.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Assessment has been moved to TaskStream in order for data to be reported by section and indicator of the rubric.

**Related Items**

**GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

**GE 02: Communication**

**GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

**SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

**MED-SE 06: LO Demonstrate competency in the use of multidimensional assessment in special education**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**Learning Outcome**

Demonstrate competency in the use of multidimensional assessment 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)**

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**

Assessment for Fall 2011: Special Education Assessment Folio

Because this assessment is being phased in over a three semester period, the data reported represents both formative and summative data. For Section I: Formal Assessments the data is formative. Section II: Informal Assessments has yet to be implemented. Section III: Assessment for Long Term Planning is summative data.

	<b>Formal assessments</b>	<b>Informal assessments</b>	<b>Assessment for long term planning</b>
Formative assessment	N= 30 2.93/4 73%		
Folio assessment			N=5 3.2/4 80%

Assessment for fall 2011: Special Education Assessment Folio.

Because this assessment is being phased in over a three semester period, the data reported represents both formative and summative data. For Section I: Formal Assessments, the data is formative. Section II: Informal Assessments has yet to be implemented. Section III: Assessment for Long Term Planning is summative data. A four point rubric was developed to score each section until the full folio is implemented. The levels of the rubric are: 4-comprehensive information, well presented; 3-adequate information, clearly presented; 2-some major gaps or incorrect information; 1-poor presentation, does not execute task.

Section I: Formative assessment was field tested in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*. Thirty candidates completed the assessment. The mean score on a four point rubric was 2.93 (73%). The assessment was conducted in two sections of the course. Instructors reported that the scores were affected by the number of candidates who were taking the course in the first semester in the program. These candidates were full time students taking 9 hours of course work. Most did not have an undergraduate degree in education or any coursework in this area. The program is considering either a prerequisite requirement for this course or emphasizing through advisement the need for a foundation course before taking the class.

Section 2: Informal assessment was not implemented in Fall 2011.

Section 3: Assessment for Long Term Planning was implemented in the capstone course, CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education*. Five candidates completed the assessment with a mean of 3.2 out of 4 (80%). The degree of access to Individual Education Plans is limited by the school districts' interpretation of how Individual Education Plans are developed and used. Some candidates had more interaction with the Individual Education Plan process than others.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

This instrument is still being revised. The rubric does not give sufficient level of detail.

**Related Items**

- ▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)
- ▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)
- ▶ [GE 03: Quantitative Skills](#)
- ▶ [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)
- ▶ [SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores](#)

**MED-SE 07: LO Demonstrate mastery of the content knowledge associated with the Council for Exceptional Children Standards.**

**Start:** 7/1/2011  
**End:** 6/30/2012

**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 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:

**Assessment I**

Education of Exceptional Children: Core Content Knowledge (0353/0354)

Semester	% pass
Spring 2011 (0354)	100%
N=7	Range= 146-176
Cutoff 142	Mean= 157
	Median= 150
Summer 2011 (0354)	100%
N=10	Range= 146-176
Cutoff 142	Mean = 160
	Median = 160
Fall 2011 (0354)	100%
N=4	Range= 149-169
Cutoff 142	Mean= 162
	Median= 166

**Trends Noted:**

In 2011, 21 candidates submitted scores. All candidates met the cutoff score of 142. The range of scores in Spring 2011 was 146-176 with a mean of 157 and a median of 150. In Summer 2011, the range was from 146- 176 with a mean of 160 and a median of 159.5. Fall 2011 scores were in a range of 149-169 with a mean of 162 and a median of 166. Educational Testing Services does not supply sub-scores to the institution for small numbers. The state is proposal higher cutoff scores so the program will have to provide more support in this measure.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

We plan to perform correlation study comparing undergraduate GPA, Praxis I scores, specialty scores and comps scores to determine model for predicting candidate need for support.

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 10: Values

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

**TLR 2012\_01: SPA/NCATE Compliance**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Prepare program reports for submission to specialized professional associations (SPAs) by March 15, 2012. The following programs will submit reports: B.S.E. in Elementary Education, M.Ed. in Special Education, M.A.T., and M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision. 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.

Institutional Goal(s) supported by this goal:

SP Goal # 1: Increase Student Learning

**Evaluation Procedures**

Program coordinators and program faculty will develop and submit SPA reports by March 15, 2012, based on the standards and requirements of 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**

Programs submitted successful reports that led to national recognition from their respective SPAs. Non-SPA programs will produce acceptable reports for view by the NCATE Board of Examiners.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Program faculty are using the results of the candidate performance assessments linked to SPA standards and addressed in the SPA reports to make data-driven decisions for the improvement of courses and the program. Program faculty are addressing any areas of concern identified in the SPA report, using this information to improve the program.

**Related Items**

GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

GE 02: Communication

GE 04: Inquiry and Technology

SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

**TLR 2012\_02: Increase Graduates in Teacher Education Programs**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Increase the number of graduates in Teacher Education Programs by an average of 2% over five years, with the baseline year as AY 2007-08.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Recruitment meetings were held in Memphis, TN, on the campus of Delta State University, and at state community colleges. Because of a change in the department chair position, specific number of candidates consulted could not be determined.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

As can be seen in table 4, the number of Teacher Education graduates regressed to the same as for the 2008-2009 year.

Table 4

Teacher Education Program Graduates



Goal	Institutional Goal	Baseline (AY 2007-08)	Year 1 (08-09)	Year 2 (09-10)	Year 3 (10-11)	Year 4 (11-12)	Year 5 (12-13)
Goal #2 – Increase number of graduates by an average of 2% over 5 years	SP 1, 2	103	97	146	156	97	

**Use of Evaluation Results**

**Related Items**

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

**TELR 2012\_03: Increase Faculty Publications**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**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**

Publications were documented in faculty activity reports. There were a total of two publications in professional journals, one from Educational Leadership faculty, and one from Elementary Education faculty.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

**Related Items**

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 10: Values](#)

▶ [SP3.Ind09: Professional development](#)

**TELR 2012\_04: Use results of Quality Matters evaluations to improve online courses.**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Use results of Quality Matters evaluations to improve online courses.

**Evaluation Procedures**

The Chair will work with Program Coordinators to plan prioritize work and implement procedures for addressing online course weaknesses.

**Actual Results of Evaluation**

Dr. Corlis Snow worked with graduate courses to ensure quality online work. All faculty evaluated online courses they taught to ensure quality.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

Information needs to be collected to determine the implications of online evaluation.

**Related Items**

▶ [GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking](#)

▶ [GE 02: Communication](#)

▶ [GE 04: Inquiry and Technology](#)

**TELR 2012\_05: Increase the number of graduates in Educational Leadership Programs**

Start: 7/1/2011

End: 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Increase the number of graduates in Educational Leadership Programs by an average of 2% over five years, with the baseline year as 2010.

**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**

Results can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5**


**Educational Leadership Program Graduates**

Goal	Institutional Goal	Baseline (2010-2011)	Year 1 (2011-2012)	Year 2 (2012-2013)	Year 3 (2013-2014)	Year 4 (2014-2015)	Year 5 (2015-2016)
Goal #5 – Increase number of graduates by an average of 2% over 5 years	SP 1, 2 GE 1, 2	40	32				

**Use of Evaluation Results**

There will be a greater emphasis on recruiting students.

**Related Items**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 02: Communication**

»  **GE 04: Inquiry and Technology**

---

**TELR 2012\_06: Data for candidate performance assessments and unit operations will be collected and analyzed in information technology systems by trained personnel.**

**Start:** 7/1/2011

**End:** 6/30/2012

**Unit Goal**

Data for candidate performance assessments and unit operations will be collected and analyzed in information technology systems by trained personnel. Faculty who evaluate candidate performance will receive training in maintaining fairness, accuracy, and consistency in assessment procedures. Standards of confidentiality will be maintained in the use of all data.

**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**

Because of a change in the chair position the procedures were handled on an individual basis. Preliminary evidence indicates that instruction is improving.

**Use of Evaluation Results**

**Related Items**

»  **GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking**

»  **GE 02: Communication**

»  **GE 03: Quantitative Skills**

## **Section V.a**

### **Faculty (Accomplishments)**

#### **Judgment**

Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**

## **Section V.b**

### **Staff (Accomplishments)**

#### **Judgment**

Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**

## Section V.c

### Administrators (accomplishments)

#### Judgment

Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

#### Narrative

##### Accomplishments

Griffin, L., Taylor, T.R., Varner, L. W., & White, C. L. (2012). Staying the course: A model leadership preparation program that goes the distance. *Planning and Changing: An Educational Leadership and Policy Journal*, 43(1,2), 57-71.

Griffin, L., & Pickard, L. (June 2012). *Overview of the Healthy Campus/Community Initiative*. Presentation at the 2012 Mississippi Health Summit, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS.

Griffin, L. (February 2012). *Overview of the Healthy Campus/Community Initiative*. Keynote address at the Second Annual Conference of Working Toward a Healthier Mississippi, Philadelphia, MS.

Griffin, L., Bridges, A., Cummins, C., & Varner, L. (September/October 2011). *Standardizing and communicating a continual assessment model for educator preparation programs*. Paper presentation at the Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE) Annual Conference, Oxford, MS.

##### Professional Service:

###### University Level

Member of Academic Council

Chair, College of Arts and Sciences Dean Search Committee

###### College Level

Chair, College of Education Administrative Council

Member of NCATE Steering Committee

Ex officio member of Teacher Education Council

Ex officio member of Graduate Education Program Council

Member, Delta Association for Improvement of Schools (DAAIS) Executive Board Member

###### State Level:

President – Elect, Mississippi Association for Colleges of Teacher Education

Steering Committee Member, Redesign of Process and Performance Review (Mississippi Department of Education)

###### Funded grants:

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi, Inc., *Healthy Campus/Community Initiative* , \$251,670

Delta Health Alliance, *Project 21: Teacher and Leadership Shortage*, \$767,020

Tri-State Educational Foundation – grants totaling \$164,820

###### Scholarships Funded:

Dave Heflin Professorship, \$30,000

###### Civic and Community Engagement:

Community Service Committee Chair, Cleveland Rotary Club

Member of Finance Committee, First United Methodist Church

Selective Service Board Member for Bolivar County

###### Professional Memberships

Delta Kappa Gamma, Legislative Committee Chair

University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)

National Rural Education Association

Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability & Teacher Evaluation (CREATE)

###### Awards

MAPE Governor's Award for Healthy Campus/Community Initiative (CORE Nutrition Program under the direction of Leigh Pickard)

###### Professional Development

June, 2012 – Bowling Green, MS – Met with professors at Western Kentucky University to review model educator prep program for DSU alignment in preparation for upcoming NCATE site visit.  
March, 2012 – Jackson, MS – Attended a presentation on the development and use of the teacher preparation data dashboard presented by the MDE.  
February, 2012 – Chicago, IL – AACTE Conference  
November, 2011 – Pittsburgh, PA – UCEA Convention  
December, 2011 – El Paso, TX – MDE trip – school visit site – Early College Initiative  
October, 2011 – Jackson, MS – MASA – Mississippi Association of School Administrators 2011 Fall Conference.  
October, 2011 – Itta Bena, MS – MAC conference  
September, 2011 – Jackson, MS – Marc Tucker presentation.  
September, 2011 – Washington, DC – 2011 Leadership for Healthy Communities Conference  
June, 2011 – Vancouver, British Columbia – NAFSA colloquium on Internationalizing Teacher Education

**Section V.d**

**Position(s) requested/replaced with justification**

**Judgment**

- Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

## **Section V.e**

### **Recommended Change(s) of Status**

#### **Judgment**

Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**



## **Section VI.a**

### **Changes Made in the Past Year**

#### **Judgment**

Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**

A request has been forwarded to the Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) to change the name of the College of Education. The request would expand the name to the College of Education and Human Sciences to more accurately reflect the diversity of the unit's programs.

## **Section VI.b**

### **Recommended Changes for the Coming Year**

#### **Judgment**

Meets Standards    Does Not Meet Standards    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**