Delta State

  Academic Affairs/Provost and VPAA

    College of Education

      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 underlined 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**

- ➧ 🔵 **GE 08: Perspectives**

- ➧ 📄 **SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

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 l 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 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.

<u>Fall 2011 - Campus Group – CEL 318</u> *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.

<u>Fall 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 318</u> *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

<u>Spring 2011- Campus Group – CEL 317</u> *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.

<u>Spring 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 317</u> *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.

<u>Fall 2011- Campus Group – CEL 317</u> *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.

<u>Fall 2011- Hinds Group – CEL 317</u> *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

<u>Spring 2011 – Campus Group</u>

(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).

<u>Spring 2011 – Hinds Group</u>

(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.

<u>Fall 2011 – Campus Group</u>

(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".

<u>Fall 2011 – Hinds Group</u>

(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.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

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 <u>pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions</u> 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

<u>Spring 2011 – Campus Group</u>

(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).

<u>Spring 2011 – Hinds Group</u>

(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).

<u>Fall 2011 – Campus Group</u>

(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).

<u>Fall 2011 – Hinds Group</u>

(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

<u>Spring 2011 – Campus Group</u>

(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).

(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 assessment these professional dispositions: Fairness, Belief That All Students Can Learn, Professionalism, Resourcefulness, and Dependability.

3. Each disposition was be 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.

(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	0	2	3	17	15	14
Number Failed	0	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	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	5	5	5	5
Number Failed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	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
. <u>Ability to Plan</u> – 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$_3$ 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
Average	**19.0/20 (95%)**	**17.3/20 (87%)**	**19.7/20 (99%)**	**19.5/20 (98%)**	**18.7/20 (94%)**	**91.5 (91.5%)**
2010 (N=10)	**96%**	**85%**	**100%**	**92.5%**	**97.5%**	**94.2%**
2009 (N=8)	**92.9%**	**95.1%**	**94.3%**	**94%**	**94%**	**94.3%**

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.

Related Items
♪ ⊙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.

Grade Distributions for Mentor Evaluations

Grades	Grade		
1 = A	Distribution		
2 = B			
3 = C			
N = 17	Grade	N	%
3	A	15	88
2	B	2	12
1	C	0	0
Mean 2.8			

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		
Mean 92.26	**Mean** 75.12	**Mean** 93.7	**Mean** 97.25

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.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

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 <u>ability to plan and support planning</u> 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 form 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.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

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 <u>ability to successfully teach in a field experience/clinical setting.</u>

  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 3.664/ 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 differentiate 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 met 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.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

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	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	
Document 1	X	X			X	X	X	X				X	X							
Document 2													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	67	67	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

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
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		
Mean	2.47	2.47	3.33	2.47	2.47	1.69	2.47	3.33	3.33

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

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

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

Related Items

↗ ⊘ **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 ISLLIC Standards, III. Summary of field experiences, IV. Situational Analysis of learning obtained from completing clinical correlations, V. Samples and artifacts of other meaningful work.

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

Results of Evaluation
For the 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
Vita	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

Clincial 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 indictors 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 comps 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.

2. 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
Overall	**N=10** **100% passed**	**N=5** **100% passed**
Contextual factors	**10/10** **Mean 2.52**	**5/5** **Mean 2.32**
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
Learning goals	**10/10** **100%** **Mean 2.54**	**5/5** **100%** **Mean 2.25**
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
Assessment plan	**10/10** **100%** **Mean 2.59**	**5/5** **100%** **Mean 2.27**
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 Median2.0
Design for instruction	**10/10** **100%** **Mean 2.62**	**5/5** **100** **Mean 2.33**
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	Mean 2.0
	Median 3.0	Median2.0
Technology	Mean 2.36	Mean 2.2
	Median 2.0	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
Overall	**N=10**	**N=5**
	100% passed	**100% passed**
Instructional Decision Making	**2.47**	**2.27**
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
Analysis of Student Learning	2.53	2.25
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	**Mean 2.6** **Median 3.0**
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
Reflection and self - evaluation	2.24	2.32
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

Composite Results from 2nd observation only	Spring 2011		Fall 2011	
	1st obs.	2nd obs.	1st obs.	2nd obs.
Lesson Planning Fall 2010 N=7 Mean 2.39 Spring 2011 N=10 Mean 2.34 Fall 2011 N=5 Mean= 2.38	Mean 1.5 Median 2.0	Mean 2.3 Median 2.0	Mean 1.4 Median2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.9 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean2.2 Median 2.0	Mean 2.8 Median 3.0
	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=2.53 Spring 2011 N=10 Mean 2.55 Fall 2011 N=5 Mean 2.26	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 3.0 Median 3.0	Mean 2.2 Median2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
	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 2.6 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 Median2.0
	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	Mean 2.2	Mean 1.4 Median	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0

	Median 2.0	Median 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 Fall 2010 N=7 Mean 2.52 Spring 2011 N=10 Mean 2.53 Fall 2011 N=5 Mean= 2.37	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.2 Median 2.0
	Mean 2.4 Median 2.0	Mean 2.5 Median 2.5	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 1.6 Median 2.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 1.2 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0
	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0	Mean 2.0 Median2.0	Mean 2.6 Median 3.0
	Mean 2.7 Median 3.0	Mean 2.8 Median 3.0	Mean 2.4 Median2.0	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 Fall 2010 N=7 Mean 2.0 Spring 2011 N=10 Mean 2.08 Fall 2011 N=5 Mean=2.0	Mean 1.3 Median 1.0	Mean 2.1 Median 2.0	Mean 1.0 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median2.0
	Mean 1.5 Median 1.5	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean .60 Median1.0	Mean 2.0 Median2.0
	Mean 1.3 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean .60 Median 1.0	Mean 2.0 Median2.0
	Mean 1.8 Median 2.0	Mean 2.20 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 2.0	Mean 2.0 Median 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 93% 3.7	165/180 92% 3.66	165/180 92% 3.66	165/180 92% 3.66	54/60 90% 3.6	605/660 92%
Summer II 2011	36/44 81.8% 3.27	117/132 88.6% 3.54	111/132 84% 3.36	111/132 84% 3.36	37/44 84% 3.36	412/484 85%

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)

Assessment for fall 2011: Special Education Assessment Folio

The Special Education Assessment Folio has replaced the Special Education Assessment Work Sample. The artifacts for this folio are developed in four classes: CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Disabilities*, CSP 686, *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and the capstone class (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education or* CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*). Artifacts are then revised and expanded based on the internship experience. The first section, Formal Assessment, is created in CSP 545, Assessment in Special Education. The subsections of this section include: Norm Referenced Assessment, Mississippi Assessment Systems: Research to Intervention (RTI), and Mississippi Assessment: Special Education, and Ethics in Assessment. The second section, Informal Assessments, is created in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescent with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and/or CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*. Subsections include: Curriculum Based Assessment Teacher Made Tests and Curriculum Based Assessment Authentic Assessment. The third section, Assessment for Long Term Planning, is created in the capstone course (CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education* or CSP 647*Action Research in Special Education*).

Results of Evaluation
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.

	Formal assessments	*Informal assessments*	*Assessment for long term planning*
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) N=7 Cutoff 142	100% Range= 146-176 Mean= 157 Median= 150
Summer 2011 (0354) N=10 Cutoff 142	100% Range= 146-176 Mean = 160 Median = 160
Fall 2011 (0354) N=4 Cutoff 142	100% Range= 149-169 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

TELR 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

TELR 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 IV.a

Brief Description

Judgment

☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

Teacher Education Programs

- Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education - This degree provides initial licensure in grades Kindergarten through 6. Supplemental endorsements for middle level grades lead to licensure in grades 7-8. The program is available at the Cleveland campus, with a few courses offered at the Greenville Higher Education Center. In the Spring 2009 Semester a 2+2 Program with Hinds Community College was begun; most courses in the 2+2 Program are taught as hybrids with a few totally online.

- Master of Education Degree in Elementary Education – This program is available at the Cleveland campus, the Coahoma County Higher Education Center, the Greenville Higher Education Center, and online. The purpose of the program is to prepare quality teachers who can teach at all levels of the elementary school.

- Educational Specialist Degree in Elementary Education – Beginning with the Spring 2009 Semester, this program has been totally online. The purpose of the program is to prepare quality elementary teachers who can function effectively and provide leadership for fellow teachers at both the primary and intermediate levels.

- Master of Education in Special Education – This program provides initial licensure in Special Education and is available at the Cleveland campus. The program mission is to train teachers to work with children and youth with mild/moderate disabilities.

- Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) – The MAT is an alternate-route program designed for promising individuals with non-education degrees who want to become teachers. It leads to a Master of Arts in Teaching Degree and Mississippi AA licensure. The program is available at the Cleveland campus, with innovative course delivery methods, including weekend classes, online, intersession courses, and hybrid courses. The program offers an emphasis in Elementary (Grades 4 – 8) and Secondary Education (Grades 7 - 12).

Educational Leadership Programs - The following graduate degree programs are available for the preparation of educational administrators and supervisors: Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision – Public School Emphasis (full-time cohort program), Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision – Independent School Emphasis, and Educational Specialist in Educational Administration and Supervision. The Doctor of Education on Professional Studies Program has tracks in Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, Higher Education, and Counselor Education.

Section IV.b

Comparative data
Enrollment, CHP, majors, graduation rates, expenditures, trends, etc.

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

Table 6 — Enrollment by Major Undergraduate											
	Sp. 2008	Sp. 2009	Sp. 2010	Sp. 2011	Su. 2008	Su. 2009	Su. 2010	Su. 2011	Fa. 2008	Fa. 2009	Fa. 2010	Fa. 2011
Educational Leadership	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Elementary Education	262	240	250	243	77	78	125	114	264	290	262	291
Master of Arts in Teaching	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Studies (Ed.D.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Special Education	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total	**266**	**240**	**250**	**243**	**80**	**78**	**125**	**114**	**265**	**290**	**262**	**291**
Enrollment by Major Graduate											
	Sp. 2008	Sp. 2009	Sp. 2010	Sp. 2011	Su. 2008	Su. 2009	Su. 2010	Su. 2011	Fa. 2008	Fa. 2009	Fa. 2010	Fa. 2011
Educational Leadership	50	36	71	80	50	47	65	65	99	81	83	82
Elementary Education	73	161	168	171	77	154	161	146	156	196	177	165
Master of Arts in Teaching	10	11	10	55	22	20	31	34	12	9	17	65
Professional Studies (Ed.D.)	56	54	54	63	16	54	31	45	61	64	60	63
Special Education	72	62	71	14	46	46	38	28	61	76	62	17
Total	**261**	**324**	**374**	**383**	**211**	**321**	**326**	**318**	**389**	**426**	**399**	**392**

The data displayed in Table 6 indicates that enrollment in the Educational Leadership Program (M.Ed. and Ed.S.) increased during the Spring and Summer of 2011 and maintained for Fall 2011. In the undergraduate Elementary Education Program, enrollment in Spring 2010 and 2011 increased from that of Spring 2009, Summer enrollment increased in 2011, and Fall 2009. Enrollment in Elementary Education graduate programs increased significantly between 2009 and 2010, but Fall 2011 is lower than that of Fall 2010. Master of Arts in Teaching enrollment was maintained from Spring 2009 to Spring 2011, increased from Summer 2009 to Summer 2010, and increased significantly between Fall 2010 and Fall 2011. Enrollment in Professional Studies increased from Spring 2010 to Spring 2011, increased significantly from Summer 2008 to 2009 and decreased between Summer 2009 and 2010, and increased across the Fall semesters. For graduate Special Education, enrollment increased between Summer 2010 and 2011 and dropped again in Summer and Fall 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr><th colspan="13" style="text-align:center">Table 7 –
Credit Hour Production by Discipline
Undergraduate</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Sp. 2008</th><th>Sp. 2009</th><th>Sp. 2010</th><th>Sp. 2011</th><th>Su. 2008</th><th>Su. 2009</th><th>Su. 2010</th><th>Su. 2011</th><th>Fa. 2008</th><th>Fa. 2009</th><th>Fa. 2010</th><th>Fa. 2011</th></tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr><td>AED</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>CAD</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>CEL</td><td>1116</td><td>1119</td><td>1185</td><td>1485</td><td>132</td><td>132</td><td>195</td><td>126</td><td>1140</td><td>1293</td><td>1395</td><td>1593</td></tr>
<tr><td>CML</td><td>99</td><td>60</td><td>72</td><td>84</td><td>36</td><td>30</td><td>78</td><td>120</td><td>66</td><td>60</td><td>81</td><td>69</td></tr>
<tr><td>CRD</td><td>150</td><td>183</td><td>186</td><td>273</td><td>90</td><td>84</td><td>129</td><td>129</td><td>336</td><td>297</td><td>363</td><td>342</td></tr>
<tr><td>CSP</td><td>519</td><td>453</td><td>453</td><td>501</td><td>225</td><td>198</td><td>183</td><td>267</td><td>402</td><td>459</td><td>414</td><td>504</td></tr>
<tr><td>CSD</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>CUR</td><td>374</td><td>262</td><td>395</td><td>436</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>517</td><td>579</td><td>605</td><td>526</td></tr>
<tr><td>EDL</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>ELR</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>SUP</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>2258</td><td>2077</td><td>2291</td><td>2779</td><td>483</td><td>444</td><td>585</td><td>642</td><td>2461</td><td>2688</td><td>2858</td><td>3034</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="13" style="text-align:center">Credit Hour Production by Discipline
Graduate</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Sp. 2008</td><td>Sp. 2009</td><td>Sp. 2010</td><td>Sp. 2011</td><td>Su. 2008</td><td>Su. 2009</td><td>Su. 2010</td><td>Su. 2011</td><td>Fa. 2008</td><td>Fa. 2009</td><td>Fa. 2010</td><td>Fa. 2011</td></tr>
<tr><td>AED</td><td>228</td><td>180</td><td>210</td><td>168</td><td>276</td><td>303</td><td>216</td><td>285</td><td>312</td><td>315</td><td>333</td><td>309</td></tr>
<tr><td>CAD</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>42</td><td>36</td><td>51</td></tr>
<tr><td>CEL</td><td>153</td><td>288</td><td>324</td><td>588</td><td>474</td><td>822</td><td>738</td><td>684</td><td>765</td><td>762</td><td>675</td><td>576</td></tr>
<tr><td>CML</td><td>36</td><td>30</td><td>33</td><td>45</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>6</td><td>24</td><td>27</td><td>24</td></tr>
<tr><td>CRD</td><td>78</td><td>66</td><td>117</td><td>165</td><td>224</td><td>216</td><td>183</td><td>186</td><td>-</td><td>84</td><td>3</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td>CSP</td><td>303</td><td>261</td><td>315</td><td>303</td><td>270</td><td>330</td><td>270</td><td>321</td><td>315</td><td>357</td><td>270</td><td>312</td></tr>
<tr><td>CSD</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>33</td><td>24</td><td>0</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>18</td><td>24</td><td>21</td></tr>
<tr><td>CUR</td><td>291</td><td>348</td><td>402</td><td>297</td><td>291</td><td>366</td><td>645</td><td>510</td><td>105</td><td>105</td><td>3894</td><td>8370</td></tr>
<tr><td>EDL</td><td>169</td><td>128</td><td>150</td><td>154</td><td>171</td><td>117</td><td>201</td><td>147</td><td>135</td><td>210</td><td>110</td><td>80</td></tr>
<tr><td>ELR</td><td>294</td><td>390</td><td>375</td><td>273</td><td>324</td><td>318</td><td>366</td><td>288</td><td>159</td><td>348</td><td>276</td><td>360</td></tr>
<tr><td>SUP</td><td>54</td><td>126</td><td>126</td><td>174</td><td>81</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>111</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>1606</td><td>1817</td><td>2052</td><td>2167</td><td>2144</td><td>2496</td><td>2619</td><td>2445</td><td>1932</td><td>2265</td><td>5648</td><td>10106</td></tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends in credit hour production identified in Table 7 include the following: (1) An increase in credit hour production for the undergraduate Elementary Education Program was identified in Fall and Spring 2011, but there was a decrease for Summer of the same year. (2) The graduate Special Education (CSP prefix) increased in Spring 2011 above that of Spring 2008 and 2009 but was below 2010. Summer 2011 was above that of Summer 2010 but was lower for Summer 2009. Fall 2011 was above 2010 but lower than Fall 2009. (3) Educational Leadership (AED prefix) increased in Spring 2011 but was lower than that of Spring 2010 and 2008. Summer 2011 was above that of Summer 2010 and 2009. Fall 2011 was below that of Fall 2010 and 2009.

Table 8 – A Comparison of Graduates by Major					
	2007-2008	**2008-2009**	**2009-2010**	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**
B.S.E. Elementary Education	51	41	44	50	39
M.Ed. Elementary Education	22	24	76	73	73
Ed.S. Elementary Education	7	2	7	10	13
M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision	13	12	12	7	12
Ed.S. in Educational Administration and Supervision	11	23	10	32	20
Master of Arts in Teaching	7	9	12	7	15
BSE Special Education	2	-	-	-	-
M.Ed. Special Education	14	21	7	16	20
Professional Studies (Ed.D.)	5	7	2	1	2
Total	**132**	**139**	**170**	**196**	**194**

The data displayed in Table 8 indicates an increase in B.S.E. graduates in 2011-12 below that in 2010-11 and 2009-10. M.Ed. in Elementary Education decreased in 2011-12. Ed.S. in Elementary Education increased in 2011-12 above that of all previous years. M.Ed. in Educational Administration increased in 2011-12 over 2010-11 to the same levels as 2009-2010. Ed.S. in Educational Administration decreased in 2011-12 but was higher than 2009-10. 2011-12 MAT graduate numbers increased above 2009-10 and 2010-11. M.Ed. in Special Education graduates increased in 2011-12 over that of 2010-11. Graduates in Professional Studies were lower in 2011-12 than any other year except 2010-11.

Section IV.c

Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

- A racial minority faculty member is the Coordinator of the graduate Elementary Education Program. One minority work-study student and one minority graduate assistant were employed to assist faculty in the Division.

- The Master of Arts in Teaching, Special Education, M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision, and Educational Specialist Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program have attracted "other race"* students from across the Delta region. The online Master's and Educational Specialist Degree Programs in Elementary Education have attracted "other race" students from across the Delta region, the State of Mississippi, and adjoining states.

- The Division had alternative course offerings during the past academic year through intersession courses, online courses, video-conferenced courses, hybrids, and intense schedules in an effort to accommodate nontraditional students, working students, or those with other encumbrances that might make traditional course offerings difficult to access.

* Since the majority of Delta State University's faculty, staff and students are classified as "White," the term "other race," as used above, is to be defined as including those individuals classified by the U.S. Census Bureau as American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander.

Section IV.d

Economic Development Initiatives and Progress

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards ☐ Does Not Meet Standards ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

Faculty Service to Area Schools and Educators
The Division provided ongoing professional development opportunities to area school district teachers and administrators. These focused on best practices for inclusive classrooms, including effective teaching of literacy skills, differentiated instruction, and RtI. Faculty also hosted events, such as reading fairs, and served as judges for events. The Educational Leadership Program partnered with DAAIS to provide professional development for local administrators in school law, presented by Jim Keith, Esq. All of these were done at nominal or no cost to area schools and school districts.

The online Master of Elementary Education and Educational Specialist in Elementary Education Degree Programs continue to draw new students. The first group of candidates (10) graduated from the Delta State University/Hinds Community College 2+2 in Elementary Education Degree Program graduated in May 2011 and continued to grow in 2012. The Ed.S. in Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program continues to grow through the provision of online and hybrid course offerings.

Faculty Service to the Community
Service to the immediate community continued in 2001-2012 through the Literacy Enhancement Clinic, which is funded by a Delta Health Alliance grant. The Clinic provided clinical experiences and professional development opportunities for teacher candidates and diagnostic and remedial assistance to K-12 students, using health-related nonfiction text. Services were provided to the K-12 students free-of-charge.

One-Year Plan (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010)
The Division continued efforts to maintain the quality of the graduate and undergraduate programs, to provide professional development opportunities to area school district teachers and administrators, and to provide services to the community through the Literacy Enhancement Clinic. In addition, a Healthy Schools Coordinator was employed with DHA funds. The Coordinator worked with undergraduate Elementary Education and Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision faculty to infuse Healthy School components into their programs of study and developed a resource room of materials for check-out by undergraduate Elementary Education teacher candidates.

Two-Year Plan (July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011)
Efforts from Year 1 continued to be refined. In addition, the Healthy Schools Coordinator worked with the instructor of the secondary education introductory course to infuse Healthy School components into these courses. The Healthy Schools Coordinator also worked with local schools on Healthy and Safe School initiatives.

Five-Year Plan (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2014)
The long-term plan includes continuing to provide quality graduate and undergraduate programs, as well as providing professional development for educators and community services through the Literacy Enhancement Clinic. Division faculty also plan to investigate the possibility of establishing long-term partnerships with area school districts to train teacher leaders and provide degree programs at the Greenville Higher Education Center and Mississippi Delta Community College. The Healthy Schools Coordinator continued to work with faculty to infuse Healthy School components into programs of study and will work with local schools on Healthy and Safe School initiatives.

Section IV.e

Grants, Contracts, Partnerships, Other Accomplishments

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

- The Literacy Enhancement Clinic, funded by an $86,260 Delta Health Alliance grant provided clinical experiences and professional development opportunities for teacher candidates and diagnostic and remedial assistance to 43 K-12 students through the use of health-related nonfiction texts. Ms. Susan Berryhill coordinates the Literacy Enhancement Clinic program. This program will cease May 2012 because grant funds will no longer be awarded.

- The Literacy Across the Curriculum: Institute for Teachers in Grades 6 – 12 (LACI), funded by a $89,447 IHL grant, provided training for Delta area teachers in the incorporation of literacy skills in the content areas. Dr. Levenia Barnes, a retired faculty member, is the director of the Institute.

- The Delta Connection, a partnership with the Elementary Education Program at Blue Mountain College, provides an exchange of undergraduate elementary education candidates for the purpose of team-teaching literacy lessons to diverse elementary students at Bell Elementary in Boyle, MS, and New Albany Elementary in New Albany, MS. Mrs. Anjanette Powers coordinate this partnership.

- The undergraduate Elementary Education Program partners with the administration and faculty at Cypress Park Elementary and Nailor Elementary in Cleveland to teach CRD 326 Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties on site at these schools. Mrs. Anjanette Powers coordinate this partnership.

- The Delta State University/Tishomingo County School District Partnership received a grant from the Tri-State Educational Foundation to assist in funding tuition for Northwest Mississippi teachers to receive a Master of Education in Elementary Education Degree and an Ed.S. in Elementary Education from Delta State University. Dr. Corlis Snow coordinates the program.

- The DSU/HCC Partnership Elementary Education Partnership is a 2+2 partnership between the Hinds Community College and the undergraduate Elementary Education Program. The program began in the Spring 2009 Semester and provides graduates of Hinds Community College and other residents of Hinds and surrounding counties the opportunity to complete a Bachelor of   Science in Elementary Education Degree from Delta State University. Ms. Amanda Dickerson and Dr. Joe Garrison coordinate this partnership.

- The Educational Administration and Supervision Program continued to receive significant funding through the Delta Health Alliance Grant, $698,280 for the 2010-2011 academic year, and $967,020 for the 2011-2012 academic year The program also partners with DAAIS to provide useful professional development to Delta area administrators.

Section IV.f

Service Learning Data
List of projects, number of students involved, total service learning hours, number of classes, faculty involved, accomplishments.

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

- Service Learning Data (list of projects, number of students involved, total service learning hours, accomplishments, etc.): Two undergraduate Elementary Education student organizations (Mississippi Early Childhood Association, Mississippi Association of Middle Level Educators) participated in a Delta State University Year of Green service learning project. The focus of the project was encouraging students at Nailor Elementary and Presbyterian Day School to recycle; ten teacher candidates participated in the project. A "Tacky Trashy Fashion Show" kicked off the project in February 2011, with teacher candidates performing a skit that explained the many ways that recycled trash may be used. Students at both schools recycled paper and cans, with teacher candidates picking these up weekly and taking them to a local recycling center. As a closing activity, a tree was planted on each school campus.

Section IV.g

Strategic Plan Data
Only use this section if you have strategic plan info to report that is not covered in other areas of your report

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

Strategic Plan Data:

- 3.11 Number of professional development activities by FT faculty - See Section V. Noteworthy activities and accomplishments, Professional Growth and Development Section
- 3.12 Number of scholarly contributions by FT faculty – See Section V. Noteworthy activities and accomplishments, Scholarship Section
- 3.13 Number of service activities by FT faculty - See Section V. Noteworthy activities and accomplishments, Service Section

Section IV.h

Committees Reporting To Unit

Each unit includes in the annual plan and report a list of the committees whose work impacts that unit or any other aspect of the university; along with the list will be a notation documenting the repository location of the committee files and records. Committee actions affecting the unit's goals may be noted in other applicable sections of the annual reports. Not required to be included in the unit's annual plan and report, but required to be maintained in the repository location, will be a committee file that includes, for each committee: Mission and by-laws, Membership, Process, Minutes.

Judgment

☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

- The Division Chair is also chair of the Teacher Education Council (TEC). The TEC is the policy-making body for all Teacher Preparation Programs at Delta State University. Membership is made up of representatives from the Teacher Preparation Programs, P-12 teachers and administrators, community college faculty, community leaders and P- 12 parents, and undergraduate and graduate teacher education candidates. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.

- The Division Curriculum Committee is made up of the Chair, who is chair of the committee; the Program Coordinators; undergraduate and graduate teacher and administrator candidates, and P-12 representatives. The committee reviews and approves all curriculum changes made to courses in the Division. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.

- The Assessment Committee for the unit is currently chaired by Dr. Cheryl Cumming with Dr. Jacqueline Craven as co-chair. This committee guides the development and refinement of candidate performance assessments and the Unit Assessment System used to collect, analyze, and disseminate data on candidate performance. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.

- The Ed.D. Program Coordinator is chair of the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council, which is the policy-making council for the Ed.D. Program. Committee records are maintained in the Ed.D. Program Coordinator's Office and on the College of Education NCATE shared drive.

Section V.a

Faculty (Accomplishments)
Noteworthy activities and accomplishments

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative
Professional Growth and Development

Faculty attended the following training and informational sessions related to teaching and administrative practices:

- Suicide Awareness and Prevention by the Mississippi Department of Mental Health through the Mississippi Department of Education. (Taylor)

  - Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Annual Conference (Taylor, White, Webster)
  - Mississippi Association of School Administrators Fall and/or Conference (Taylor, Webster, White, Varner)
  - School law presentations on law for principals and/or special education law (Hartley, Kuykendall, Lambert, Waddell, Taylor, Varner, Webster, White)
  - Academic Chair's Conference (Waddell)
  - Teaching Professor Conference (Varner)
  - Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education (Powers, Barnes, Van Namen)
  - Southern Early Childhood Association Annual Conference (Powers, Thomas)
  - American Council for Rural Special Education Annual Conference (Hartley, Lambert, Kuykendall, Cummins, Bridges, Waddell, Snow)
  - Annual F.E. Woodall Spring Conference for Helping Professionals (Hartley, Lambert, Kuykendall, Varner)
  - Mississippi Department of Education Healthy Schools Leadership Institute (Van Namen)
  - Barksdale Literacy Training (Thomas)

Scholarship

Publications

Thomas, D. (2012). The Subtlety of Bullying. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin.*

Henderson, M., & Varner, L. W. (2010). Back to school with information literacy: One library's plan. *Mississippi Libraries, 70*(3).

Presentations

Lambert, E., Hartley, V. J., & Kuykendall, M. (2011) Taking it on the Road: Training Teachers where They Live. Paper presented at American Council of Rural Special Education, Albuquerque, NM.

Stocks, A. & Hartley, V. J. (2011). Inclusion: Professional Development Needs of Educators. Paper presented at American Council of Rural Special Education, Albuquerque, NM.

Kuykendall, M., Lambert, E., & Hartley, V. J. (2011) Cultural Responsiveness in teacher training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS.

Hartley, V. & Street, S. (2012) RTI: Not just for academics. Practioner training at Mississippi Council for Exceptional Children, Philadelphia, MS.

Holland, J. (2011) Reading along Route 66, Mississippi Reading Association Annual Conference, Jackson, MS.

Holland, J. (2011) Assessing Teachers' Effectiveness through National Board Certification, National Evaluation Institute Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation Annual Conference, Oxford, MS.

Kuykendall, M., Briones, D., Kerr, D., Mayo, M., Morgan, R., & Pfaffenbach, C. (2011, April) Culturally Relevant revelations: An action research project. Presented at the 30th annual Delta State University F.E. Woodall Spring Conference for Helping Professions, Cleveland MS.

Kuykendall, M., Lambert, E., & Barbian, H. & Turner, E. (2011) Compare, contrast, and change: Teachers respond to cultural context. Presentation at the American Council of Rural Special Education, Albuquerque, NM.

Thomas, D. (2011). Three Key Ingredients to Successful Reading and Writing with Young Children. Southern Early Childhood Association Annual Conference.

Service

Collaboration

- CASE Examination Coordinator and Proctor (Powers)
- Praxis I & II Workshop Coordinator (Powers, Thomas, Van Namen)
- Grammar & Writing Workshop for Education Students (Powers, Thomas, Van Namen)
- Cleveland-Bolivar County Chamber of Commerce (Powers)
- Portfolio Day Coordinator and Evaluator (Powers)
- Regional Reading Fair Coordinator (Van Namen)
- Advisory/Craft Committee, Cleveland Career Development and Technology Center (Powers)
- Cleveland-Bolivar County Young Leaders Network Committee, Cleveland-Bolivar County Chamber of Commerce (Powers)
- 5th Congressional Reading Fair Judge (Powers, Snow, Varner)
- Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Advisory Committee (Snow, Powers, Hubbard)
- Research Committee for the Iota Chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma International (Thomas)
- Reviewer for the Learning, Media, and Technology journal (Thomas)
- American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES) Board member (Lambert, Hartley)
- ACRES Conference Planning Committee (Lambert)
- ACRES Technology Committee (Lambert)
- ACRES Scholarship Committee (Lambert)
- Delta State representative at IHL meeting on infusion of healthy schools components (Van Namen)
- National Board of Examiners for NCATE (3 visits) (Varner)
- Educational Leadership Constituent Council national program lead reviewer (6 institutions) (Varner)
- Mississippi Board of Examiners for Accreditation and Process and Performance Reviewer (Varner, Waddell)

- Education and Information Systems, Technologies, and Applications and International Conference on Education, Training and Informatics-- Editorial Boards (Varner)
- Reviewer – Journal of Curriculum Theorizing (Waddell)
- Reviewer, What's New in Children's Literature 2011 (Thomas)
- Reviewer, What's New in Children's Books 2011 (Thomas)
- ACRES Conference Planning Committee (Kuykendall)
- Mississippi Blue Ribbon Commission for the Redesign of Administrator Preparation, Standards Committee (Varner)
- IHL representative to the Mississippi Professional Educators Board (Barnes)
- IHL representative to the Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education Board (Barnes)
- Recruitment meetings for prospective MAT students (Bridges)
- Recruitment meetings for new Tishomingo cohorts (Snow)
- Behavior Management workshop for new teachers Clarksdale Municipal School District (Hartley)
- Peer Reviewer Delta Education Journal (Holland)

Technical Assistance/Professional Development Services to Area Schools and Communities

- Presenter, What Works in Classroom Instruction, Pontotoc County School District (Bridges)
- Presenter, Enhancing the Development of Advanced Phonics Skills, Fluency Building Activities to Enhance Comprehension, Effortless Ways to Improve Reading Comprehension, Delta Area Association for the Improvement of Schools (Bridges)
- Presenter, Differentiated Instruction workshop, St. George's Day School, Clarksdale (Lambert)
- Presenter, Response to Intervention presentation to teaching assistants at Ida Green Elementary School, Belzoni, MS (Kuykendall)
- Presenter, Effective Lesson Planning workshop, Humphreys County School District (Van Namen)
- Presenter, Differentiated Instruction. Content Area Reading Strategies. (Van Namen)
- Presenter, The How and Why of Guided Reading (Belzoni) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Differentiated Instruction Workshop (Hollandale) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Independent Reading and Writing (Cleveland) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Interactive Reading and Writing (Cleveland) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Writers' Workshop (Hollandale) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Differentiated Instruction Workshop (Cleveland) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Comprehension Workshop (Benoit) (Bridges)
- Presenter, Fluency Workshop (Clarksdale) (Bridges)

Advisors to Student Organizations

- Early Childhood Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Thomas)
- Future Educators Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Powers, Van Namen)
- Mississippi Early Childhood Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Thomas)
- Student Association of Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education Co-Advisors (Powers, Van Namen)
- Student Association of Mississippi Professional Educators Advisor (Powers)
- Kappa Delta Pi (Waddell, Snow)

Affiliation with/Support of Professional Organizations, University, College, and Division Committees

Faculty members provide service as sponsors, officers, committee members, and/or members in the following organizations:

American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies
American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education
American Association of School Administrators
American Council on Rural Special Education
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association on Higher Education and Disability
Council for Exceptional Children
Delta Kappa Gamma
Delta Reading Council
Future Educations Association
International Reading Association
Kappa Delta Pi
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education
Mississippi Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Mississippi Association of School Administrators
Mississippi Early Childhood Association
Mississippi Professional Educators
National Board of Professional Teaching Standards
National Middle School Association
Omicron Delta Kappa
Phi Delta Kappa
Southern Early Childhood Association

Faculty members are involved in committee work at the University, College, and Division levels. During the past year, The Division had representation on each of the following:

University
Alumni Association
Courtesy Committee
Delta Innovative Research Triangle Network
Diversity Advisory Committee, Recorder
DSU Alumni Association
DSU Foundation Board, Strategic Planning and Trustee Committee
Faculty Senate
Graduate Appeals Committee
Graduate Council
Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Advisory Committee
Health and Wellness Committee
Library Committee
Online Course Task Force
Research Committee
Student Organizations Committee
Student Publications Committee
Teaching Excellence Committee
Textbook Committee
Teaching Excellence Committee
Tenure and Promotion Committee, Chair
University Budget Committee
Writing across the Curriculum Committee
Graduate Education Program Council
Go Green! Committee, Co-Chair

College
Assessment Committee; Co-Chair, Member
College of Education Academic Council
Conceptual Framework Committee
Diversity Committee, Co-Chair
Doctoral Admissions and Curriculum Council; Chair, Member

Enhancement Fund Committee; Co-Chair, Member
Faculty Qualification, Performance, and Development Committee, Co-Chair
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Committee; Co-Chair, Member
Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Advisory Committee
NCATE Coordinator
NCATE Committees Members
Teacher Education Council; Chair, Member
Unit Governance and Resources Committee; Chair, Member

<u>Division</u>
Redesign of Teacher Education, Leadership, & Research Program Committee
Teacher Education Redesign Committee
Tenure and Promotion Committee; Chair, Member
Search Committee for Division Chair

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

<u>Presentations</u>

   Cummins, C., Powers, A. & Van Namen, M (2011). Passive to active: Transforming the traditional teacher education classroom. Presentation at the American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES) 31st Annual National Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

   Cummins, C., Garrison, R.J., Thomas, D. (2011) Position Paper on Teacher Tenure. Presentation at the Mid-South Educational Research Association 40th Convention, Oxford, MS.

Section V.d

Position(s) requested/replaced with justification

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

New position(s) requested, with justification: None at this time

Section V.e

Recommended Change(s) of Status

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

Recommended change(s) of status:

- Dr. Levenia Maxwell-Barnes retired as of June 30, 2011.
- Dr. Joe Garrison took the Interim Chair position as of July 1, 2011.
- Dr. Dan McFall resigned in January 2011.
- Mrs. Cindy Steele resigned in April 2011.
- Dr. Jenetta Waddell resigned as of July 1, 2011.
- Dr. Carole White retired as of May 31, 2011.
- Dr. Thomas R. Taylor resigned as of December 31, 2011.

Section VI.a

Changes Made in the Past Year

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative
An Independent School Emphasis track was added to the Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program. The candidate performance assessments for the new M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision – Independent School Emphasis Degree Program were finalized during the Summer 2011 for implementation in Fall 2011. There was an insufficient amount of data to analyze.

Section VI.b

Recommended Changes for the Coming Year

Judgment
☐ Meets Standards   ☐ Does Not Meet Standards   ☐ Not Applicable

Narrative

- CUR/CEL 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* internship placement must be completed in a public school setting or in a private school that is accredited by the Mississippi Department of Education. CUR/CEL 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* internship placement must be completed in the area in which the candidate passed the Praxis II Subject-Area Test. (approved for 2011-2012 Catalog)