Unit Missions

🏅CEDP Mission Statement

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

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

🏅College of Education and Human Sciences Mission Statement

Mission statement

Summary of the professional education unit, its mission, and its relationship to the other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators.
The Professional Education Unit at Delta State University is the College of Education and Human Sciences (COEHS) and includes all faculty, staff, and administration engaged in the preparation of educators for Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP), Advanced Teacher Preparation (ATP), Other School Professionals (OSP), and Other Professionals (OP) programs. A Teacher Education Council and Graduate Education Program Council and Assessment Committee provide direction for program decisions and COEHS policy.   The COEHS Administrative Council (CEAC) and the DSU Academic Council also are engaged in the review of unit changes and progress. The unit maintains collaborative structures with the College of Arts and Sciences for the ITP and ATP programs. The mission of the COEHS and the university are aligned to serve the broader community of the Delta region.   They are undergirded by the guiding principles established by DSU. The COEHS operates collaboratively with the other colleges/schools of the university, the university staff, and outside

agencies to produce professional graduates who will be effective in the fields of education, human learning, and services.

Since the last visit, the scope of DSU programs has not changed, but the areas where they are offered have broadened to meet the needs of MS teachers and administrators. ITP in Elementary Education is offered in a 2+2 format at Hinds Community College near Jackson, MS, and Holmes Community College in Goodman, MS. The M.Ed. and Ed.S. in Elementary Education and Educational Leadership are offered in Tishomingo County, MS, and online. The Ed.S. and Ed.D. programs are offered to cohorts at off-campus sites and many classes are online or offered in a hybrid format.

Summary of programs offered at initial and advanced preparation programs (including off-campus distance learning, and alternate route programs, and accreditation status.

The unit offers programs at both the initial and advanced levels. B.S. programs include Elementary Education, Physical Education, Mathematics Education, Biology Education, Chemistry Education, English Education, Music Education, Social Sciences Education, and Art Education. The DSU Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) is an alternate route ITP program established by the Mississippi State Board of Education. The Special Education Program (ITP) is offered at the master's degree level.

At the advanced level, master's degree programs are offered in Elementary Education, Secondary Education (history, English, social sciences, art and physical education), Educational Leadership, and Counselor Education. Educational Specialist's degrees are offered in Elementary Education, Counseling, and Educational Leadership, and an Ed.D. degree is offered in Professional Studies. The Counselor Education master's program is recognized by CACREP and accreditation has been awarded to the Art Education program NASAD. The Music Education Program holds accreditation through the National Association for School Music (NASM) ITP undergraduate programs and the master's programs in Special Education and Educational Leadership have been reviewed by their respective SPAs. All have been fully recognized except the Physical Education program (with resubmission in March 2014).

The B.S. in Elementary Education is offered (2+2) at Hinds Community College in Raymond, MS. The M.Ed. and Ed.S. in Elementary Education are offered completely online and in a hybrid format in Tishomingo County, MS. The Ed.S. in Counseling is offered primarily online. Both the Ed.S. and Ed.D. programs are offered with online and hybrid coursework at off-campus locations in Batesville and Belzoni, MS.

The Mississippi Department of Education approves programs in teacher education, with annual reviews of programs leading to initial licensure for teachers and administrators. (1.4.a.1-8)

Summary of the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

The DSU COEHS and its community partners in regional, public, and private educational systems have a shared vision of enhancing educational opportunities for all individuals who live and work in the Mississippi Delta and beyond. This vision is in accord with that of the university which states that "students will learn and grow in an environment that fosters discovery and creativity."

To this end, the COEHS continues to promote a vibrant educational community, which serves as a catalyst for lifelong learning in the Mississippi Delta and beyond its borders. The undergraduate programs prepare confident and competent teachers for a range of grade levels and settings. Graduate programs prepare candidates for a variety of professional and leadership roles in diverse educational environments. These roles include teaching, counseling, administration, and supervision. Outreach efforts focus on renewing quality teaching within the Mississippi Delta by keeping professionals in the field connected to a broader educational community as well as providing the COEHS with continuous feedback on current needs in education and research. These efforts embody the belief that a professional educator is a life-long learner who engages in reflective practice through interactions within an educational community.

The shared vision/mission and candidate (college student) proficiencies for the college are illustrated by the Delta P³ Model. The program platform is the Delta triangle, reflecting the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for the development of effective candidates who positively impact student achievement. The Delta symbol is used not only because it symbolizes the geographic region, but also because equilateral triangles are the strongest of polygons. The Delta triangle is an appropriate representation since triangles are stable and can support heavy loads. Additionally, each side of the Delta triangle supports the others; a triangle can only be weakened if one of its sides is lengthened or shortened. These figures combine easily with other polygons to form larger, more complex structures.

Surrounding the Delta triangle are the three critical candidate components that form the basis of the unit's programs and its assessment system: *performance, preparation,* and *professionalism.*

1. *Preparation* (knowledge) includes the professional training components of each of the unit's programs for the preparation of educators. Effective candidates must demonstrate proficiencies that verify they have mastered the content of their disciplines, have exhibited knowledge of the skills necessary to effectively communicate this content to all of their students, and have displayed knowledge of the systems of education including teaching, assessment, classroom management, and decision making. In advanced programs, candidates demonstrate knowledge of new content, professional skills, and current research to enhance the architecture of their professional competence in order to better serve the complex needs of students in the region and beyond. Leadership candidates learn the ways in which they can establish distributed models of leadership and the critical components of school leadership.

2. *Performance* (skills) are developed through the field-based components of each program. Field experiences are sequenced, intensive, reflective, and require data-driven supervision to ensure candidates' growth in meeting proficiencies in the skills and dispositions needed to positively impact student learning for all students. Field experiences provide the foundation for candidates to develop an effective and dynamic teaching repertoire, enhancing skills to serve a diverse student population. In the case of advanced programs, candidates develop in-depth knowledge of teaching and learning as well as leadership and counseling skills to assist their students.

3. *Professionalism* (dispositions) are the developing characteristics that candidates demonstrate as they assume new professional roles and are committed to the welfare of their students. These dispositions reflect the ways in which their concern for students is manifested in interactions with not only the students, but with colleagues, families, and community stakeholders. These professional behaviors manifest the candidates' beliefs about their roles as professional and include: compassion, critical self-reflection, diversity, ethical practice, management of time and resources, creativity, flexibility, appreciation for and commitment to life-long learning, collaboration, and the belief that all students can learn.

All three components of the unit's conceptual framework work together to provide high quality preparation for candidates in initial and advanced programs. The triad of professionalism, preparation, and performance is encircled by the external and internal supports that renew and sustain candidates as they progress professionally through systematic programs of study. These supports include the internal resources provided by Delta State University faculty, staff, and leadership as well as support and feedback provided from external educational partners and alumni.

As an educational community, the unit supports and uses the following five guiding principles and knowledge bases to inform the key components highlighted above:

GP 1.   *Education is a lifelong endeavor.*
[SP1.Ind2; SP1.Ind3; SP1.Ind4; SP1.Ind5; SP1.Ind6; SP1.Ind7;SP2.Ind2; SP2.Ind3; SP2.Ind4; SP2.Ind6; SP2.Ind7; SP5.Ind1; SP5.Ind2; SP5.Ind4; SP5.Ind6; SP5.Ind8]

GP 2. *Education is interactive and reflective.*
[SP1.Ind5; SP1.Ind6; SP1.Ind7; SP5.Ind 4; SP5.Ind5]

GP 3. *Education is culturally contextualized.*
[SP1.Ind5; SP3.Ind6; SP5.Ind5; SP5.Ind6]

GP 4. *Education is dynamic.*
[SP1.Ind2; SP1.Ind4; SP1.Ind6; SP2.Ind4; SP4.Ind9; SP4.Ind10; SP4.Ind11; SP4.Ind12; SP5.Ind6; SP5.Ind8]

GP 5. *Education is enhanced by technology.*
[SP1.Ind7; SP3.Ind3; SP3.Ind4; SP3.Ind8; SP4.Ind5; SP4.Ind6; SPR.Ind10; SP5.Ind1; SP5.Ind2]

Assessments are aligned to the guiding principles and the corresponding dispositions assessed by the unit include fairness, the belief that all students can learn, professionalism, resourcefulness, dependability, and commitment to inquiry (graduate students only).

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

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

HPER Mission Statement
Mission statement
The Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation has a two-fold responsibility. The first is to develop a campus-wide program of health, safety, physical education, and recreation experiences to help all students achieve and maintain a high level of mental, physical, and social competence. The second is

to train teachers, coaches, and fitness leaders, athletic trainers, and recreation leaders capable of advancing high standards in their profession.

RFAC

Mission statement

The Department of Recreational Facilities and Aquatics mission is emphasizing health and recreation for faculty, staff, students and the citizens of Mississippi's Northern Delta counties. Emphasis is also placed on service, with special attention to a friendly environment

---

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.

Learning Outcomes

⯐BA-PSY 01: LO Learning and Cognition

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology

Learning Outcome

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

Data Collection (Evidence)

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

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

PSY 490 (Senior Seminar) Capstone Course Assessment:
MFT PSY assessment indicator for Memory and Cognition

Results of Evaluation

PSY 402 Learning and Cognition Course Assessment Data

PSY 402 *Learning and Cognition* assessment trend data (i.e., unit tests, a final exam [FE], and reflection papers [RP]) from Spring 2011 to Spring 2015 are reported below. In Spring 2015, the format was changed from quizzes and tests to frequent reflection papers and a research paper. Those class averages are listed first followed by the assessments from the previous years.

Spring 15

Reaction Paper 1	75.00
Reaction Paper 2	84.38
Reaction Paper 3	70.83
Reaction Paper 4	87.50
Reaction Paper 5	59.38
Reaction Paper 6	84.38
Reaction Paper 7	78.13
Reaction Paper 8	50.00
Reaction Paper 9	87.50
Reaction Paper 10	81.25
Reaction Paper 11	83.85
Reaction Paper 12	68.63
Reaction Paper 13	79.90
Reaction Paper 14	78.92
Reaction Paper 15	76.47

Student-Led Discussion   85.38
Term Paper   80.00

	S11	F11	S12	F12	S13	S14
Quizzes	NA	NA	NA	0.79	0.81	0.74
Test 1	0.82	0.74	0.82	0.87	0.84	0.73
Test 2	0.83	0.97	0.83	0.89	0.85	0.75
Test 3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.73
Test 4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.71
FE	0.83	0.86	0.82	0.74	0.83	0.73
RP 1	0.8	0.72	0.81	0.69	0.72	0.63
Rp 2	NA	0.77	NA	0.72	0.67	NA
Rp 3	NA	NA	NA	0.74	0.78	NA
Rp 4	NA	NA	NA	0.78	0.86	NA

MFT PSY Assessment Data

MFT PSY Assessment Indicator (Mean Percent Correct based on 14 students) for Memory and Cognition = 46 (national average = 43.6). There was an 8-point improvement from 2014 to 2015. In 2013, the national average was 43.7, and DSU students were 6 points below the national average, although there was a 3-point improvement from 2012 to 2013. In 2014, students were 5.7 points below the national average. In 2015, students were 2.4 points **ABOVE** the national mean. The 2015 scores represent an important trend from 2013.

National average is based on 357 institutions and 25,895 students taking the test from September 2010 to June 2014.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY **Scaled** Score: 14 PSY students = 152.7 out of a possible 200. National average is 155. DSU students improved 6 points in 2013 and 3.6 points in 2014. The scores have remained relatively stable compared to 2014 when the mean score was 153.6 (a decrease of .9 points). Three area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., measurement/methodology, clinical and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. However, the sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score. For most students who scored above the 50th percentile, the social psychology score was the lowest subscore. For two, the lowest subscore was abnormal/clinical.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who are capable of and plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. Six students scored above the national average of 155. The two highest scores were 182 (93rd percentile) and 175 (86th percentile).

Use of Evaluation Results

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

Spring 2015, the assessments for PSY 402 were changed to written papers instead of tests and quizzes.

There is ongoing discussion about whether the core is meeting the needs of students.

BA-PSY 02: LO Biological Psychology

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Students will recognize and apply terminology of the major concepts and theories in biological psychology.

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

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

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

Results of Evaluation
PSY 409 Biological Psychology Course Assessment Data
PSY 409 *Biological Psychology* assessment trend data (i.e., unit tests, a final exam [FE], and reflection papers [RP]) from Spring 2011 to Spring 2015 are reported below:

PSY 409

	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15
Quizzes	NA	NA	0.76	0.81	0.89
Test 1	0.83	0.8	0.68	0.74	0.67
Test 2	0.82	0.85	0.76	0.74	0.70
Test 3	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.65
FE	0.77	0.72	0.66	0.74	0.69
RP	0.69	0.81	NA	NA	NA
RP	0.71	0.81	NA	NA	NA
Paper	NA	NA	0.72	0.86	NA

MFT PSY Assessment Data

MFT PSY Assessment Indicator (Mean Percent Correct based on 14 students) for Sensory and Physiology = 61 (national average = 48). There was a 6-point improvement from 2014 to 2015.

National average is based on 357 institutions and 25,895 students taking the test from September 2010 to June 2014.

Note – Mean MFT PSY Sensory and Physiology student scores increased this year and are 13 points **ABOVE** the national average.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY **Scaled** Score: 14 PSY students = 152.7 out of a possible 200. National average is 155. DSU students improved 6 points in 2013, 3.6 points in 2014, and 6 points in 2015. The scores have remained relatively stable compared to 2014 when the mean score was 153.6 (a decrease of .9 points). Three area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., measurement/methodology, clinical and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. However, the sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score. For most students who scored above the 50th percentile, the social psychology score was the lowest subscore. For two, the lowest subscore was abnormal/clinical.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who are capable of and plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. Six students scored above the national average of 155. The two highest scores were 182 (93rd percentile) and 175 (86th percentile).

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

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

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

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

Introduced detailed semester writing assignment on topic of interest to students that was pertinent to the content of the course.

Provided systematic feedback to students on papers throughout the semester and assisted them in formulating an outline for their paper.

Introduced detailed rubric in syllabus that listed all expected paper components and the grading scale associated with each component.

BA-PSY 03: LO Developmental Psychology

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Students will recognize and apply terminology of the major concepts and theories in developmental psychology.

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

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

PSY 490 (Senior Seminar) Capstone Course Assessment:
MFT PSY assessment indicator for Developmental Psychology.

Results of Evaluation
PSY 307 Developmental Psychology Course Assessment Data

PSY 307 course trend data based on four-unit test average:
Spring 2011   .83   (N= 27)
Fall 2011   .79   (N = 31)
Spring 2012   .77   (N = 34)
Fall 2012   .80.5 (N = 26)
Spring 2013   .85   (N = 21)
Fall 2013   .79   (N = 27)
Spring 2014   .78   (N = 21)
Fall 2014   .73   (N=25)
Spring 2015   .77   (N=20)

MFT PSY Assessment Data
MFT PSY Assessment Indicator (Mean Percent Correct based on 15 students) for Developmental = 48 (national average = 50.9). The scores remained the same from 2013 to 2014. The 2015 score is 7 points lower than 2014. However, the scores are only 2.9 points below the national average.

National average is based on 357 institutions and 25,895 students taking the test from September 2010 to June 2014.

Note – Currently, students take PSY 307 as much as four semesters before the MFT. Some students have received credit for PSY 307 by taking CEL 300. This along with the fact that social psychology is not a core requirement may adversely affect DSU student scores.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY **Scaled** Score: 14 PSY students = 152.7 out of a possible 200. National average is 155. DSU students improved 6 points in 2013, 3.6 points in 2014, and 6 points in 2015. The scores have remained relatively stable compared to 2014 when the mean score was 153.6 (a decrease of .9 points). Three area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e.,

measurement/methodology, clinical and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. However, the sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score. For most students who scored above the 50th percentile, the social psychology score was the lowest subscore. For two, the lowest subscore was abnormal/clinical.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who are capable of and plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. Six students scored above the national average of 155. The two highest scores were 182 (93rd percentile) and 175 (86th percentile).

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

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

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

PSY 307 Developmental Psychology
In response to student performance on unit tests and the MFT assessment indicator, the instructor incorporated more group work and group discussions in the course meetings. More activities were incorporated that are designed to allow students to engage in more peer-to-peer dialogue, incorporate more real-world scenarios into the discussions, and apply more of the text information to their specific disciplinary interests.

Students also use publisher-provided online lab experiences to supplement in-class work.

BA-PSY 04: LO Statistics
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Students will produce and interpret descriptive and inferential statistics.

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

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

Results of Evaluation
PSY 331 Statistics Assessment Data

PSY 331 was on a six-test system from Fall 2010 to Fall 2013. In Spring 2014, three tests were given instead of six. In 2014-15, Homework, Quizzes, Midterm and Final Exam averages are included. Course averages on each assignment are recorded beginning Fall 2011.

Note – Previous years are reported to provide trend data.

PSY 331

	2011/2012	2012/2013	F13	S14	2014/15
Test 1	0.74	0.77	0.77	0.84	0.64
Test 2	0.81	0.87	0.80	0.88	NA
Test 3	0.73	0.69	0.84	NA	NA
Test 4	0.73	0.73	0.70	NA	NA
Test 5	0.78	0.76	0.77	NA	NA
Test 6	0.75	0.76	0.80	0.70	0.64
Homework	0.84	0.82	0.81	0.77	0.56
Quizzes	NA	NA	NA	0.77	0.68
Sem. Avg.	0.77	0.78	0.78	0.79	0.70

Research Methods Redesign Grade distribution data from 2006 to 2009 compared to data from 2010 to Fall 2011 indicate that the redesign has been ineffective in increasing student pass rates (pre-redesign 75% pass rate compared to post-redesign 73% pass rate). While the Spring 2012 pass rate increased to 79% and the Fall 2012 pass rate increased to 90%, the pass rate for Spring 2013 and Spring 2014 was 75%. The pass rate was 43% in Fall 2013. For Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, the courses were re-sequenced to put statistics first. The pass rate for PSY 331 for Fall 2013 was 77% and for Spring 2014, 85%.

Use of Evaluation Results
PSY 331 Statistics
In 2014-15, the instructor included more opportunities to apply statistics to actual research situations. Additional changes: YouTube videos of instructor working out problems; use of R statistical package (previously computer packages were not used in 331); ConcepTest questions every two weeks where students worked independently in class on problems and then in groups (individual classwork was reported as new); collaborative assignments. There was an attempt to modernize the curriculum.

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

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

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

BA-PSY 05: LO Research Design Writing
Start: 7/1/2014

End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Students will be able to demonstrate effective research design and scientific writing skills using APA style which culminates in an executable research proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

Results of Evaluation
PSY 330 Research Methods I Assessment Data
PSY 330 assessment trend data (i.e., unit tests, research topic proposal, annotative bibliography [Bib], rough draft [Draft], final literature review [Lit R] and final exam [FE]) for spring 2011 to spring 2015 are reported below. Over 2013-14, the course format was changed, and then it changed again in 2014-15. Both sets are listed for comparison.

PSY 330

	F14	S15
Quizzes	58.5	56.7
Assn	92.25	73.6
Paper 1	90	76.3
Paper 2	83.64	76.6
Presentation	72.5	77.8
Course	79.55	73.6

	S11	S12	F12	S13	F13	S14
Quizzes	NA	NA	0.77	0.72	0.65	0.88
Test 1	0.76	0.83	0.78	0.82	0.70	0.75
Test 2	0.83	0.88	0.76	0.79	0.72	0.75
Proposal	0.62	0.77	0.85	0.67	NA	NA

Bib	0.74	0.7	0.42	0.7	NA	NA
Draft	0.64	0.84	0.72	0.69	0.44	0.60
Lit R	0.73	0.8	0.81	0.82	0.50	NA
FE	NA	NA	0.66	0.85	0.46	NA

PSY 332 Research Methods II Assessment Data
PSY 332 has been on the four-test system since fall 2006; however, only two tests were given in Spring 2014. There is an early-semester talk to peers designed to pressure them for the details for their project. There is also an annotated bibliography, first draft, and second draft.

Note - 2011-2012 data are also reported to provide trend data.

PSY 332						
	2011/2012	2012/2013	F13	S14	F14	S15
Test 1	0.77	0.77	0.84	0.91	0.89	0.71
Test 2	0.70	0.77	0.71	0.75	0.91	0.64
Test 3	0.81	0.87	NA	NA	NA	NA
Test 4	0.79	0.74	NA	NA	NA	NA
Talk	0.82	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.74
Bib	0.66	0.77	0.71	0.62	0.80	0.66
Draft 1	0.65	0.74	NA	0.77	NA	NA
Draft 2	0.8	0.83	NA	0.75	NA	NA
RP	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.80	0.76
FE	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.80	0.70
HW	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.83	0.70
Sem. Avg.	0.77	0.79	0.78	0.81	NA	NA
Quiz Avg.	NA	0.55	0.72	0.77	0.71	0.83

MFT PSY Assessment Data
MFT Assessment Indicators for Measurement and Methodology (Mean Percent Correct) demonstrated a decrease in 5 points from 2014 to 2015 but a 4-point improvement from 2010-2015:
2010: 44 (52 national average)
2011: 49 (52 national average)
2012: 45 (55 national average)
2013: 54 (55 national average)
2014: 53 (54 national average)
2015: 48 (54 national average)

National average is based on 357 institutions and 25,895 students taking the test from September 2010 to June 2014.

Note - Average TOTAL MFT PSY **Scaled** Score: 14 PSY students = 152.7 out of a possible 200. National average is 155. DSU students improved 6 points in 2013, 3.6 points in 2014, and 6 points in 2015. The scores have remained relatively stable compared to 2014 when the mean score was 153.6 (with 2015 showing a decrease of only .9 points). Three area assessment indicators on the MFT PSY (i.e., measurement/methodology, clinical and social psychology) are not required core courses at DSU, so they have been excluded from evaluation. However, the sub-scores from these areas may adversely affect the total MFT PSY score. For most students who scored above the 50th percentile, the social psychology score was the lowest subscore. For two, the lowest subscore was abnormal/clinical.

Note – Course grade and standardized test (MFT PSY) score distributions indicate that there are two different populations of DSU psychology students: Those who are capable of and plan on attending graduate school and those who plan on starting a post-baccalaureate career. Six students scored above the national average of 155. The two highest scores were 182 (93rd percentile) and 175 (86th percentile).

Note – Although the Clinical/Abnormal score is not analyzed because it is not part of the core, it should be noted that the Mean MFT PSY Clinical/Abnormal student score is 65, which is 2.8 points above the national average of 62.2.

Student Research and Presentation Production
Psychology students conducted a good number of research projects. Five students registered for PSY 493 Independent Research.

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

Tests are periodically revised to reflect current course content.

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

PSY 330 Research Methods I
In order to increase student learning the following were carried out:

Changed topical selections of papers to focus on topic students were interested in studying.

Refined the structure of the writing components of the course to make the criteria for evaluation consistent across all assignments.

Provided systematic feedback to students on papers throughout the semester.

In addition, majors were assigned to PSY 331 before PSY 330. This would give transfer students more time in psychology courses before they had to write research proposals. The faculty felt that transfer students in particular did not have enough experience in psychology to be able to carry out research papers their first semester at DSU.

PSY 332 Research Methods II

The following grading changes were carried out:

The annotated bibliography was reweighted from .06 to .08 and the weight of the final draft of the paper was increased by .02.

Tests were reduced to less than .50 the final grade.

Research Methods Redesign:
The redesign has been ineffective in increasing student pass rates. It was determined that students are taking PSY 330 (*Research Methods I*) too early in the course sequence to have appropriate knowledge to begin a research paper. Thus, the redesign has been recalibrated again by changing the course sequence of PSY 330 (*Research Methods I*), 331 (*Statistics*), and 332 (*Research Methods II*). Now, students take PSY 331 (*Statistics*) first, and then take PSY 330 and 332. Pushing PSY 330 back a semester allows students to take other topical psychology courses and learn more about psychology before taking PSY 330.

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

The department started a psychology stats lab with tutoring by graduate students in Spring 2014. While statistics help was specifically advertised, tutors were also available to help with writing and APA style. Increased test and homework grades were in all courses.

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

Year (spring)	Number of Students Tested	Overall MFT Score (national average)	Memory and Cognition (national average)	Sensory and Physiology (national average)	Developmental (national average)	Measurement and Methodology (national average)
2010	14	152 (155)	44 (48)	38 (38)	43 (46)	44 (52)
2011	20	148 (156)	47 (48)	33 (38)	38 (46)	49 (52)
2012	19	144 (156)	29 (44)	45 (49)	38 (52)	45 (55)
2013	15	150 (156)	32 (44)	51 (49)	49 (52)	54 (55)
2014	15	154 (155)	38 (44)	55 (49)	50 (51)	53 (54)
2015	14	153 (156)	46 (44)	61 (49)	48 (51)	48 (54)

National average is based on 325 institutions and 17,046 students taking the test from September 2010 to June 2013.

BS-AT 01: LO Clinical Decision-Making

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Graduates of the Athletic Training Program have the working knowledge sufficient to make clinical decisions required of Certified Athletic Trainers.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The Board of Certification Examination results is used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Board of Certification Examination results were collected and reported by the Board of Certification, Inc. office to the Athletic Training Program Director.

3. The Athletic Training Program Curriculum Committee performed a program analysis in light of the certification examination results. The Committee submitted their recommendations to the HPER Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for approval.

BS-AT 02: Practical Ability

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Graduates of the Athletic Training Program have the practical ability to provide appropriate treatments, prescribe therapeutic exercise programs, and incorporate injury prevention management strategies for athletes and patients.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Completed Clinical Experience Evaluations of the Athletic Training Students by the Clinical Supervisors for on-campus clinical assignments are used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Athletic Training Program Director collects all clinical experience evaluations on the athletic training students by the clinical supervisor and they are housed in the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in the Athletic Training Students' portfolios.

3. The Athletic Training Program Curriculum Committee performed a program analysis of this information. The Committee submitted their recommendations to the HPER Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for approval.

BS-AT 03: Clinical Skills

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Graduates, upon completion of the Internship in Athletic Training course, achieved the appropriate level of clinical skills necessary to perform the duties of an Athletic Trainer in the appropriate chosen setting.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Internship Experience Evaluations were used to determine clinical performance of athletic training students.

2. The Internship Coordinator collected the data from the Internship Supervisor and they are housed in the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in the Athletic Training Students' portfolios.

3. The Athletic Training Program Curriculum Committee performed a program analysis of this information. The Committee submitted their recommendations to the HPER Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for approval.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Identify and assess the stages of human development from conception through adolescence in areas of physical/motor, social, and emotional growth.
GE 1, GE 4, GE 5

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

Objective examinations: Students are given exams and asked to write reports to determine their content knowledge concerning the stages of human development. These exams and reports determine the students' basic knowledge of child development. Students who do not score at least 70% on these assessments will not be able to effectively apply the knowledge with children. Students who do not earn at least a grade of 70% in a child development course must repeat the course.

- Appendix 1

Results of Evaluation
Final analysis of the points on the student assessment tool over the past three years indicated that at least 70% of the students received an average rating of at least 3 out of 4, on the assessment tool. This is considered acceptable, safe to practice. 26% of the students received an average rating of over 3.5, with a 4 rating being considered outstanding, effective practice. The remaining four percent of the students were considered marginal or unacceptable.

Use of Evaluation Results
Lab evaluation forms were modified year before last to allow consistency in evaluation procedures throughout the student's course of study. These forms, filed in the student's personal folder in the Division office, are used to determine improvement throughout the course of study. This model has been used for four years. Students continue to be evaluated at midterm so that they are informed before the semester's end of any difficulties they may be having.

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

BS-FCS-CD 02: LO Developmentally appropriate practices

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Plan and implement activities and administer programs for children that incorporate early childhood principles and are based on developmental needs and characteristics of children.

GE 1, GE 4, GE 5, GE 8

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

Development and implementation of developmentally appropriate projects and activities:

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

Internship Evaluations:

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

- Appendix 2

Results of Evaluation

According to lab evaluations,
students needed more classroom instruction on the development of age appropriate activities. Lab evaluation findings further indicated that students need more opportunities to participate in and/or implement activities and programs that they had developed for children in the classroom.

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

85% of the students in the past four years have achieved at least a rating of 3 on the 4-point Likert-type scale on their first assessment during their internship experience. This is defined as acceptable, safe to practice. Students who failed to meet these acceptable expectations were required to repeat until acceptable performance was achieved. At the end of the internship experience, 90% of the student interns received a rating of at least 3 (acceptable, safe to practice) on the assessment. Based on findings over the past four years from the internship evaluations, the following recommendations were made and changes implemented accordingly:
1. In the area of dependability, students need to understand the importance of their consistency in working with children and employers.
2. Students need to work with less supervision during their internship experiences.

Use of Evaluation Results

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

Additional class time is still dedicated to the instruction of creating developmentally appropriate activities. Blackboard is also used to hold student discussions, and additional web resources for students are utilized to locate developmentally appropriate activities for children. Individual conferences are held with students who require more individualized instruction.

Faculty determined several years ago that students cannot successfully take over 12 semester hours, including the internship hours, during their internship semester.
Student interns are now required to meet as a group six times with the internship academic supervisor to receive detailed instructions regarding internship requirements. This is an increase from the earlier requirements. Before reporting to the internship site, interns must meet once individually with the academic supervisor to discuss specific requirements and to address questions. Internship rubric and evaluations were modified to help students understand prior to evaluations what the expectations were.

A packet of expectations that the student must meet has been developed for the supervising teacher. The supervising teacher is encouraged to allow the student to work independently. Meetings are held by the internship academic supervisor and the supervising teacher when an adequate level of independence is not being allowed. The evaluation form was revised this last year to accommodate more written comments from the Child Development teachers.

BS-FCS-CD-03: LO Professional Development

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Identify and asses the level of professionalism that students possess and identify knowledge and skills needed in the workforce.

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

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

Use of Evaluation Results
The instructional materials, rubrics, and other evaluative materials are reviewed annually.

BS-FCS-FM 01: LO Requirements and skills

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Identify responsibilities and demonstrate skills necessary for a variety of positions in the fashion industry.

GE 1, GE 2, GE 4, GE 5

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

- appendices

Results of Evaluation
Over the past thirteen years, 90% of the student interns have been rated above average or higher on their evaluation forms by employment supervisors. 90% of these students were also rated satisfactory or higher on their internship manuals by their academic advisor and employment supervisors. Based on an evaluation rating sheet, 75% of students earned a grade of 75% or higher from the instructor on their career research papers.

Use of Evaluation Results
An in-depth research project was added in the past several years to enhance their knowledge base and improve their written communication skills. No new requirements have been added

BS-FCS-FM 02: LO Merchandise selection

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Correctly evaluate and select merchandise based on individual and family values and lifestyles.

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

Results of Evaluation
80% of students produced portfolios and projects that earned a grade of 75% or higher by the instructor.

Use of Evaluation Results
Wardrobe analysis project was amended in the last couple years to incorporate revised software. Students were also shown available internet sites to facilitate their wardrobe selection process. They learned that this information and skill would be transferrable to their clients in the future.

BS-FCS-FM 03: LO Consumer acceptance theories

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Correctly identify theories of change which have impact on consumer acceptance.

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

Results of Evaluation
Trend boards and projects required all students to satisfactorily design or construct products that incorporated their content knowledge and research. Photoshop technology was incorporated into Trend Board design several years ago. At least 80% of students earned a grade of 75% or higher on the trend board assignment. This year's trend board assignment changed focus from a fiber focus, to a general trend focus.

Use of Evaluation Results
Assessment methods changed to reflect an evaluation procedure that pays more attention to detail.

BS-FCS-FM 04: LO Apparel industry roles

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Correctly identify the roles of manufacturers, retailers and consumers as related to the apparel industry.

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

- appendices
- appendices

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

Use of Evaluation Results
Current additional readings were assigned to enhance knowledge base for research papers.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Effectively design, prepare and present activities which incorporate business and creative concepts.

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

- appendices

Results of Evaluation
80% of students earned at least a grade of 80% or higher from their instructor on class portfolios and projects; 80% of students earned a very satisfactory or higher rating on class portfolios and projects;

The results of the portfolio over the past three years demonstrate that at least 90% of the students achieved a grade of at least 80% on the Professional Development portfolio.

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

BS-FCS-FM 06: LO Product knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Effectively evaluate the impact of fabrication, design and the function of apparel and/or textile products on human behavior and lifestyles.

Data Collection (Evidence)
Lab notebook; Exams;
An objective evaluation form is used to evaluate notebooks.

Results of Evaluation
80% of students earned a grade of 75% or higher from their instructor on lab notebooks. 75% of students earned at least an 75% or higher on exams.

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

BS-FCS-ND 01: LO Nutritional care process

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Effectively perform the Nutrition Care Process and use standardized nutrition language for individuals, groups and populations of differing ages and health status in a variety of settings. Assess the nutritional status of individuals, groups and populations in a variety of settings where nutrition care is or can be delivered.

Data Collection (Evidence)
95% of students will receive a mean average ≥ 4 out of 5 on the preceptor evaluation for patient assessments.

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

- appendix 4

Results of Evaluation
90% of students received a score of three or better on a four-point scale for their performance on the Nutrition Care Process.

Use of Evaluation Results
Overall, the Intern evaluations by their Preceptors are excellent. Faculty will continue to bring new knowledge and technology to the program and incorporate these into student learning activities to allow attainment of required competencies. The total number of hours in FCS 479 (clinical aspect of Supervised Practice) was changed from 540 to 500 to allow students to be able to complete the required hours within one semester.

BS-FCS-ND 02: LO Nutrition interventions

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Effectively plan and implement nutrition interventions to include prioritizing the nutrition diagnosis, formulating a nutrition prescription, establishing goals and selecting and managing intervention.

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

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

Results of Evaluation
90% of students received a B or higher on their major case study paper and presentations.

Use of Evaluation Results
Preceptor evaluations of interns were above average. The number of nutrition assessments and case studies required (specify the number of cases with diabetes, cardiovascular disease, digestive disorders, inborn errors of metabolism, etc.) was reviewed for possible increases. Students are continuing to complete a minimum of ten mini case studies in FCS 477 and one major case study for FCS 479.

BS-FCS-ND 03: LO Nutritional cultural diversity

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Successfully develop and evaluate recipes, formulas and menus for acceptability and affordability that accommodate the cultural diversity and health needs of various populations, groups and individuals

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

Results of Evaluation
90% of students received a score of three or better on a four-point scale for their performance on the Nutrition Care Process.

Use of Evaluation Results
Students have been evaluating and developing menus for diverse clients in a variety of settings, from child care, to senior adults, as well as recipes and menus for special diets in hospitals and nursing homes. The instructor for FCS 360 Quantity Food Procurement and Production is seeking additional quantity food experiences to supplement the classroom and laboratory experiences currently utilized.

BS-FCS-ND 04: LO Guidelines and literature

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Appropriately apply evidence-based guidelines, systematic reviews and scientific literature (such as the Academy's Evidence Analysis Library and Evidence-based Nutrition Practice Guidelines, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, National Guideline Clearinghouse Web sites) in the nutrition care process and model and other areas of dietetics practice.

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

Results of Evaluation
90% of students received a grade of B or higher on their major case study paper and presentation.

Use of Evaluation Results
Students have successfully used the AND (Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics) Evidence Analysis Library and relevant literature for nutrition assessments as well as their major case study.

BS-FCS-ND 05: LO Food service plan

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Develop a realistic plan to provide or develop a product, program or service that includes a budget, staffing needs equipment, and supplies.

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

Results of Evaluation
80% of the students received a grade of 75% or higher on their business plan.

Use of Evaluation Results
Students have received guidance on their business plans from instructors in the FCS 460 and the FCS 478 courses

BS-FCS-ND 06: LO Environment

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Propose and use procedures as appropriate to the practice setting to reduce waste and protect the environment

Data Collection (Evidence)
Students in FCS 360 Quantity Foods participate in laboratory experiments, menu design for catering, and produce catering events for DSU and Cleveland community events. Students include these events in the professional portfolio, in which written documentation of the menu, budget and other necessary elements can be found. Additionally, content knowledge from this experience is evaluated as part of

the students' onsite experiences within the Supervised Practice in Foodservice Management (FCS 478). Portfolio contents are evaluated in concert with the AND competencies for the specific supervised practice rotation

Results of Evaluation
At least 80% of the students in FCS 360 earned an average grade of 80% on these projects in the course. 95% of students received a grade of B or higher in the Supervised Practice in Foodservice Management (FCS 478) course. Students have been successfully utilizing the Ada Swindle Mitchell Foods Laboratory since the beginning of spring 2006 to gain foodservice experience.

Use of Evaluation Results
Facility preceptors indicated that students would benefit from prior exposure to commercial/institutional kitchens/bakeries prior to beginning the supervised practice rotation. Based on the results of the 2013 evaluations, faculty members determined that there may be a need for more hands-on projects within foodservice organizations prior to the beginning of the Supervised Practice. Students are now utilizing the Foods Laboratory to provide catering for a number of functions on campus. A standardized third-party evaluation process is being developed (similar to that used in the Supervised Practice rotations) so that the recipient of the catered function can provide objective and subjective (taste and presentation) feedback.

BS-FCS-ND 07: LO Sanitation
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Family and Consumer Sciences
Learning Outcome
Effectively perform management functions related to safety, security and sanitation that affect employees, customers, patients, facilities and food.

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

Results of Evaluation
At least 90% of students received a grade of B or higher in their supervised practice courses. In addition, all students become ServSafe® Certified prior to or during the Supervised Practice FCS 478. The ServSafe® program has become the industry standard in food safety training and is accepted in almost all United States jurisdictions that require foodservice employee certification. The ServSafe® program provides accurate, up-to-date information for all levels of students/employees on all aspects of handling food, from receiving and storing to preparing and serving.

Use of Evaluation Results

Students have taken advantage of opportunities to conduct safety, security, and sanitation audits in various rotations and facilities. This has increased the students' knowledge of regulations regarding safety and sanitation.

BS-HPER-ES 01: Exercise Program Design

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Assess clients, interpret test results, and design appropriate exercise programs for the general population.

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

BS-HPER-ES 02: Group Exercise Leadership

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Prepare and teach a group exercise class ag an acceptable level.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Students Planned, choreographed, and produced a group exercise class in PER 361 *Clinical Experience in Exercise Science II.*

2. This data is collected by the instructor of PER 361 *Clinical Experience in Exercise Science II Exercise Prescription*.
3. Data is analyzed by the Coordinator of the Exercise Science Program.

BS-HPER-ES 03: Integration of Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014

End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

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

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. A capstone course was developed called PER 465 Internship in Exercise science that includes work experiences in the health and fitness field.

2. This data is collected by the instructor of PER 465 Internship in *Exercise Science*.
3. This data is analyzed by the instructor of PER 461 *Exercise Prescription*.

BS-HPER-ES 04: Fitness Testing

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Administer a fitness test at an acceptable level of competence.

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

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

BS-HPER-HPE 01: Historical Concepts

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 *HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION*.

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300.

⬛BS-HPER-HPE 02: Organization and Administration

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. PER 391 *ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS* has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391.

⬛BS-HPER-HPE 03: Skill Set Assessment

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
The physical education teacher candidates will be physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Skill assessment tests and Individual Fitness testing was used.
2. Skill assessment-PER 314/315: Each teacher candidate was required to pass or demonstrate proficiency in movement and skill performance. Fitness test-CUR 300: Each teacher candidate was fitness tested during the semester of CUR 300.
3. Data was analyzed within the HPER Division and within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

BS-HPER-REC 01: Historical Concepts

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

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

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 *HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.*

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300 and included in the division and unit reports to be analyzed by the division chair for the Annual Report.

BS-HPER-REC 02: Organization and Administration

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. PER 391 *ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS* has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391, the division chair, and included in the HPER annual report.

BS-HPER-REC 03: Planning and Implementation

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

Plan and implement a recreational activity based on current discipline–specific scientific and theoretical concepts.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. PER 435 *RECREATION SEMINAR* is a capstone class for Recreation Leadership. The project for this course is to plan and implement a large-scale recreational activity for the community, campus, or schools in the Delta.

2. Journal article reviews and writing assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 435.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 435, the division chair, and included in the HPER annual report.

BS-HPER-SI 01: Historical Concepts

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 *HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION*.

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300 and included in the division and unit reports to be analyzed by the division chair for the Annual Report.

BS-HPER-SI 02: Organization and Administration

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. PER 391 *ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS* has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391, the division chair, and included in the HPER annual report.

BS-HPER-SI 03: Professional Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of sports information professionals by engaging in professional activities.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The Internship Evaluation Form will be used for this assessment.

2. The internship coordinator will collect these forms.

3. This data will be analyzed by the internship coordinator.

BS-HPER-SM 01: Historical Concepts

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Recognize historical concepts, ideas, accomplishments, challenges, sacrifices, or heroic achievements of the past and articulate how it relates to the field of Health, Physical Education, or Recreation.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. An individual scoring rubric is used for the oral presentation in PER 300 *HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION.*

2. The rubrics will be collected after the oral presentation by the instructor of PER 300.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 300 and included in the division and unit reports to be analyzed by the division chair for the Annual Report.

BS-HPER-SM 02: Organization and Administration

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate knowledge of facility design, staffing and management for physical education, sport, or recreation programs, including scheduling of use, safety and risk management issues, development of a budget, and fiscal management of a facility.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. PER 391 *ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION PROGRAMS* has class projects to design a facility, staff a facility, and develop a budget for a facility.

2. These assignments will be collected by the instructor of PER 391.

3. This data will be analyzed by the instructor of PER 391, the division chair, and included in the HPER annual report.

BS-HPER-SM 03: Professional Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of sport managers by engaging in professional activities.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The Internship Evaluation Form will be used for this assessment.

2. The internship coordinator will collect these forms.

3. This data will be analyzed by the internship coordinator.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate mastery of the <u>appropriate content and skills</u>.

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
<u>Praxis II Subject Area Test</u>
<u>Spring 2014 – Campus – N = 16</u>
These results are for interns (Campus group) from spring 2014. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 173.8, with a median score of 171; the minimum passing score is 158. One candidate failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt. This indicates an 94% 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.

<u>Spring 2014 – Hinds – N = 8</u>
These results are for interns (Hinds group) from spring 2014. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 172.0 with a median score of 176.0; the minimum passing score is 158. One candidate failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, and one candidates failed on two or more attempts. This indicates a 75% 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.

<u>Fall 2014 – Campus – N = 14</u>
These results are for interns (Campus group) from spring 2014. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 171.5, with a median score of 169.50; the minimum passing score is 158. Three candidates failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on two or more attempts. This indicates a 79% 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.

<u>Fall 2014 – Hinds – N = 16</u>
These results are for interns (Hinds group) from spring 2014. The mean score on the Praxis II Subject Area Test was 169.1, with a median score of 163.5; the minimum passing score is 158. One candidates failed the Praxis II Subject Area Test on the first attempt, and one candidate failed on two or more attempts. This indicates a 88% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the

internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT) Test
Spring 2014 – Campus – N = 16
These results are for interns (Campus group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in spring 2014. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 175.2 and the median 171; the minimum passing score is 160. One candidate failed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching on two or more attempts which indicates a 94% 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 2014 – Hinds – N = 8
These results are for interns (Hinds group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in spring 2014.On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 169.5 and the median 170; the minimum passing score is 160. Two candidates failed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test on the first attempt and one student failed on two or more attempts, which indicates a 63% 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 2014 – Campus – N = 14
These results are for interns (Campus group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in fall 2014.On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 172.6 and the median 172; the minimum passing score is 160. All candidates successfully passed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test on the first attempt, which indicates a 100% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

Fall 2014 – Hinds – N = 16
These results are for interns (Hinds group) taking the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test in fall 2014. On the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching, the mean score was 170.4 and the median 167.5; the minimum passing score is 160. Three candidates failed the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching Test on the first attempt and one student failed on two or more attempts, which indicates a 75% first-time pass rate. All candidates successfully completed the internship and all met the minimum GPA requirement for Admission to Teacher Education and Admission to Internship.

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

First-time pass rates on the Praxis II Tests ranged from 75% to 94%. Workshops prior to test taking have been implemented and will continue as support for teaching candidates

BSE-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate mastery of content knowledge
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome

Demonstrate mastery of <u>content knowledge</u>.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. College BASE (C-Base), a criterion-referenced academic achievement exam (covering mathematics, social studies, science, and English) was administered. The C-Base was developed at the University of Missouri and is used across the U.S. as an assessment of content knowledge for pre-service elementary education teacher candidates. Scores range from 40 – 560, with a mean score of 300. Reports provide mean scores and standard deviations for each tested group.

2. The assessment was administered to all candidates in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*, as a measure of students' content knowledge.

3. An institutional summary and individual score reports provided descriptive data. Data results were compared with those of past years to identify trends in strengths and weaknesses in candidates' knowledge of content.

Results of Evaluation
This summary reports on four groups of candidates. Group one consists of on-campus students taking the C-Base test in Spring 2014. Group two consists of candidates enrolled in the Hinds 2 + 2 Program who took the test in Spring 2014. Group three consists of on-campus candidates taking the C-Base test in Fall 2014. Group four consists of candidates enrolled in the Hinds 2 + 2 Program who took the test in Fall 2014.

<u>Spring 2014 – Campus Group – N=20</u>
In the spring 2014 testing of on-campus candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 211 and 43; mathematics, 258 and 41; science 171 and 53; and social studies, 191 and 44. The composite score for candidates was 207.
The highest average performance was in the area of Math (Average = 258). The math score is 51 points higher than the composite score of 201, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-Base. The second highest average performance was in the area of English (Average = 211). The English score is 4 points higher than the composite score of 201. Because this group of candidates' math score exceeds the composite score, they have demonstrated a relative strength in math as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in math is 43. While the math scores are the highest of this group of candidates, the standard deviation indicates that English had greater variance of student scores than math.

For this group of candidates, social studies scores were the lowest at an average of 191, which is 16 points lower than the group composite score of 207. Sixteen points represents a meaningful difference, thus this group of candidates shows a relative weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for social studies scores is 44. It indicates a slightly larger variance in scores compared to English with a standard deviation of 43.

<u>Spring 2014- Hinds Group – N=12</u>
In the spring testing of Hinds 2 + 2 candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 279 and 37; mathematics, 294 and 29; science 235 and 36; and social studies, 269 and 49. The composite score for candidates was 268.

The highest average performance for these candidates was in the area of math (Average = 294). However, the math score is 26 points higher than the composite score of 268, indicating a difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-BASE. The English score exceeds the composite score by 11 points. The Social Studies score exceeds the composite score by 1 point. Because this group of candidates' math scores, social studies scores, and English scores exceed the composite score, they have demonstrated a slight strength in these areas as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in math is 29, the standard deviation in social studies is 49, and the standard deviation in English is 37.

For this group of candidates, science scores were the lowest at an average of 235, which is 33 points lower than the group composite score of 268. This represents a meaningful difference and indicates a relative weakness in social studies as compared to other tested areas.

Fall 2014 – Campus Group – N=32
In the fall testing of on-campus candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 238 and 51; mathematics, 247 and 45; science 216 and 57; and social studies, 219 and 59. The composite score for candidates was 232.

The highest average performance was in the areas of math (Average = 247). The math score is 15 points higher than the composite score of 232, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in math and their overall performance on the C-BASE. The second highest average performance was in the area of English (Average = 238). The English score is 6 point higher than the composite score of 232. Because this group of candidates' math score and English score exceeds the composite score, they have demonstrated a relative strength in math and a slight strength in English as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in math is 45. While the math scores are the highest of this group of candidates, the standard deviation indicates that Science and Social Studies had greater variance of student scores than math.

For this group of candidates, Science scores were the lowest at an average of 216, which is 16 points lower than the group composite score of 232. Thirty points represents a meaningful difference, thus this group of candidates shows a weakness in Science as compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for Science scores is 57. This group of candidates also shows a slight weakness in Social Studies. The average for Social Studies was 2190, which is 13 points lower than the composite score of 232. The standard deviation for Social Studies was 59.

Fall 2014 – Hinds Group - N=15
In the fall testing of Hinds candidates, averages and standard deviations respectively were English, 257 and 42; mathematics, 275 and 37; science 242 and 35; and social studies, 240 and 49. The composite score for candidates was 251.

The highest average performance was in the areas of mathematics (Average = 275). The math scores are 24 points higher than the composite score of 251, indicating a meaningful difference between these candidates' performance in mathematics and their overall performance on the C-BASE. Because this group of candidates' mathematics scores exceed the composite score, they have demonstrated a relative strength in mathematics as compared to other areas in which they were tested. The standard deviation for this group in mathematics is 37.

English scores were at an average of 257, which is 6 points higher than the group composite score of 251. A score must be at least 17 points higher or lower than the composite score to make a meaningful relationship and to determine strengths and weaknesses.

For this group of candidates, social studies and science scores were the lowest. Social studies scores were at an average of 240, which is 11 points lower than the group composite score of 251. Science scores were at an average of 242, which is 9 points lower than the group composite score of 251. This represents a meaningful difference and indicates a slight weakness in social studies and science as

compared to other tested areas. The standard deviation for social studies scores is 49. The standard deviation for science scores is 35. The scores indicate that the smallest variance for this group is in the area of science.

<u>Trends noted</u>
Social Studies has been an area where the candidates consistently average the lowest score each year. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2014, Social Studies is the lowest area (225). The second lowest area is Science (236). After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2014, Mathematics is the highest area (274). The second highest area is English (243). Overall, the candidates' average composite score is 240, which indicates that math and English are relative strengths for the candidates.

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

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

After averaging the mean scores from the years 2013-2014, Science is the lowest area (216). The second lowest area is Social Studies (229.75).

After averaging the mean scores from the years 2013-2014, Mathematics is the highest area (268.5). The second highest area is English (246.25).

Overall, the candidates' average composite score is 240.13, which indicates that math and science are relative strengths for the candidates.

The 2013-2014 scores are beginning to show that we have students at a variety of different achievement levels in English, Science, Mathematics, and Social Studies. The candidates range in ability from high performers to medium performers to low performers. Actions based upon these trends have been to conference with candidates regarding their individual scores.

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

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

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

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

Elementary faculty will continue to use this test data to establish a baseline reference upon which to determine how best to direct students in their efforts to compensate for content area weaknesses. Even though candidates take the C-Base test upon entering the elementary education program, the test is not used as an admission requirement. The instructor for the introductory course in which the C-Base is given, meets with each candidate individually after scores are received. The

instructor, along with the candidate's advisor, discusses the score report with the candidate. Low scores provide a basis for the advisor to devise an action plan with the candidate to improve his/her content knowledge.

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

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 2014- Campus Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*
(N=18) 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 lesson plans 3.75/4), Home School Community Connection (2.82/3) and Reflection and Self Reflection (2.91/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Spring 2014- Hinds Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*
 (N=13) 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 the Lesson Plans (3.62/4), Assessment Plan (2.40/3), Home School Community Connection (2.44/3) and Reflection and Self Reflection (2.49/3) In Spring 2014, these four areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2014- Campus 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 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 Lesson Plans (3.41/4), Assessment Plan (2.69/3), Teaching Day Assessments (3.99/4), and Reflection and Self Reflection (2.91/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2014- Hinds Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood*
 (N=9) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Early Childhood* demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. Areas of concern are Learning Objectives (2.84/3), Lesson Plans (3.64/4), and Assessment Plan (2.65/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Spring 2014 - Campus Group CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
 (N=19) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades* demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of Unit Rationale (2.45/3), Assessment Plan (2.46/3), Home School Community Connection (2.44/3), and Reflection and Self Reflection (2.38/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Spring 2014 - Hinds Group CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
 (N=13) 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 Unit Rationale (2.79/3), Lesson Plans (3.63/4), Assessment Plan (2.72/3), Teaching Day Assessments (3.64/4), and Reflection and Self Reflection (2.71/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2014 - Campus Group CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
 (N=16) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades* demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. An area that is of concern is that of Unit Rationale (2.67/3),

Learning Objectives (2.24/3), Lesson Plans (3.37/4), Assessment Plan (2.53/3), Teaching Day Assessments (3.82/4), Reflection and Self reflection (2.60/3), and Unit at a Glance (2.00/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Fall 2014 - Hinds Group CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades* (N=9) Overall results showed that candidates in the CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades* demonstrated their ability to plan at or above the acceptable levels in most categories of the Integrated Unit. One area of concern is that of Learning Objectives (2.71/3) , Lesson Plans (3.59/4), Assessment Plan (2.50/3, Reflection and Self Reflection (2.63/3) and Unit at a Glance (2.73/3). In Spring 2014, these areas had fewer students scoring at the acceptable or target levels.

Methods Courses

Spring 2014- Campus Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
Spring 2013 (Campus) (N=16) – Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on prepares appropriate teaching techniques (# 4) and plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 2.81 on selects appropriate objectives (# 1) and incorporates diversity (#2). For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 2.13/3 on plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 2.67 on selects appropriate objectives (# 1) and plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4).

Spring 2014- Hinds Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
Spring 2014 (Hinds) (N=13) – Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 1.92/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to 2.62 on selects apropriate objectives (#1) and prepares appropriate assessments (#5). For CEL 318, there were no scores.

Fall 2014- Campus Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
Fall 2014 (Campus) (N=16) - Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.06/3 on plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 2.88 on integrates core content knowledge (#3). For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 1.75/3 on prepares appropriate assessment procedures (#5) to 2.56 on selects appropriate objectives (#1).

Fall 2014- Hinds Group CEL 317 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood* and CEL 318 *Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades*
Fall 2014 (Hinds) (N=9) - Indicators 1-6 of the TIAI were used with a rating scale of 0-3. For CEL 317, mean ratings ranged from 2.33/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) to2.89 on selects appropriate objectives and integrates core content knowledge. For CEL 318, mean ratings ranged from 2.56/3 on incorporates diversity (#2), plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4), and prepares appropriate assessment (#5) to 2.78 on selects appropriate objectives (#1).

Teaching Internship

Spring 2014 (Campus) (N = 16) On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.75/3 on plans differentiated learning experiences (#6) to 2.94/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1), plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4), and prepares appropriate assessment procedures (#5). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.69/3 on prepares appropriate assessment procedures (#5) to 3.00/3 on plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4).

Spring 2014 (Hinds) (N = 8) On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on incorporates diversity (#2), plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4), and prepares appropriate

assessment proceures (#5). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on plans appropriate teaching procedures (4) and prepares appropriate assessment procedures (#5) to 2.75 on integrates core content knowledge (#3).

Fall 2014 (Campus) (N = 15) On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.60/3 on pland differentiate learning experiences (#6) to 2.93/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1). On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.60/3 on prepares appropriate assessment procedures (#5) to 2.80/3 on integrates core content knowledge (#3) and plans differentiated learning experiences (#6).

Fall 2014 (Hinds) (N = 11) On the TIAI, Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.73/3 on selects appropriate objectives (#1) and incorporates diversity (#2) to 2.91/3 on plans appropriate teaching procedures (#4) and prepares appropriate assessment procedures (#5).On the final observation, DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.73/3 on incorporates diversity (#2) and integrates(#6) to 2.70/3 on core content knowledge (#3) to 3.00/3 on prepares appropriate assessment and procedures (#5).

Trends Noted
In 2009-2013, differentiated instruction was identified as an area of concern. In 2014, this continues to be an area of concern regarding candidate performance in differentiating instruction, but candidates appear to be understanding differentiation more to some degree. There continues to be a slight decrease in abilities from semester to semester in differentiated instruction. Faculty will continue to closely monitor this area to determine any long-term trends. As the decrease has continued, workshops and a more intense focus on gearing field experiences to helping students implement differentiated instruction. Assessments were noted as a slight weakness as well as integration of the arts, physical education, and health.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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.

2. Observation data from the candidate's Cooperating Teacher and Delta State University Supervisor was collected.

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

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

- Appendix A, Instrument 2

Results of Evaluation
Domain II focuses on Assessment
<u>Spring 2014 (Campus)</u>

CEL 317 *Principles & Techniques of Teaching Early Childhood* (N=16)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.31/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.19/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
6.25% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 93.75% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 318 *Principles & Techniques of Teaching in Middle Grades* (N= 15)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.13/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.07/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
13.33% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 86.67% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship* (N=16)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean ratings ranged from 2.81/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.88/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

CEL 496 (N= 16)   DSU Supervisor
Mean ratings on the final observation ranged from 2.81/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.81/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

<u>Spring 2014 (Hinds)</u>

CEL 317 (N=13)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.69/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.15/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
7.69% scored at the emerging level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 92.31 scored acceptable or target.

CEL 318 (N= 8)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.63/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

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

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

CEL 496 Internship (N=8)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.50/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

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

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

CEL 496 (N= 8)   DSU Supervisor

Mean ratings on the final observation ranged from 2.50/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.63/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

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

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

Fall 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)

Mean ratings ranged from 1.88/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.38/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

18.75% of the students scored emerging and 81.25% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

6.25% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 93.75% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 318 (N= 16)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.06/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 1.94/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

18.75% of the students scored emerging and 81.25% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

25.00% of the students scored emerging on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments while 75.00% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 Internship (N=15)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 2.80/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments to 2.80/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.

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

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

CEL 496 (N= 15)   DSU Supervisor

Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 2.67/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.80/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

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

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

Fall 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)

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

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

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

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.78/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 2.89/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

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

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

CEL 496 Internship (N=11)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings

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

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

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

CEL 496 (N= 11)   DSU Supervisor

Mean ratings on the final observation ranged from 2.91/3 on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback to 3.00/3 on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to students and provides timely feedback.
100% of the students scored at the target level on incorporates a variety of formal and informal assessments.

Domain III focuses on Instruction
Spring 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.13/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 2.94/3 on demonstrates knowledge of content.
12.50% of the students scored emerging and 87.50% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on demonstrates knowledge of content.

CEL 318 (N= 15)
Mean ratings ranged from 1.93/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning and provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners to 2.47/3 on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, and uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies.
13.33% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging and 86.67% scored at the acceptable or target level on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning and on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.
6.67% of the students scored emerging on uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction and on uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies.while 93.33% scored acceptable or target.
13.33% of the students scored emerging on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning while 86.67% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 Internship (N=16)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on provides clear, complete written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction.to to 2.69/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.
100% scored at the target level on provides clear, complete written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction.
100% of the students scored acceptable and target on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.

CEL 496 (N= 16) DSU Supervisor
Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning to 2.75/3 on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.
100% of the students scored at the target level on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.
100% of the students scored scored acceptable or target on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

<u>Spring 2014 (Hinds)</u>

<u>CEL 317 (N=13)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.23/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 3.00/3 on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning and demonstrates knowledge of content.
7.69% of the students scored at the emerging level on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning while 92.31% scored acceptable or target.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning and demonstrates knowledge of content.

<u>CEL 318 (N=)</u>
N/A

<u>CEL 496 Internship (N=8)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.25/3 on provides clear, complete, written and/or oral directions for instructional activities to 2.75/3 on conveys communicates high expectations for learning to all students, enthusiasm for teaching and learning, and provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on provides clear, complete, written and/or oral directions for instructional activities.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on conveys communicates high expectations for learning to all students, enthusiasm for teaching and learning, and provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

<u>CEL 496 (N= 8)   DSU Supervisor</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.25/3 on provides clear, complete, written and/or oral directions for instructional activities to 2.75/3 on conveys communicates high expectations for learning to all students, and provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on provides clear, complete, written and/or oral directions for instructional activities
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on conveys communicates high expectations for learning to all students, and provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners.

<u>Fall 2014 (Campus)</u>

<u>CEL 317 (N=16)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.13/3 on provides opportunities for students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning and provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners to 2.81/3 on uses acceptable written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction and uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.
25% of the students scored emerging on provides opportunities for students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other while 75% scored acceptable or target.
12.50% of the students scored emerging on provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners while 87.50% scored acceptable or target.

6.25% of the students scored emerging on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning while 93.75% scored acceptable or target.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on uses acceptable written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction

CEL 318 (N= 16)
Mean ratings ranged from .63/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 2.94/3 on uses acceptable written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction.
75% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning while 25% scored acceptable or target.

100% of the students scored acceptable or target on uses acceptable written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction.

CEL 496 Internship (N=15)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 2.47/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 2.93/3 on communicates high expectations for learning to all students, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning, and uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning.
6.67% of the students scored emerging on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning while 93.33% scored acceptable or target.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on communicates high expectations for learning to all students, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning, and uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning.

CEL 496 (N= 15)   DSU Supervisor
Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 2.60/3 on engages student in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking to 2.93/3 on communicates high expectations for learning to all students and conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.
100% of the candidates scored at the target level on engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on communicates high expectations for learning to all students and conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.22/3 on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning to 3.00/3 on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other, and demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning, provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners,engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply

concepts in problem solving and critical thinking and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses family or community resources in lessons to enhance learning.

100% of the students scored at the target level on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other, and demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning, provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners,engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

CEL 318 (N= 9)

Mean ratings ranged from 2.56/3 on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction and demonstrates knowledge of the subject content to 3.00/3 on communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction and demonstrates knowledge of the subject content.

100% of the students scored at the target level on communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other.

CEL 496 Internship (N=11)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings

Mean ratings ranged from 2.45/3 uses family and community resources to enhance student learning to 2.91/3 on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning, provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners, and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

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

100% scored at the acceptable or target level on provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning, provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners, and elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time.

CEL 496 (N= 11) DSU Supervisor

Mean ratings ranged from 2.55/3 on uses family and community resources to enhance student learning to 3.00/3 on uses acceptable written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction, provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning, demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, and uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to enhance student learning.

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

100% of the students scored at the target level on uses acceptable written/oral/nonverbal communication in planning and instruction, provides clear, complete written and oral directions for instruction, communicates high expectations for learning, conveys enthusiasm for teaching and

learning, demonstrates knowledge of the subject content, and uses a variety of appropriate teaching stategies to enhance student learning.

Domain IV focuses on the Learning Environment
<u>Spring 2014 (Campus)</u>

<u>CEL 317 (N=16)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.50/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning to 2.88/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>CEL 318 (N= 15)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 2.53/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
13.33% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on attends to or delegates routine tasks and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 86.67% scored acceptable or target.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>CEL 496 Internship (N=16)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.94/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>CEL 496 (N= 16) DSU Supervisor</u>
Mean ratings on final observation ranged from 2.69/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning to 2.94/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks, and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on attends to or delegates routine tasks, and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>Spring 2014 (Hinds)</u>

<u>CEL 317 (N=13)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.62/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 3.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.
100% of the students scored at the target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks and on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>CEL 318 (N= 8)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.75/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks.

<u>CEL 496 Internship (N=8)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.75/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks.

<u>CEL 496 (N= 8)   DSU Supervisor</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 2.75/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks; uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks.

<div align="center">Fall 2014 (Campus)</div>

<u>CEL 317 (N=16)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.13/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks to 2.94/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>CEL 318 (N= 16)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 1.94/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 2.69/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
18.75% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior while 81.25% scored acceptable or target.
6.25% of the students scored unacceptable on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students while 93.75% scored acceptable or target.

<u>CEL 496 Internship (N=15)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings</u>
Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 2.73/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks and attends to or delegates routine tasks and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior to 2.93/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% scored at the target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning; attends to or delegates routine tasks and attends to or delegates routine tasks and uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<u>CEL 496 (N= 15) DSU Supervisor</u>
Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 2.73/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks to 2.93/3 on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored target on attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

<div align="center">Fall 2014 (Hinds)</div>

<u>CEL 317 (N=9)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.67/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs to 3.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.
100% of the students scored at the target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

CEL 318 (N= 9)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.56/3 on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs to 3.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.
100% of the students scored at the target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.

CEL 496 Internship (N=11)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean ratings on observation three ranged from 2.73/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students to 3.00/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% scored at the acceptable or target level on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.
100% scored at the target level on attends to or delegates routine tasks.

CEL 496 (N= 11)- DSU Supervisor
Mean ratings on observation five ranged from 2.91/3 on attends to or delegates routine tasks to 3.00/3 on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning, uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students and attends to or delegates routine tasks.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on attends to or delegates routine tasks
100% of the students scored target on monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning, uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior and creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students and attends to or delegates routine tasks.

Domain V focuses on Professional Responsibilities
Spring 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.31/3 on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior to 2.69/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior.
6.25% of the students scored emerging and 93.75% scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

CEL 318 (N= 15)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.40/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 1.87/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
13.33% of the students scored emerging and 86.67% scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

13.33% of the students scored emerging and 86.67% scored at the acceptable or target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

CEL 496 Internship (N=16)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean ratings ranged from 2.88/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.694/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 496 (N= 17)   DSU Supervisor
Mean ratings ranged from 2.94/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 3.00/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored at the target level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=13)
Mean ratings ranged from 2.77/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.08/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
7.69% of the students scored emerging while 92.31% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on   maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored at acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

CEL 318 (N= 15)
Mean ratings ranged from 1.87/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.40/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.
13.33% of the students scored at the emerging level on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues while 86.67 scored acceptable.
13.33% of the students scored at the emerging level on maximizes time available for instruction while 86.67% scored acceptable or target.

CEL 496 Internship (N=8)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings
Mean ratings ranged from 2.63/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.25/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on maximizes time available for instruction.

CEL 496 (N= 8)   DSU Supervisor
Mean ratings ranged from 2.25/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.63/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on maximizes time available for instruction.

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

<u>Fall 2014 (Campus)</u>

<u>CEL 317 (N=16)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.81/3 on maximizes time available for instruction and establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues to 2.94/3 on demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior and demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on maximizes time available for instruction.
6.25% of the students scored emerging on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues while 93.75% scored acceptable or target.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target level on demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior and demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.

<u>CEL 318 (N= 16)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 1.50/3 on demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior to 2.31/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.
16.67% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging and 56.25% scored at the acceptable or target level on demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.
12.50% of the students scored unacceptable or emerging while 87.50% scored acceptable or target on maximizes time available for instruction.

<u>CEL 496 Internship (N=15)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.67/3 on demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior to 2.80/3 on maximizes time available for instruction and establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored target on demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction and establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

<u>CEL 496 (N= 15)   DSU Supervisor</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.73/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.80/3 on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior and demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.
100% of the students scored at the target level on maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior and demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.

<u>Fall 2014 (Hinds)</u>

<u>CEL 317 (N=9)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.89/3 on maximizes time available for instruction to 2.00/3 on establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

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

<u>CEL 318 (N= 9)</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior to 2.44/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored target on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior
11.11% of the students scored at the emerging while 88.89% scored acceptable or target on maximizes time available for instruction.

<u>CEL 496 Internship (N=11)   Cooperating Teacher Ratings</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 2.64/3 on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior and demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior to 2.91/3 on maximizes time available for instruction.
100% of the students scored acceptable or target on use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior and demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student behavior.
100% of the students scored at the acceptable or target level on maximizes time available for instruction.

<u>CEL 496 (N= 10)   DSU Supervisor</u>
Mean ratings ranged from 3.00/3 on maximizes time available for instruction and establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.
100% of the students scored target on maximizes time available for instruction and establishes opportunities for communication with parents/guardians and professional colleagues.

<u>Trends Noted</u>
The areas the teaching candidates need additional instruction in are providing opportunities for students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning; using higher-order thinking questions to engage students in analytical, creative, and critical thinking; adjusting lessons according to individual student cues, professional reflections, and group responses; and communicating assessment criteria and performance to students.
Enthusiasm for teaching and maximizing time available for instruction are two of our strengths.

Use of Evaluation Results
Continue to track, assess, and analyze data. Even though weaknesses were identified, those areas are not true weaknesses as scores were in the acceptable ranges. In these terms, weakness indicates an area where the scores were slightly lower than other areas. Those areas will be closely monitored. Additional training and activities in planning for diversity, differentiation, and integration of all subject area content knowledge will be included in teacher education course work at DSU.

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

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 2014 (Campus)
(N = 17) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.80/3, Learning Goal 2.89/3, Assessment Plan 2.70/3, Design for Instruction 2.64/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.79/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.32/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.68/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.54/3.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)
(N = 11) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.67/3, Learning Goal 2.32/3, Assessment Plan 2.42/3, Design for Instruction 2.44/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.65/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.29/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.27/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.08/3.

Fall 2014 (Campus)
(N = 14) Overall mean ratings by component were as follows: Contextual Factors 2.96/3, Learning Goal 2.69/3, Assessment Plan 2.69/3, Design for Instruction 2.56/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.64/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.36/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.66/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.63/3.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)
(N = 9) – Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 3.00/3, Learning Goal 3.00/3, Assessment Plan 3.00/3, Design for Instruction 3.00/3, Instructional Decision Making 3.00/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.80/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 3.00/3.

Internship

Spring 2014 (Campus)
(N = 16) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.96 /3, Learning Goals 2.95/3, Assessment Plan 2.95/3, Design for Instruction 2.81/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.89/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.69/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.98/3.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)
(N = 8) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.98/3, Learning Goals 3.00/3, Assessment Plan 2.95/3, Design for Instruction 2.88/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.88/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.73/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.96/3.

Fall 2014 (Campus)
(N = 14) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.99/3, Learning Goals 2.94/3, Assessment Plan 2.94/3, Design for Instruction 2.93/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.87/3, Analysis of Student Learning 2.93/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.76/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.92/3.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)
(N = 11) - Overall mean ratings by component were as follows:
Contextual Factors 2.96/3, Learning Goals 2.96/3, Assessment Plan 2.94/3, Design for Instruction 2.95/3, Instructional Decision Making 2.96/3, Analysis of Student Learning 3.00/3, Reflection and Self Evaluation 2.89/3, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education 2.96/3.

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 2.69-3.00, with many of the ratings at 3.00. The lowest evaluation was in the area of Reflection and Self-Reflection for the Campus group. In addition, another weakness was Design for Instruction in Elementary Education for the Hinds Group.

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

Scores usually increase between methods and internship on the Teacher Work Sample. However, we are beginning to see a truer picture as supervisors of interns are now capturing first attempts on the

Teacher Work Sample in Task Stream as well as final submission. The Teacher Work Sample has also been revised to more closely align with the rubrics.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to <u>diagnose and remediate deficits in reading skills</u>.

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
<u>Spring 2014 Campus Program</u>
(N = 17)- Candidates scored 100% (target) in general observations and tests administered/results. In the area of describing student data, 71% were at the target level and 29% at the acceptable level. In the area of describing background information, 88% were at the target level and 12% were at the acceptable level. In the area of analysis, 41% were at the target level, 29% at the acceptable level, and 29% at the unacceptable level. In the area of field experiences, 41% were at the target level, 51% were at the acceptable level, and 16% were at the unacceptable level. For summary and recommendations, 71% were at the target level, 24% at the acceptable level, and 6% were at the unacceptable level.

<u>Spring 2014 Hinds Program</u>
(N = 12)- Candidates scored 100% (target) in describing student data, describing background information, general observations, analysis, and in summary/recommendations. For this group, 75% were at the target level and 25% were at the acceptable level for tests administered/results. In the area of field experiences, 33% were at the target level, and 67% were at the acceptable level.

<u>Fall 2014 – Campus Program</u>

(N = 16)- Candidates scored 100% (target) in general observations. In the area of describing student data, 88% were at the target level and 12% at the acceptable level. In the area of test administration/results, 88% were at the target level and 13% at the acceptable level. For the area of describing analysis, 50% were at the target level, 44% at the acceptable level, and 6% were at the acceptable level. In the area of field experiences/teaching, 52% were at the target level, 31% were at the acceptable level, and 17% were at the unacceptable level. For summary and recommendations, 69% were at the target level, 19% at the acceptable level, and 12% were at the acceptable level.

Fall 2014 Hinds Program
(N = 9)- Candidates scored 100% (target) in describing student data, describing background information, general observations, analysis, and in summary/recommendations. For this group, 78% were at the target level and 22% were at the acceptable level for tests administered/results. In the area of field experiences, 100% were at the target level.

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

Use of Evaluation Results
Analyzing data continues to be a low-scoring area. Faculty will continue to emphasize analyzing student data in all courses that incorporate pre-and/or post-testing.
Describing student data and background information, general observations, and test administered and results are strengths of the candidates.

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

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Exhibit professional dispositions associated with successful teaching.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1 & 2. The undergraduate version of the *Dispositions Rating Scale* (DRS) was developed by the College of Education faculty and is correlated with the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument and

was used to assess students' dispositions in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education*/CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences*, and the teaching internship. The scale is also used throughout the program to document dispositional concerns and exemplary dispositions. The instrument uses a 4-point scale and assesses these professional dispositions: Fairness, Belief That All Students Can Learn, Professionalism, Resourcefulness, and Dependability.

3. Each disposition was 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 2014 – Campus Group
(N = 19) – The instructor's overall mean ratings for the group ranged from 1.79 on Professionalism to 1.84 on Dependability to 1.89 on Resourcefulness to 2.00 on Fairness and the Belief that All Students Can Learn. The overall mean score was 1.91/3.0. CEL 301 is one of the first classes that candidates take in the elementary education program at Delta State University. These scores from the Disposition Rating Scale represent our students' dispositions at the beginning of their journey to becoming teachers.

Spring 2014– Hinds Group
(N = 3) – The instructor's overall mean ratings for the group ranged from 2.33 on Resourcefulness and Professionalism to 2.67 on Fairness and Dependability to 3.00 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn. The overall mean score was 2.60. CEL 301 is one of the first classes that candidates take in the elementary education program at Delta State University. These scores from the Disposition Rating Scale represent our students' dispositions at the beginning of their journey to becoming teachers.

Fall 2014 – Campus Group
(N = 28) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.43 on Dependability to 2.64 on Professionalism to 2.71 on Fairness and the Belief That All Students Can Learn to 2.75 on Resourcefulness. The overall mean score was 2.65.

Fall 2014– Hinds Group
(N = 4) – Instructor mean ratings ranged from 2.31 on Resourcefulness, to 2.56 on Professionalism and Dependability, to 2.75 on Fairness, to 2.81 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn. The overall mean score was 2.60.

Internship

Spring 2014 – Campus Group
(N = 16) – The cooperating teacher overall mean ratings ranged from 2.56 on Resourcefulness to 2.69 on Professionalism to 2.81 on Dependability to 2.88 on Fairness and the Belief That All Students Can Learn, with an overall mean of 2.76. DSU Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.88 on Professionalism and Resoucefulness to 2.81 on Dependability to 2.94 on Fairness and the Belief That All Students Can Learn, with an overall mean of 2.89. During internship the students are rated by their cooperating teachers on the Disposition Rating Scale and the scores show that our candidates

have grown over the course of the elementary education program. These scores from the Disposition Rating Scale represent our students' dispositions at the end of their program at Delta State University.

Spring 2014 – Hinds Group

(N= 8) – The cooperating teacher overall mean ratings ranged from 2.38 on Resourcefulness to 2.50 on the Belief That All Students Can

Learn and Dependability to 2.63 on Fairness and Professionalism, with an overall mean of 2.53. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.13 on Dependability to 2.25 on Resourcefulness to 2.38 on Professionalism to 2.63 on Fairness to 2.75 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn, with an overall mean of 2.43. During internship the students are rated by their cooperating teachers on the Disposition Rating Scale and the scores show that our candidates have grown over the course of the elementary education program. These scores from the Disposition Rating Scale represent our students' dispositions at the end of their program at Delta State University.

Fall 2014– Campus Group

(N = 15) – Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.73on Fairness, Resourcefulness, and Dependability to 2.80 on The Belief That All Students Can Learn and Professionalism.The overall mean score was 2.76. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.53 on Professionalism to 2.60 on The Belief That All Students Can Learn and Resourcefulness to 2.67 on Fairness and Dependability. The overall mean score was 2.61.

Fall 2014– Hinds Group

Hinds (N= 11) - Cooperating Teacher mean ratings ranged from 2.73 on Dependability to 2.82 on the Belief That All Students Can Learn to 2.91 on Fairness and Professionalism to 3.00 on Dependability. The overall mean score was 2.87. Delta State University Supervisor mean ratings ranged from 2.73 on Dependability to 2.82 on Firness, the Belief That All Students Can Learn, Professionalism, and Resourcefulness. The overall mean score was 2.80.

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 ratings for CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* and CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* over all semesters showed some distribution over the range of descriptors, as opposed to reflecting primarily ratings that fell exclusively in the target and acceptable ranges. Marginal and unacceptable behavior ratings were not given for any indicator for the CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* group. The CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education* groups earned some marginal ratings on Professionalism. The indicators of Fairness, the Belief That All Children Can Learn, Resourcefulness, and Dependability were acceptable or on target.
Data summaries related to the evaluation of dispositions during CEL 496 *Directed Teaching Internship,* for the campus groups revealed that the percentages indicated that candidates performed at the target or acceptable levels according to results of Cooperating Teachers and Delta State University Supervisors on the indicators. For most indicators, Delta State University Supervisors

rated fewer candidates at the outstanding level than did cooperating teachers.

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

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

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate ability to <u>synthesize views of education </u>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 2014 (Campus)
(N= 17) – Mean ratings ranged from 1.94/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.47/3 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.27/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level or the emerging level.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)
(N= 14) Mean ratings ranged from 1.94/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.47/3 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.00/3. The means of all five areas were at the acceptable level or the emerging level.

Spring 2014 (Hinds) (CUR 302)
(N=10) Mean rating ranged from 1.67/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content to a 2.80 on Teaching Rationale and Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 2.543. The means of all five areas were at the Emerging level or Target level.

Fall 2014 (Campus)
(N=29) – Mean rating ranged from 2.14/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content to 2.41 on Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate. The overall mean rating was 2.23/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)
(N=4) – Mean rating ranged from 1.75/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content and Professionalism to 2.50 on Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 2.00/3. The means of all five areas were at the Emerging Level or the Acceptable level.

Fall 2014 (Hinds) (CUR 302)
(N=10) – Mean rating ranged from 1.67/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content to 2.80 on Teaching Rationale and Composition/Mechanics. The overall mean rating was 2.58/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level or Target level.

Trends Noted
Composition/Mechanics has been an area where candidates consistently average the lowest score each year, but this analysis shows some improvement within recent semesters. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2014, Content is the lowest area (2.06). The second lowest area is Professionalism (2.20). After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2014, Teaching Rationale (2.42) and Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate (2.47) are the highest areas. Overall, the candidates are scoring at the acceptable level in each of the five areas. Areas to watch are Content and Professionalism.

Internship

Spring 2014 (Campus)
(N=16) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.44/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.69 on Teaching Rationale & Appropriate teaching/learning climate. The overall mean rating was 2.31/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)
(N=8) – Mean ratings ranged from 1.63/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.75 on Teaching Rationale. The overall mean rating was 2.00/3. The means of all five areas were at the Emerging level or Acceptable level.

Fall 2014 (Campus)
(N=16) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.25/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Content to 2.75 on Appropriate teaching/learning climate. The overall mean rating was 2.31/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)
(N=11) – Mean ratings ranged from 2.73/3 (with a 4-point scale of 0-3) on Composition/Mechanics to 2.82 on Teaching Rationale, Appropriate teaching/learning climate, Content, & Professionalism. The overall mean rating was 2.73/3. The means of all five areas were at the Acceptable level.

Trends Noted
Composition/Mechanics has been an area where the candidates consistently average the lowest score each year. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2011-2014, Composition/Mechanics is the lowest area. The second lowest area is Content. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2011-2014, Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate is the highest area. The second highest area is Teaching Rationale. Overall, the candidates are scoring at the acceptable to target level in each of the five areas.

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

Implement grammar/writing workshops with elementary education candidates.

Emphasize content and composition/mechanics in each of the elementary education courses. Encourage students needing help to take advantage of the DSU writing labs and tutors. Encourage students to attend the Praxis CASE writing workshops offered by the Elementary Education faculty.

BSE-HPER 01: NASPE Standard 1
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

The physical education teacher candidates will know and apply discipline–specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. PRAXIS II Physical Education: Content Knowledge (0091)
2. Individual score reports are sent to the office of the Director of Field Experiences who collects all score reports. Field Experiences then forwards the Praxis score reports to the HPER Department Chair and the HPER Program Coordinator. All teacher candidates are required to pass the Praxis physical education content knowledge test prior to admission to CUR 498: Directed Teaching (Internship)
3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is then placed into an electronic format that is stored in the HPER Department. The data is also presented to the College of Education Assessment Committee. The data is then analyzed by the assessment committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends among HPER teacher candidates and across disciplines.

BSE-HPER 02: NASPE Standard 2

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
The physical education teacher candidates will be physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Skill assessment tests are administered in PER 314/315: Teaching Team/Individual Sports. These skill assessments are based on the topics covered in the courses and may include; volleyball skills (serve, bump), basketball skills (offensive /defensive strategies), and racquet sports (tennis, badminton). Individual Fitness tests are administered twice throughout the teacher candidates program of study
2. Skill assessment-PER 314/315: Each teacher candidate will be required to demonstrate proficiency in movement and skill performance. Individual score reports are provided by the course instructors. These reports are collected and analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator. Data is collected at the end of each year and is prepared for this report and Data Summary Reports.
Fitness test-CUR 300: Survey of Field Experiences and/or PER 487: Methods of PE, PER 103: Weight Training. Each teacher candidate will be fitness tested during the semester of CUR 300. Individual score reports are provided by the Fitness Testing Administrator. These reports are then analyzed by the program coordinator.

3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is then placed into an electronic format that is stored in the HPER Department. The data is also presented to the College of Education Assessment Committee.

BSE-HPER 03: NASPE Standard 3

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
The physical education teacher candidate will plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (1-9): These sections of the TIAI demonstrate the Teacher Candidates ability to plan and organize instruction to accommodate individual student needs and diverse developmental needs. Each teacher candidate must score in the Acceptable or Target level to be considered meeting the learning outcome.
2. The TIAI (1-9) will be completed during CUR 498: Teaching Internship. Each teacher candidate is scored three times on the TIAI during their internship. The program coordinator scores each candidate and the data is stored in Task Stream.
3 Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

BSE-HPER 04: NASPE Standard 4

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
The physical education teacher candidate will use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. TIAI (10-34): These sections show the teacher candidates ability to communicate, subject knowledge, and management of learning environment to enhance social relationships.
2. The TIAI (10-34) will be collected during the CUR 498: Teaching Internship and stored in Task Stream.

3 Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

BSE-HPER 05: NASPE Standard 5

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
The physical education teacher candidates will utilize assessments and reflection to foster student learning and inform instructional decisions.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Teacher Work Sample (TWS) was used.
2. This data was collected during the CUR 498: Teaching Internship and stored in Task Stream. Teacher candidates are required to submit the TWS twice during their internship.
3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

BSE-HPER 06: NASPE Standard 6

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
The physical education teacher candidate will demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The College of Education Dispositions Rating Scale is used.
2. During CUR 300 the teacher candidates complete a disposition self-assessment and the instructor of the course completes a disposition assessment. HPER faculty rate teacher candidates at the time of entrance to teacher education on their dispositions. During CUR 393 Teacher Internship the teacher candidates do another disposition self-assessment, the cooperating teacher does a disposition assessment, and the supervising faculty from DSU does a disposition assessment. The data is stored in Task Stream.
3. Data was analyzed by the HPER Program Coordinator and the HPER Department Chair. The data is also analyzed within the COE Assessment Committee to determine strengths, weaknesses, and/or trends.

EDD 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 Portfolio Results:

Semester	Average Score	Number Submitted	# Pass		# Marginal Pass		# Fail		# Repeaters
F '14	2.37	16	14	88%	3	19%	2	13%	1
Spr '14	2.4	21	21	100%	7	29%	0	0%	1
F'13	2.31	17	5	29%	9	53%	3	18%	0
Sum '13	2.44	9	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0
Spr '13	2.49	18	9	50%	9	50%	0	0	0
F '12	2.49	9	6	66%	3	33%	0	0	0
Spr '12	2.25	8	6	75%	1	12.50%	1	12.50%	0
F '11	1.97	11	4	36%	2	18%	5	45%	1 (F)
Spr '11	2.02	12	4	33%	5	42%	3	25%	1 (F)
F '10	2.14	8	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%	0
Spr '10	2.09	11	4	36%	2	18%	5	45%	4 (4 F)
F '09	1.89	15	6	40%	1	7%	8	53%	2 (2 P)
Spr '09	2.14	35	18	51%	7	20%	10	29%	1 (F)
F '08	1.88	10	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	1 (P)
Spr '08	2.19	11	7	64%	1	9%	3	27%	0

| F '07 | 1.83 | 10 | 3 | 30% | 4 | 40% | 3 | 30% | 1 (F) |

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis: Program faculty will continue to review the portfolio instructions, rubric, and tips for success. Specifically, we've had recent discussion of utilizing the interview portion of portfolios, which currently aren't employed. While interviews aren't assessed with scores, they could aid faculty in making decisions for students scoring just below or just above the minimum threshold of two. We have also discussed adding an in-house writing exam requirement for entry into the program. I would like to explore using the dispositions rating scale as this entry-exam requirement, which would allow us to learn about students' self-evaluations as well as their impromptu writing abilities. In 2013, we discussed portfolio components and analysis with a DSU COEHS consultant and have a clearer understanding that evidence is a key component for each required section. Thus, any changes we make will keep this key aspect of evidence in mind. Since I arrived in fall of 2012, there has been no <u>faculty training</u> for evaluating portfolios offered to me. However, faculty will work together to make meaningful changes to the portfolio assessment and will therefore be well-versed in how and why each component pertains to program entry. This will in turn ensure consistent <u>rigor</u> during the process of students gaining entry to the program. Naturally, <u>fairness and consistency</u> in evaluating the program will also be of primary concern. The instructions, rubric, presentation, and tips remain on the EdD website and are attached below.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s): We accept portfolios twice each year and on average, applicants pass this phase of admission. Occasionally, students fail the portfolio and are allowed to resubmit one time. One reason for applicants' low scores/failure rate is due to the inability to adequately address the prompt; in some instances, the content is unclear or not specific enough to fully address the necessary details. In other instances, grammatical errors or poor writing skills cause students to lose points. There has been some inconsistency in ratings among different reviewers, with one reviewer in particular consistently scores portfolios as failing while others score the same portfolios as passing, which has resulted in more attention regarding how to score portfolios as well as who scores them. We've received more stable reviews since I designed a new scoresheet for reviewers, which requires them to insert comments as to why the student earned each subscore on the portfolio. Because each portfolio is independently evaluated by two faculty members, scores maintain stability and representation from various perspectives. In the case of starkly opposed scores, a third faculty member reviews the portfolio. Scores for 2014 were comparable to 2013 scores, which were comparable to average scores for 2012, which were higher than for the previous four years with a submission rate of approximately average with the other years. It seems the pass/fail rate has stabilized since 2012 and is more aligned than scores in 2013. Since 2012, scores have been consistent as a result of the primarily the same faculty members scoring portfolio submissions. Submissions have been largely stable over time except for the 2009 boom, which is to be expected. With ongoing attention to revisions, we anticipate further stabilization of scores.

EDD 02: LO Program Specific Content

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

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 very small group of students sitting for comprehensive exams in spring 2014. All performed satisfactorily and there were zero retakes necessary. See results below.

Analysis of Comprehensive Exam Results:

	Curriculum		Success Rate	Supervision		Success Rate	Research		Success Rate
	Pass	Fail		Pass	Fail		Pass	Fail	
Spring 2014	2	0	100%	2	0	100%	2	0	100%
Spring 2013	9	0	100%	9	0	100%	9	0	100%
Summer 2012	2	0	100%	1	0	100%	5	0	100%
Spring 2012	16	1	94%	17	0	100%	5	4	20%
Summer 2011	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
Spring 2011	7	0	100%	7	0	100%	7	0	100%
Summer 2010	0	0	N/A	2	0	100%	3	0	100%
Spring 2010	17	0	100%	15	2	88%	14	3	82%
Summer 2009	0	0	N/A	3	0	100%	1	0	100%
Spring 2009	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	1	0	100%
Summer 2008	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	1	0	100%
Spring 2008	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	0	1	0%

Fall 2007	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	2	0	100%
Summer 2007	2	0	100%	2	0	100%	2	1	66%
Spring 2007	5	0	100%	5	0	100%	5	0	100%
Fall 2006	1	0	100%	1	0	100%	0	3	0%
Summer 2006	1	0	100%	2	0	100%	6	4	60%
Spring 2006	14	2	87.5%	15	5	75%	7	10	41%
Fall 2005	6	0	100%	4	2	66%	2	4	33%
Summer 2005	9	0	100%	9	0	100%	7	2	77%
Spring 2005	3	0	100%	3	0	100%	2	2	50%

Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:
We had only two students completing comps this year because in years past, students were allowed to take the exam before actually finishing coursework. I've been working to change that practice, so this year the change was most noticeable in that we had fewer students taking the exam. Our groups sitting for comps after this will be back to the typical size of 15 approximately students. There has been absolutely no <u>faculty training</u> for anyone managing comps in any way; however, I have worked to broaden the range of questions offered on the comprehensive exam and to further tailor the grading rubric. When I arrived in 2012, questions for the research portion were simple true/false items, which are inappropriate for graduate students who should be able to apply, synthesize, evaluate, and create new knowledge and skills rather than just recall information. I have also asked various faculty members to assist with writing questions for specific tracks so as to ensure that questions reflect content adequately and are written in part by the instructors of the course. Thus, the <u>rigor</u> of the comprehensive assessment has much improved, but is under ongoing revision.
Having revised comps since the 2012 version, there are still improvements to be made for the comprehensive exam; changes have already been made for how students are evaluated, but I'd like to continue revising this, particularly so in light of the pending new standards. However, <u>fairness and consistency</u> in evaluation have not been problematic due to the blind review of comp responses by two separate faculty members for each response. This ensures that each candidate is assessed anonymously with the same standards, but by different professors. This practice has been very helpful with scoring comprehensive exams thus far.
Immediate suggestions for change include continuing to add to the repertoire of questions, which will be based upon ongoing curriculum revisions. Also, it would be wise to align comprehensive exams across all programs to ensure consistency in requirements & practices among all program exams.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):
Results from 2014 indicate that students comprehend and can articulate at an appropriate level for each section of the comprehensive exam. To better address critical thinking skills rather than rote memorization, all questions were revised for the 2013 comprehensive examination and students performed at satisfactory levels. Ongoing revisions have focused on higher-order thinking skills through questions that require students to address scenarios by applying, synthesizing, and evaluating research concepts and skills. In 2012, students struggled most with the research portion of comps,

which was comprised of approximately 100 true-false and multiple choice questions about statistical facts. Entirely absent was any sort of interpretation of data or synthesis of findings with meaning. Since at least 2010, the research section was failed most often, resulting in retakes in summer. Due to revised questions and evaluation practices, there have been zero students requiring a retake of any section of comps. While this trend may change, it is most imperative that we ensure the comprehensive exam adequately reflects coursework and thereby requires students to perform at appropriate level for the degree.

EDD 03: LO Ability to Plan

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
. Ability to Plan – Demonstrate the ability to develop a supervisory plan for classroom-based instruction.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Needs Assessment Project: Candidates will use the knowledge they will gain about assessment, data interpretation, and data analysis to address a problem in their school or district. The goal will be to show the ability to design, align, and evaluate curriculum and to guide professional learning.

2. The CUR 812 *Comprehensive Assessment and Data Analysis* instructor will administer the project and grades it according to a rubric.

3. Mean scores and percent correct will be calculated for the total score and each section of the project.

Results of Evaluation
Analysis of Results:
The highest scores for this group were the Identify the Problem (92%) and the Describe hunches & hypotheses (89%), which increased by 20% in one year. The Develop an action plan/implementation portion has seen the most fluctuation in the past 3 years. While the 2014 results are overall consistent with most previous scores, the change scores from 2012-14 are striking and need attention. In 2013, the participants were primarily members of the Jackson cohort. Additionally, the 2014 scores reflect those under a different instructor than who had taught the course for four years prior. With attention to fluctuating scores and weak areas, scores should stabilize as the instructor becomes more familiar with the course.

CUR 812

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences

Area	Possible score	Average score 2011 N=15	2011 %	Average score 2012 N=14	2012 %	Average score 2013 N=24	2013 %	Average score 2014 N=24	2014%
Identify the problem	15	13.8	92%	14.36	96%	14.9	99%	13.85	92%
Describe hunches & hypotheses	10	8.7	87%	9.21	92%	8.9	89%	8.86	89%
Identify questions & data	10	8.7	87%	9.07	91%	9.0	90%	8.8	88%
Analyze multiple measures	20	17.6	88%	17.36	87%	18.42	92%	16.2	81%
Analyze political realities & root causes	10	8.7	87%	9.07	91%	8.6	86%	7.45	75%
Develop an action plan/implementation	20	17.7	89%	15.5	76%	19.2	96%	15.4	77%
Narrative (reflection)	15	14.1	94%	12.71	85%	14.17	94%	13	87%
Total	100	89.4	89.4%	87.28	88%	93.19	93%	88.58	89%

Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:
Clearly, scores this year are a bit lower than those in years past. The largest contributing factor to this fact is the new faculty member who taught the course for the first time during the semester these data were collected. Because this faculty member is quite competent in all areas in which she operates within the division, I attribute the difference in scores to a more <u>rigorous</u> level of assessment. This faculty member met with the previous instructor for this course for <u>faculty training</u>, which aided understanding of this particular assignment as well as the other course components. An additional factor that potentially contributed to the difference in scores emerges from the students themselves, who were primarily studying in the higher ed. track. It is quite logical that these students have not engaged in assignments similar to the needs analysis project. While it is common for teachers and administrators to think and analyze conditions in this way, it may be less common for those in higher education settings. However, ongoing discussion and adjustments to the assignment with both instructors and myself will ensure <u>fairness and consistency in evaluation.</u>

Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):
It is clear to me that the nature and track of students completing the needs analysis project affects the results in every way. In 2012, the majority of students were enrolled in the higher ed. track; thus, we see that during 2012 and 2014, scores on the assignment were lower than when students in the leadership or curriculum track took the course. Until 2014, we had consistency in evaluation due to having the same instructor utilizing the same rubric for each year. We see that the 2013 results for the Needs Analysis project were stronger overall than those for 2012, although there were two areas that lost a few percentage points; it's important to keep in mind that there were 10 more students in 2013 than in 2012, however. The 2014 group was also larger than 2011-2012, which also impacts results. Over time, we will revise and make adjustments as we continue to learn how students respond to the assignment.

Suggestions for improvement include emphasizing all the elements of the needs analysis in which students score lowest, specifically to identifying questions & data and analyzing political realities &

root causes. Continually incorporating mini-lessons and pre-tests on concepts proved to heighten students' awareness and understanding of their importance in the assignment. The change in instructors will result in more discussion among faculty and when definitive action is taken with regard to CAEP standards, the course instructor may change according to scheduling demands, but should remain stable between the two instructors who have taught it in the past four years.

EDD 04: LO Clinical Practice

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 now be collected during CUR 820/833 Practicum in Higher Education/Curriculum & Supervision, which will be taught during each spring semester.
3. Mean scores and score distributions will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation
Analysis of Results:
For the last year data were reported, there were ten candidates in the class. The candidates in the course had previously taken AED 636 *Practicum I in School Administration*, so they were very familiar and comfortable with the format and nature of the course. There was one issue with candidates submitting mentor evaluations. Most evaluations were mailed to the instructor in a timely fashion. The mentors were directors and assistant superintendents for this course.

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

10	89	94	97	99	96	99	99	94	99	97	A	A

Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:
Program faculty will discuss possible ways to improve consistent mentor feedback.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s):
This course was revised in 2007. The changes made have been very positive and have allowed the instructor more control over projects candidates choose in the field. Candidates in AED 737 *Practicum III in School Administration* are much better prepared for the workload of this course if they were successful in AED 636, *Practicum I in School Administration*. The average for the mentor evaluations remains consistently high; therefore, program faculty are pleased with the field supervisors' views of candidate performance. The quality of projects was outstanding. Candidates chose projects that were relevant to current issues and rated as highly applicable.

EDD 05: LO Ability to Support Student Learning and Development
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 CRU was part of a course that is no longer required & will be replaced with an assignment in CUR 853 *Teaching in Higher Education*. The new assessment requires students to display the same components as the CRU, yet with different titles; Introduction will now be Conceptual Framework. Instructional Goals, Learning Activities, and Evaluation Techniques will remain the same, and   References & Resources will be embedded. The new assessment also requires students to explicitly address issues of diversity as well as to include creative ways to implement instruction and to follow APA formatting throughout.

2. Data for the Syllabus assignment in CUR 853 *Teaching in Higher Education* will be collected each summer and analyzed each spring for the annual report.

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

Results of Evaluation
Analysis of Results:
The program faculty are satisfied with the scores overall, though there are areas in which we will focus for improvement. It is positive that one of the highest scores has fluctuated in the past, so the

change in scores was likely due to the change in faculty and will likely result in increased improvement over time due to instructor consistency and competence.

N	Introduction 20 points	Instructional goals 20 points	Learning activities 20 points	Evaluation techniques 20 points	References list 20 points	Overall 100 points
2014 N=18	19.11/20 96%	18.72/20 94%	19.17/20 96%	19.67/20 98%	19.17/20 96%	96.8%
2013 N=20	19.75/20 99%	19.70/20 99%	19.60/20 98%	19.90/20 100%	18.35/20 92%	97.3%
2012 N=8	19.1/20 96%	19.6/20 98%	18.6/20 93%	19.5/20 98%	18.6/20 93%	93.4%
2011 N=11	95%	87%	99%	98%	94%	91.5%

Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:
Interestingly, in fall of last year I proposed to eliminate this as a required course for the doctoral core and learned just this semester that my proposal was approved. While the class may be offered in the future, it will no longer be required. However, I do plan to utilize a similar assignment in another course, CUR 853 *Teaching in Higher Education*, until deeper curriculum revisions occur relating to CAEP standards. Thus, the recommendation for now is to use an assignment from CUR 853 *Teaching in Higher Education*. and to revisit the appropriateness of the CRU. Specifically, we'll need to scrutinize every aspect of the assignment in terms of its purpose, the efficacy of that purpose, the rigor, & how well the assignment distinguishes among candidate performance. We'll take a team approach to faculty training because although I coordinate the program, I do not typically teach the class in which this assignment is employed. While we've had one instructor teaching this class for the past 3 years, a different (i.e., new faculty member) will likely teach the class in 2015 and possibly beyond. Part of this will necessarily address fairness and consistency in evaluation, which is aided in part by using strong rubrics and the same instructor over time.

Trends Noticed and Actions Based upon those Trends across the Year(s): In 2014, scores were slightly lower in all sections except one in the curriculum resource unit assignment: the reference list. This group of students is full of some of the strongest students I've seen at DSU, with a majority of those students in the higher ed. track. Students in this track typically have backgrounds in areas outside of education, which means they may simply be unfamiliar with many sorts of educational practices, such as defining instructional goals, learning activities, and evaluation techniques. As a result, this deficit in knowledge and skills could lead to lower scores on this assignment. Also, this is a summer course that is typically offered for the duration of only 30 days. Clearly, this may not be enough time for students to properly engage with material and to fully think through the requirements and details of the assignment.

For 2013, scores remained stable or increased in every area except the references section. This indicates much stronger results with more than twice the amount of students in 2013 than in 2012. This may be due to having the same professor (Watkins) teaching the course for two semesters prior, which likely enabled him to feel more comfortable and familiar with the assignment's

requirements and what quality work looks like. Despite somewhat different group sizes, achievement is comparable across 2011 and 2012, with the only real change in two areas: instructional goals and learning activities. While the first of these areas' scores decreased in 2012, the latter increased. Otherwise, scores were stable regardless of the group size and are now clearly stronger.

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

EDD-COU 01: LO Mastery of Prior Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Demonstrate mastery of the prior knowledge needed to be successful in the Doctor in Education program.

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

2. The portfolio will be submitted within the first six hours in the program.

3. Average scores and pass rate percentages will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation
One candidate submitted a portfolio in Spring 2015 for the Ed.D. Counseling track. It was accepted. There was only one more student who continued taking three hours each semester.

Use of Evaluation Results
With one student, no program changes were made. With one student, no new assessment data were collected or evaluated in order to make necessary changes.

Efforts to recruit more qualified students for the Counseling Track of the Ed.D. program are ongoing and have resulted in three applicants to the program in 2014-15 who took courses in the spring while working on their portfolios.

The initiation of the Ed.S. program has created a better pipeline for more students to enter the counseling track of the Ed.D. One of the new applicants is an Ed.S. graduate.

EDD-COU 02: LO Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Program Specific Content: Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Counselor Education.

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. Comprehensive Examinations: Comps will be taken at the end of the program by all candidates and must be passed in order to register for ELR 888 (Dissertation Seminar). They will be divided into 3 sections: research, curriculum, and supervision and based upon the core program courses and scored by program faculty.

2. Results will be compiled and analyzed by program faculty and reported to the Unit Assessment Director and the NCATE Coordinator annually.

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

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

Use of Evaluation Results
Because there were no counseling track students taking comprehensive exams in this reporting period, no data were collected. Thus, no program changes were made. In the event that students take comprehensive exams, assessment data will be collected and evaluated in order to make necessary changes.

Efforts to recruit more qualified students for the counseling track of the Ed.D. program are ongoing.

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

The initiation of the Ed.S. program has created a better pipeline for more students to enter the counseling track of the Ed.D.

EDD-COU 03: LO Advanced Counseling Skills

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome

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

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

Results of Evaluation
There were no students in the Advanced Counseling Practicum or Internship Classes for the Ed.D. during the 2014-15 year.

Use of Evaluation Results
There are evaluative efforts and changes occurring in both the M.Ed. and the Ed.S. programs that will impact the Ed.D. experiential classes positively when they are populated.

There were no students in the Advanced Counseling Practicum or Internship Classes for the Ed.D. during the 2014-15 year. Efforts to recruit more qualified students for the counseling track of the Ed.D. program are ongoing.

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

The initiation of the Ed.S. program has created a better pipeline for more students to enter the counseling track of the Ed.D.

Two counseling track Ed.D. courses were offered in this reporting period. One course was stacked because it had two students taking it. The other course offered Spring 2015 had seven students. Thus, no other program changes occurred because of the low number of students.

EDD-COU 04: LO Research and Writing Techniques

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Mastery of research techniques and academic writing (dissertation):
Demonstrate the ability to create a research question relevant to the counseling literature; design the appropriate research methodology; collect and analyze the data; and, report the findings in a manner conducive to enhancing the counseling literature.

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

Results of Evaluation
Currently, there are four counseling students in various stages of the process.
One student awaits comprehensive exams, but has not responded to repeated inquiries about taking comprehensive exams.

Use of Evaluation Results
Currently there has been no significant progress toward completion. Students have been assigned committees and are expected to interact with their chair and committee.

Efforts to recruit qualified students for the counseling track of the Ed.D. program are ongoing:

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

The Ed.S. program may create a better pipeline for more students to enter the counseling track of the Ed.D.

EDS-COU 01: LO Mastery of Prior Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Demonstrate mastery of the prior knowledge needed to be successful in Ed.S. program.

Data Collection (Evidence)
The application process for the Ed.S. in counseling – school track includes:

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

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

Results of Evaluation
In 2014-15, nine students were admitted for the Ed.S. program. They began with two core courses. These students met all the prerequisites and came highly recommended. There were 11 graduates in 2014-15.

Use of Evaluation Results
The core courses are entirely online, and thus it has enabled recruitment from across the state. Using students who are working as school counselors, through both asynchronous and synchronous class meetings, students have established a learning environment that includes in-depth instruction as well as peer-supervision. Faculty will continue this model in 2014.

EDS-COU 02: LO Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Program Specific Content: Students will demonstrate detailed knowledge of the ASCA School Counseling model.

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

Results of Evaluation
During 2014-15, students submitted nine manuscripts proposing research and program enhancement.

Evaluations of examinations and research project proposals in both core classes (CED 717 and CED 735 *Advanced Counseling Research Methods*) showed that students were viewing program enhancement through the lens of the ASCA Model. All students passed the assignments with an average of 98.8%.

Use of Evaluation Results
Faculty have noticed research proposals and program enhancements have become more focused with subsequent cohorts.

Taskstream has been utilized for students to upload papers. This is a better solution for keeping and assessing student data. Last year was focused on designing Taskstream for data collection and assessment, and 2014-15 focused on the implementation of it.

EDS-COU 03: LO Advanced Counseling Skills

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Advanced Counseling Skills and program enhancement: Demonstrate advanced skills as a counselor in the current place of counseling practice. Advanced skills include additional knowledge and

counseling techniques beyond the master's degree. Implement the enhancement plan created in CED 717 Advanced School Counseling.

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

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

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

Results of Evaluation
The major benchmarks for this goal lie in CED 758 *Advanced School Counseling* and CED 790 *Theories of Counseling Supervision*. These classes are part of the second half of the core EDS classes.

During 2014-15, students submitted nine manuscripts proposing research and program enhancement. All students passed this assignment with an average of 96%.

Evaluations of examinations and research project proposals in both core classes (CED 717 and CE 735) showed that students were viewing program enhancement through the lens of the ASCA model.

Use of Evaluation Results
As faculty teach the second portion of the core, they are discovering the changes necessary to clarify program goals and requirements for the incoming students. Primarily, helping students adopt the role of scholar-practitioner will be explained with more depth. The intent is to help these students become better program evaluators.

One challenge to be faced is a requirement by MDE upon the local school districts. A new Professional School Counselor evaluation was created and piloted around the state during the school year. Most of the PSCs in the Delta were not trained on the evaluation due to training cancellations because of inclement weather. The evaluation, the M-CAR, is scheduled to go live for the 15/16 year. Most remain untrained. A training is offered in July at a cost per participant of $50 and will be at the Beau Rivage in Biloxi, making this an unobtainable option for DSU students due to cost of training and associated travel. Faculty have adapted the program to address the M-CAR and to try to help students understand the process of evaluation, so that should help prepare them.

EDS-COU 04: LO Supervision Skills
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome

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

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

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

Results of Evaluation
Students were not able to tape and submit videos that would ensure HIPAA compliance. They submit case studies in CED 790 and engage in ex-post facto supervision where they see students and then discuss the cases with the faculty member. All students (13) passed the course in 2014-15. All students received 100% on the case studies.

Use of Evaluation Results
Results of the comprehensive exams for the EdS for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 completers continue to be excellent. Students have grown in writing ability and in the ability to conceptualize larger programmatic and school issues that impact closing the gap on student achievement. They can speak well to their abilities regarding program evaluation and interventions. The EdS program, in its encompassing nature, allows the student to build toward the comprehensive through all four core courses. The comprehensive exam is research/practice based and has worked well as a measure of professional growth.

EDS-EAS 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 – One candidate submitted CAAP scores.
- GRE Analytic Writing – Seven candidates submitted scores. The average was 3.80 and the scores ranged from 3.00 to 4.80.
- Praxis Writing I- Forty-six candidates submitted scores ranging from 172-183, and the average is 176.

The mean from the 2014 GRE remained the same as the 2013 school year, it was slightly lower than that of the past years. The average Praxis Writing Score is 176.

Analysis of Results of 2014:

•The results indicated that student GRE scores decreased from 333 in 2012 to 330 in 2013, and increased during 2014 to 3.80.
•The Praxis I Writing scores are overall higher than the required 172. The average score of 176 is higher than the state required average of 174.

CAAP Scores 2011										
Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	2009 Calendar Year	2010 Calendar Year	2011 Calendar Year	2012	2013	2014
3.75	3.5	3.25	4.0	3.5	4.00	3.75	4.75	4	0	3.5
3.0	3.5	5.5	3.5	4.5	5.00	3.50	3.5	4		
3.0	3.25	4.5		5.	3.00	4.00	3.75	4		
3.5	4.0	4.0		3.5	3.75	3.25		3		
3.75	4.5	3.0		4.0	3.25	3.75		4		
3.5	4.75			3.75	3.00	3.25				
	3.5				4.00					
	3.0				3.50					
					4.0					
					4.25					
					4.00					
					3.25					
					4.50					
					3.50					
					3.50					
					4.50					
					4.25					
					3.50					
					3.25					
					3.75					

3.42 (avg)	3.75 (avg)	4.05 (avg)	3.75 (avg)	4.04 (avg)	3.77 (avg)	3.58 (avg)	4.0 (avg)	3.8	0	3.80

GRE Analytical Writing					
2009	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
430	500	3.0	310	320	3.25
410	380	4.0	320	340	3.00
360	550	3.5	320	320	4.80
420	310	3.0	350	340	3.70
550	330		370	330	4.00
390	390		370	320	4.50
430			300		3.70
290					
460					
670					
330					
430.91 (avg)	410 (avg)	3.375 (avg)	333	330	3.80

Praxis			
2013= 17	2014= 46		
Average 176	Average 176		

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

Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

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

EDS-EAS 02: LO Program Specific Content

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Program Specific Content – Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge associated with content in Educational Leadership.

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

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

Results of Evaluation
In 2014, forty candidates took comprehensive examinations. The average score was 1.58. The average scores on each question ranged from 1.25 to 2.

Data have been collected by question to provide diagnostic information.

2009 Mean Scores (N = 17)	2010 N=17	2011	2012 N=11	2013 N= 15	2014 N=40
1.64	.64		1.5	1.5	
1.55	1.5		1.65	1.63	
1.8	1.64		1.75	1.43	
1.5	1.3		1.25	1.75	
1.61	1.45		1.65	1.5	
1.41	1.45		1.65	1.25	
1.48	1.5		1.75	1.75	
1.14	1.59		1.75	1.75	
1.41	1.68		1.65	1.5	
1.77	1.36		1.75	1.25	
1.36	1.59		1.75	1.53	
1.95	1.18			1.63	
1.64	1.43			1.65	
1.30	1.68			1.75	
1.57	1.79			1.80	

1.64	1.77				
1.75	1.86				
1.56 (avg)	1.50		1.65	1.58	2

Use of Evaluation Results
1. No specific trend was found when compared with scores from previous years. The range of scores from past years have remained within the same range.

2. Course content will be analyzed and emphasis will be placed in areas of weakness so that scores in all areas are in the acceptable range.

EDS-EAS 03: LO Ability to Plan
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
No data is available at this time.

Use of Evaluation Results
No data is available at this time.

EDS-EAS 04: LO Clinical Practice

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
Summary of Results: The results of the AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration* Mentor Evaluation resulted in student grades ranging from 80 to 100, with an overall average of 99.08.

Analysis of Results of 2014: The results indicate that students are successfully mastering the objectives:

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

Grade Distributions for Mentor Evaluations

Grades 1 = A 2 = B 3 = C	Grade Distribution For 736			2014
N = 12	**Grade**	**N**	**%**	**N= 36**
3	A	10	83	
2	B	1	8.5	
1	C			
0	**I**	**1**	**8.5**	

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Consider disaggregating the mentor evaluation score for each of AED 736 *Practicum II in School Administration* projects and link these to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council Standards to obtain diagnostic information.

2. None at this time.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 2014, 36 candidates completed the Curriculum Development Project. The scores ranged from 75 – 100, with a mean of 97.25 and a median and mode of 100.

2009 N = 43	2010 N = 22	2011 N = 20	2012 N=41	2013 N=50	2014 N=36
Mean 75.12	**Mean** 93.7	**Mean** 97.25	Mean 93.3	Mean 97	Mean 95.6

Use of Evaluation Results

1. No changes recommended at this time.

EDS-EAS 06: LO Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Dispositions – Demonstrate appropriate dispositions necessary for success as a school leader.

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

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

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

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

3. Score ranges will be calculated.

Results of Evaluation
Summary of Results:

The results of the 2014 Disposition Rating Scale (DRS) exit level indicated that most of the students met the requirements of the six dispositions:
•   Fairness
•   The belief that all students can learn
•   Professionalism
•   Resourcefulness
•   Dependability
•   Commitment to Inquiry

Analysis of Results of 2014: Students who completed the exit DRS responded with the following results: Fairness-   11/ Meets, 8/Exceed, with an average of 3.42 out of a possible 4; The Belief that all Students Can Learn- 14/Meet, 5 Exceed with an average of 3.26 out of a possible 4; Professionalism- 14 Meet, 5 Exceed, with an average of 3.26 out of a possible 4; Resourcefulness- 17 Meet, 2 Exceed, with an average of 3.10 out of a possible 4; Dependability- 15 Meet, 4 Exceed with

an average of 3.21 out of a possible 4; and Commitment to Inquiry- 19 Meet with an average 3 out of a possible 4.

2014 Results	2	3	4	
1 Fairness		11	8	
2 All Students Can Learn		14	5	
3 Professionalism		14	5	
4 Resourcefulness		17	2	
5 Dependability		15	4	
6 Commitment to Inquiry		19		

Use of Evaluation Results
1. It is recommended that the Dispositions Rating Scale be administered as a self-assessment in AED 702

Role of the Principal. Faculty would review the self-assessment at application to the comprehensive examination, as well as reviewing any disposition flags for the student. Each student must be cleared before sitting for the comprehensive examination.

2. None at this time.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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

2014, a total of 12 online Ed. S. candidates took the comprehensive exam. Two out of the twelve (17%) failed the exams, thus yielding a pass rate of 83%. All of the candidates responded to items for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* & CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School*, which is a requirement for Comps. Of the 12 responses for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education*, 3 (25%) received target ratings, 7 (58%) received acceptable ratings, and 2 (17%0 received unacceptable ratings. Of the 12 responses for CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School*, 3 (25%) received target ratings, 8 (67%) received acceptable ratings, and 1 (8%) received an unacceptable rating. Candidates had choices between CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education*, CEL 712 *Leadership Roles in Elementary Education*, CSP 616 *Behavioral Management*, and CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education*. Eleven of the candidates responded to prompts for CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education* with 4 (36%) receiving target ratings and 2 (33%) receiving an acceptable ratings. Six candidates responded to prompts from CEL 712 *Leadership Roles in Elementary Education* with 3 (50%) receiving a target rating, 2 (33%) receiving acceptable ratings, and 1 (17%) receiving an unacceptable rating. Two candidates responded to the prompt for CSP 616 *Behavioral Management*. One (50%) received an acceptable rating and 1 (50%) received an unacceptable rating. Five candidates responded to CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education*. Two (40%) received target ratings, 2 (40%) received acceptable ratings, and 1 (20%) received an unacceptable rating. Of the required prompts, candidates performed best with the CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* prompt. Of the choice items, candidates performed best with CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education*. Additionally, it was the only course in which no candidate received an unacceptable rating.

A total of 7 Tishomingo Ed. S. candidates took the comprehensive exam. Two out of the seven (28%) failed the exams, thus yielding a pass rate of 71%. All of the candidates responded to items for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* & CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School*, which is a requirement for Comps. Of the 7 responses for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education*, 2 (29%) received target ratings, 3 (43%) received acceptable ratings, and 2 (29%) received unacceptable ratings. Of the 7 responses for CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School*, 2 (29%) received target ratings and 5 (71%) received acceptable ratings. Candidates had choices between CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education*, CEL 712 *Leadership Roles in Elementary Education*, CSP 616 *Behavioral Management*, and CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education*. Seven of the candidates responded to prompts for CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education* with 2(29%) receiving target ratings and 3 (60%) receiving an acceptable ratings. Five candidates responded to prompts from CEL 712 *Leadership Roles in Elementary Education* with 2 (40%) receiving a target rating and 3 (60%) receiving acceptable ratings. None of the candidates responded to the prompt for CSP 616 *Behavioral Management*. Seven candidates responded to CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education*. Two (29%) received target ratings and 5 (71%) received acceptable ratings. Of the required prompts, candidates performed best with the CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* prompt. Of the choice items, candidates performed best with CEL 711 *Instructional Strategies in Elementary Education*. CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* was the only course in which candidates received unacceptable ratings. Similar results were noted for the online candidates.

Trends Noted

Performance on the comps has remained consistent for the Ed. S. students. Dissemination of a comps study guide began 2011 to mirror the support offered to the M. Ed. candidates. The pass rate for the 2011 candidates was slightly less than the 2010 candidates but the number of 2011 candidates was greater. CSP 648 was added to the comps Fall 2012 to accommodate candidates who took it instead of CSP 616 *Behavioral Management*; however, no online candidates chose to respond to the CSP 648

Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education prompt. In 2013, some Ed. S. candidates responded to the CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education* prompts and were successful. Candidates in 2014 continued to perform acceptably with the CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education* prompt. However, performance for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* showed a weakness. Synchronous online class meetings will highlight topics that are included on comps for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education*.

Similar to the online candidates, Tishomingo candidates' performance for CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* showed a weakness.

Use of Evaluation Results
1. The prompt for CSP 648 *Parent-Teacher-Student Relationships in Special Education* will be maintained; candidates attempted the prompt and were successful.

2. No changes will be made to the comps at this time.

EDS-ELE 02: LO Demonstrate skill in verbal ability

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate skill in <u>verbal ability</u> 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 <u>one</u> 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
CORE Writing – minimum score of 162
NTE (Communication Skills) – minimum score of 653

Results of Evaluation
A total of 21 candidates gained full acceptance in the Ed. S. program in 2014. Their Praxis writing scores ranged from 174-179. CAAP writing scores ranged from 3-4. All candidates demonstrated acceptable verbal ability.

<u>Trends Noted</u>
No trends are apparent. All of the fully admitted candidates presented the required verbal proficiency scores.

Use of Evaluation Results
1. Faculty discussions explored the relevance of requiring a score of 174 as opposed to requiring the score of 172 that is acceptable for licensure with the State Department of Education.

2. The requirement for the 174 Praxis writing score will be maintained.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to plan and support planning at a level commensurate with the Educational
Specialist level of expertise.

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

3. These sections of the Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) will be used to show the ability to
plan and support planning: Contextual Factors, Learning Goals, Assessment Plan, Design for
Instruction, Instructional Decision Making, and Design for Instruction in Elementary Education.
   The assessment data in this area are related to the National Board of Professional Teaching
Standards, Standard II (Knowledge of Content and Curriculum) and Standard VI (Meaningful
Applications of Knowledge) for the middle childhood/generalist and Standard VI (Multiple Teaching
Strategies of Meaningful Learning) for the early childhood generalist.

Results of Evaluation
Spring 2014, all (100%) CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* candidates met the
indicators for selecting appropriate objectives and planning sequential teaching procedures. The
greatest weaknesses were noted for incorporating diversity into lessons. Nine (69%) partially met this
indicator. Additional indicators that were partially met by 4 (30.7%) candidates include integrating
core content, preparing appropriate assessments, communicating assessment criteria and performance
standards, and incorporating a variety of informal and formal assessments. Fall 2014, all (100%) CEL
705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates met the indicators for incorporating
diversity, integrating content, and communicating assessment criteria and standards. The greatest
weaknesses were noted for planning differentiated instruction and incorporating a variety of
assessments. The overall average was 90% for the group.

2014 TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) data for items 1-9 indicate that most candidates
can incorporate diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. They noted the ability to
select appropriate objectives, plan sequential teaching procedures, incorporate diversity, and integrate
content. Finally, they did not overwhelmingly demonstrate the ability to develop and use a variety of
formal assessments (ex. – pretests, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities)
to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or
educational needs.

According to the Guiding Principles, candidates demonstrated their understanding that education is a lifelong process; Candidates were able to plan appropriate and sequential instruction. Strengths were noted in the CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates' ability to demonstrate knowledge of the dynamic nature of education. With regards to the belief that education is culturally contextualized, all (100%) of the CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates were target for the following measures: incorporating diversity, integrating content, and communicating assessment criteria and standards. However, the CEL705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates presented the weakest performance for planning differentiated instruction and incorporating a variety of assessments. All candidates demonstrated their understanding that education was dynamic. Strong performances were noted for candidates' ability to select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives, and prepare appropriate assessments. CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* candidates showed some weakness in planning differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners. Finally, all candidates performed well on indicators that demonstrated their understanding that education is enhanced by technology. They planned appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that included innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and used a variety of teaching materials and technology.

Trends Noted
A previous concern with the candidates' ability to explicitly align all lessons with learning goals, integrate physical education and health into the unit lessons, effectively use technology, and foster higher thinking skills was addressed with the following: more explicit and specific online discussions regarding planning effective lessons; targeted course readings; and research assignments that focused on specific aspects of the TIAI indicators. Previous weak areas have seen improvement with most (at least 90%) candidates meeting all of the indicators. For 2014, weaknesses with incorporating diversity and developing and using a variety of formal assessments resurfaced.

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

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

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to successfully teach in a field experience/clinical setting.

Data Collection (Evidence)

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

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

Results of Evaluation
Spring 2014, all (100%) CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* candidates met the indicators for all of the criteria except provide clear directions, provide opportunities for cooperative learning, illicit student input, monitor and adjust class environment, and communicate with parents. For each of those items, 1 (7.69%) candidate partially met the indicator. The greatest weakness was noted for engaging students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and providing opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. Twelve (92%) of the candidates partially met this indicator. Another weakness was noted for accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners. Nine (69%) partially met this indicator. Fall 2014, all (100%) CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates met all of the indicators except communicating high expectations (90% group average) , accommodating student differences (95% group average), facilitating critical thinking (85.7% group average), and monitoring the classroom environment (95% group average).Facilitating critical thinking was the greatest weakness.
2014 TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) data for items 10-25 indicate that most candidates can implement sound instruction. They noted the ability to select appropriate objectives and plan sequential teaching procedures. However, they did not overwhelmingly demonstrate the ability to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs.

Trends Noted
Though candidates have noted improvement with providing learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners, providing opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking, using higher-order questions to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking, and using family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to enhance student learning, these areas will continue to be monitored. 2014 presented weaknesses with differentiating instruction and facilitating critical thinking again. Discussions and readings, as well as class meetings will be dedicated to engaging candidates in sound instruction for these areas.

Use of Evaluation Results
1. The graduate faculty will indicate specific course experiences and resources that will emphasize strategies and accommodations for diverse learners as well as facilitate critical thinking.

2. We will maintain an emphasis on differentiating instruction and fostering higher order thinking skills. We will continue to monitor candidate performance of indicators 10-25 of the TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument). We will also monitor adjunct perception of acceptable candidate performance.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate that candidate's teaching has an <u>impact on student learning and support of an environment that supports learning</u>.

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
Fall 2014, all CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates (100%) met all indicators for the elements of the early childhood TWS (Teacher Work Sample). Spring 2014, all (100%) CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* candidates met all indicators for contextual factors, Assessment, Analysis of student learning, and research-based lit review. Weaknesses were noted for the rest of the components of the TWS. For Learning Objectives, 13 (100%) of the candidates partially met the indicator for aligning objectives with state standards and 12 (92%) partially met the standards for developing objectives with Creativity and Higher Order Thinking Skills. For Design for instruction, a weakness was noted for the ability to differentiate instruction. Nine (69%) partially met the indicator. For instructional decision making, 7 (53.8%) candidates partially met the indicator for modifications based on analysis of student learning. For reflection, 12 (92%) partially met the indicator for articulating implications for professional development. According to the Guiding Principles, (1) candidates demonstrated their understanding that education is a lifelong process; all (100%) candidates accurately represented the content when designing the instruction. (2) Most of the candidates met indicators that showed they understood the interactive and reflective nature of education; they were able to reflect on and articulate implications of contextual factors modifications for future lessons and implications for their own professional growth and development. (3) Candidates performed well on TWS indicators that demonstrated their understanding that education is culturally contextualized. They made adaptations to assessments that were appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students. The adaptations were explicitly delineated and contextualized. However, the CEL 706 candidates demonstrated weaknesses in their ability to address prompts in the narrative regarding the learning objectives and the plan's design. Additionally, CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* candidates were weak in their abilities to modify instructional plans to address individual student needs. (4) Strengths were noted in the CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates' ability to demonstrate knowledge of the dynamic nature of education. They were able to develop varied assessments that appropriately collected evidence of the students' learning (100% met indicator). They demonstrated the ability to use the data to guide their instruction (100% met indicator). Finally, they performed well on the indicator that revealed their ability to determine impact on student learning (100% met indicator). (5) Finally, candidates improved on indicators that demonstrated their understanding that education is enhanced by technology. Candidates in both CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood*

Education and CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* integrated appropriate and available technology that made a significant contribution to teaching and learning.

Trends Noted

Beginning Spring 2011, the TWS (Teacher Work Sample) was modified to include more in-depth exploration of the community's impact on contextual factors and task 6 of the TWS was modified to require candidates to analyze prescribed subgroups which reflect current classroom populations, assessments, and school district policies. Overall ratings for these areas were improved and remain strong. A 2012 review of Section 6 indicates candidates showed weaknesses in the ability to interpret the data and demonstrate evidence of their impact on student learning. This weakness was addressed with modifying the sample Section 6 of the TWS with an extended section on interpreting data and demonstrating evidence of impact on student learning. To further differentiate M. Ed. & Ed. S. performance on the TWS, faculty agreed to enrich Section 3-Assessment to require the Ed. S. candidates to self-design assessments and justify the appropriateness of those assessments with research annotations. 2013 data for both CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* and CEL 706 *Practicum in Upper Elementary/Middle School* showed candidates successfully self-designed and annotated the assessments. Data also revealed improvement in analyzing impact on student learning. 2014 data showed consistent performance with analyzing student data, improvement with assessments, and weaknesses with learning goals and making modifications based on analysis of student learning.

Use of Evaluation Results

1 & 2. It appears the CEL 705 *Practicum in Early Childhood Education* candidates' instruction is sound. The modified Section 3-Assessment required candidates to self-design assessments and justify their designs with research annotations. Candidates performed this task well. Faculty will continue to monitor candidate performance with Section 3 and will emphasize the areas of learning goals and making modifications based on analysis of student learning.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate that candidate teaching reflects underline appropriate dispositions necessary for effective teaching.

Data Collection (Evidence)

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

2. Data are collected in TaskStream.

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

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

Results of Evaluation
Spring 2014, the online candidates exceeded expectations for all categories except Resourcefulness and Dependability. They met expectations for those indicators. Summer II 2014 and Fall 2014, all candidates either met or exceeded expectations. The indicator that yielded the most "exceeds expectations" ratings was Dependability in Summer II. Three (60%) candidates received "exceeds expectations" ratings. Overall, the strongest performance was noted for the Belief that all Students Can Learn (overall average of 92%) followed by Fairness and Professionalism (both yielded an overall average of 85%). The weakest overall performance was noted for Resourcefulness (overall average of 77%). According to candidate's self-ratings, most (90%) gave themselves "exceeds expectations" for belief that all students can learn and dependability. No candidate submitted a self-rating less than "meets expectations" for any disposition.

Spring 2014, all (100%) of the Tishomingo candidates met or exceeded expectations for all categories. Most (85.71%) candidates exceeded expectations for all categories except Resourcefulness for which 71.43% exceeded expectations and 28.57% met expectations. Thus the indicator that showed a weakness was Resourcefulness. No candidate submitted a self-rating less than "meets expectations" for any disposition.

Trends Noted
The 2012 data revealed that candidates' overall ability to demonstrate fairness improved. In 2013, fairness did not present as a weakness. All candidates met or exceeded expectations for all dispositions. However, fall candidates earned higher ratings for the belief that all students can learn, professionalism, and commitment to inquiry. Course instructors highlight professional dispositions and will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) aspects of course assignments and activities that exemplify fairness and resourcefulness. For 2014, Resourcefulness presented as the overall weakness for both the online and the Tishomingo candidates.

Use of Evaluation Results
1. No changes will be made to the instrument or process for assessing dispositions.

2. We will continue to work to improve candidate ratings with resourcefulness. Course instructors will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) the important role of resourcefulness for educators who are working in increasingly diverse school settings.

MAT 01: LO Demonstrate proficiency in basic pre-professional and content knowledge
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome

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

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

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

Results of Evaluation
100% of the Cohort VIII candidates passed the comprehensive examination during the Spring 2015 semester. The M.A.T. candidates answered 5 questions submitted by three of their professors. The questions were generated around the topics of special education, assessment and planning, classroom management, the use of technology in instruction and educational philosophy.   Candidates must earn an average score of at least 2.00 to pass the exam.

Spring 2015 comps

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	avg
Gillespie, Alicia	3	2	3	2	3	2.6
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	2	2	1	2
Hooper, Leora	2	2	2	2	2	2
Parnell, Courtney	2	2	2	2	2	2
Robinson, Damius	3	3	3	2	2	2.6
Taylor, Jennifer	3	2	3	3	3	2.8
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3
avg	2.71	2.29	2.57	2.29	2.29	

 As you see in the chart above, all students passed the comprehensive exams. Questions 2(technology), 4(assessment) and 5(philosophy) were the questions where students performed at the lowest scores. They did best on Question 1 (special education).

In past years there was a decline in scores for CEL/CUR 611 *Classroom Management*, CSP 546 *Advanced Survey of Exceptional Children* stayed the same, and the other three courses were fairly consistent in average scores. Since new questions were used for this iteration of the comprehensive exams, most data will be needed to draw pattern conclusions.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

The results had remained steady except for CEL/CUR 611 *Classroom Management*. Changes were made in the course content by a new instructor so I would like to meet with the new instructor to

review and/or revise the test items to match what is being taught. Content in CSP 546 *Advanced Survey of Exceptional Children* was changed during the summer of 2013, therefore, results from Spring 2014 should have shown an increase.

Use of Evaluation Results
1. This is the seventh year that the M.A.T. comprehensive examination has been given. Faculty will continue to analyze the results of the comprehensive examination by question to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the students and the program.

2. Instructors in each class will be given the topic of the comprehensive exams in their content area to ensure better alignment with what is being taught in the courses.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate <u>the ability to plan and implement instruction</u> that meets the needs of diverse learners in the classroom setting.

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

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

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

3. TaskStream reports provide descriptive statistical analyses.

Results of Evaluation
The M.A.T. candidates were evaluated by the program coordinator.

Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Indicators in Domain I: Planning and Preparation assess the candidate's ability to plan instruction. Each candidate was evaluated two times each during the Fall and Spring semesters. The TIAI instrument shows a score of "0" as unacceptable, "1" as emerging, "2" as acceptable and a score of "3" as target. I looked at the distribution of scores across each evaluation when analyzing the indicators.

In the fall iterations of the TIAI indicators the lowest scores came on indicators 3, 22 and 24. Indicator 3 (**Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons**) is no surprise as the silo effect of content area designations makes it difficult to find time to integrate multiple content areas into lessons, especially at the middle and secondary levels. Indicator 22 (**Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs**) also comes as no surprise given that management of classroom behavior is always the most challenging aspect of teaching. These MAT students are teachers of record from the beginning of the school year and therefore have to integrate strategies immediately without the scaffolding of a cooperating teacher. Indicator 24 (**Maximizes time available for instruction (Uses instructional time effectively)**) is also understandable for a rookie teacher to struggle with. Without experience planning and implementing lessons, it takes time to estimate timing well. We preach that they should always have an alternative

activity in their back pocket to go to if their lesson finishes more quickly than they planned. The more challenging thing to learn is what to do when you aren't going to get through everything on your plan for the day.

All three of these lower scoring indicators showed improvement in the second semester implementations of these assessments. In both the fall and spring semester indicator 4 (**Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology**) scored highest. This is a result of a focus on lesson planning and implementation including bookending the lessons and using technology appropriately.

Fall 2014- TIAI   0= unacceptable, 1= emerging, 2= acceptable, 3= target

Student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	
Gillespie, Alicia	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2.59
Gillespie, Alicia	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.93
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	3	2.44
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.74
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2.44
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.81
Moore, Tanarri	2	2	1	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.37
Moore, Tanarri	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.81
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Robinson, Damius	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.81
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.89
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.67
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Taylor, Katrina	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	2	2	1	1	2.30
Taylor, Katrina	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2.67
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
avg	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Spring 2015- TIAI

Student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences

Name																												avg
Gillespie, Alicia	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.74
Gillespie, Alicia	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.89
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.48
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2.52
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.59
Hooper, Leora	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2.59
Moore, Tanarri	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.44
Moore, Tanarri	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.78
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.96
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.93
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.89
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.78
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Taylor, Katrina																												
Taylor, Katrina																												
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.93
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
avg	3	3	3	**3**	3	3	**3**	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**3**	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Use of Evaluation Results
1. Track candidate performance related to the ability to incorporate multiculturalism and diversity in lessons to determine if curricular changes are needed.

2. A recommendation would be to work with the secondary candidates more explicitly on how to incorporate diversity, prepare assessments and how to differentiate instruction.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to complete a successful internship.
Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The MAT Program includes a year-long internship in the field. During the CEL/CUR 650* fall and spring courses candidates will be evaluated three times each semester by a university supervisor using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (Cohort VI during spring 2011 and Cohort VII during fall 2011)

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

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

In last year's data collection the weakest indicator was #19: "Uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning". In fact, this is a pattern that was noticed repeatedly by my predecessor. It would make sense that this issue would be an area of concern in the fall, when the teachers are still determining the resources available to them. It is troubling that scores on this indicator declined from the fall until the spring. This is an area I intend to investigate further.

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

Fall 2014- TIAI   0= unacceptable, 1= emerging, 2= acceptable, 3= target

Student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27

Student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	
Gillespie, Alicia	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2.59
Gillespie, Alicia	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.93
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	3	2.44
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.74
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2.44
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.81
Moore, Tanarri	2	2	1	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.37
Moore, Tanarri	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.81
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Robinson, Damius	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.81
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.89
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.67
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Taylor, Katrina	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	2	2	1	1	2.30
Taylor, Katrina	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.67
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.85
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
avg	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Spring 2015-TIAI

Student	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	
Gillespie, Alicia	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.74
Gillespie, Alicia	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.89
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2.48

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences

Name																													avg
Haywood, Jontarius	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2.52
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.59
Hooper, Leora	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2.59
Moore, Tanarri	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.44
Moore, Tanarri	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2.78
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.96
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.93
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3		2.89
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.78
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
Taylor, Katrina																												
Taylor, Katrina																												
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.93
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00
avg	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Changes were made during 2013 to the assessment (CEL/CUR 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*) and methods (CEL/CSD 614 *Methods of Instruction*) courses to focus more on using a variety of assessments, teaching across the curriculum and including diversity in the lessons. The data show improvements in the student's performance in the classroom, but these changes need to continue during 2014.

2. The M.A.T. coordinator will provide more opportunities in class to discuss and implement creative ways to use family and community resources in disadvantaged environments.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to measure student achievement, employ classroom management, and adjust instruction for maximum <u>impact on student learning</u>.
Data Collection (Evidence)
1. All candidates in Cohort VI successfully completed the Graduate Teacher Work Sample in CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* during the Spring 2011 semester.

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

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

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

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

3. Descriptive statistics will be calculated using TaskStream.
Results of Evaluation
Since the beginning of the program, candidates in the M.A.T. Program were introduced to Teacher Work Sample (TWS) methodology during one of the first courses taken in the program, CEL/CUR 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*. During 2014 the TWS methodology was moved from Summer I course: CEL/CUR 612 to the Summer II course: CSD/CEL 614 *Methods of Instruction*. This change will be reflected in the Spring 2015 data. The candidates are required to complete the TWS assessment based on hypothetical data during the summer course which prepares them for implementation during CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship*. During the fall semester, the teacher candidate must complete a teaching unit of integrated study according to the TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Indicator) indicators, and develop a corresponding TWS during the spring semester. In completing the TWS, candidates address a total of eight components, seven of which deal with teaching processes identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. TWS data is only collected during the spring semester of the student's internship. In the past only the final submission of TWS was logged in TaskStream. Because this information has not been very discriminating, the candidates will be required to upload the first

submission and final submission after corrections. The students were very successful. Reflection and Evaluation was rated the lowest, but is still very close to target.

<u>Trends Noted:</u>

Trends over the last four years show that the students are demonstrating acceptable ratings for the components of TWS. It is troubling that there is no differentiation among the acceptable scores for many of the indicators. It is the recommendation of this coordinator that we look at the required scoring rubric again to ascertain a way to do so.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty will meet to discuss revisions of Teacher Work Sample (TWS) to reflect the teachers' ability to plan for diverse students.

2. The first time TWS is introduced is during the summer. That was moved from the assessment course to the methods course during 2013. After analyzing data for Spring 2015, we found that the assessment needs to be completed early on in the semester to ensure adequate time for remediation if necessary.

Teacher Work Sample																
Spring 2015	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2
Student	1-Jan	2-Jan	3-Jan	4-Jan	5-Jan	1-Feb	2-Feb	3-Feb	4-Feb	5-Feb	1-Mar	2-Mar	3-Mar	4-Mar	5-Mar	6-Mar
Gillespie, Alicia	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
Haywood, Jontarius	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2
Hooper, Leora	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3
Moore, Tanarri	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Robinson, Damius	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
avgs	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3

Teacher Work Sample																
Spring 2015	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Student	1-Apr	2-Apr	3-Apr	4-Apr	5-Apr	6-Apr	7-Apr	8-Apr	9-Apr	1-May	2-May	3-May	4-May	1-Jun	2-Jun	3-Jun	4-Jun
Gillespie, Alicia	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Haywood, Jontarius	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Hooper, Leora	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
Moore, Tanarri	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Robinson, Damius	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Taylor, Jennifer	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences

avgs	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Teacher Work Sample															
Spring 2015	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Student	1-Jul	2-Jul	3-Jul	4-Jul	5-Jul	1-Aug	2-Aug	3-Aug	4-Aug	5-Aug	6-Aug	7-Aug	8-Aug	9-Aug	10-Aug
Gillespie, Alicia	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3
Haywood, Jontarius	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	█	█	█
Hooper, Leora	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	█	█	█
Moore, Tanarri	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	█	█	█
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Robinson, Damius	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	█	█	█
Taylor, Jennifer	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	█	█	█
avgs	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Teacher Work Sample									
Spring 2015	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Student	1-Sep	2-Sep	3-Sep	4-Sep	5-Sep	6-Sep	7-Sep	8-Sep	totals
Gillespie, Alicia	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.67
Haywood, Jontarius	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.35
Hooper, Leora	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.31
Moore, Tanarri	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.38
Parnell, Courtney	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.9
Robinson, Damius	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.82
Taylor, Jennifer	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.79
Yardley, Matthew	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.87
avgs	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.64

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to identify and develop the <u>professional dispositions</u> of an effective educator.
Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The graduate version of the Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS) will be used to assess candidates' professional dispositions in CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* for both fall and spring sections. The rating scale is based on six indicators: Fairness, The belief that all children can learn, Professionalism, Resourcefulness, Dependability, and Commitment to inquiry.

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

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

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

<u>Trends Noted</u>
Trends over the last four years continue to show higher ratings during the Spring semester for all M.A.T. candidates. I believe it is a result of having a full semester of teaching in their classroom. Throughout the program the students discuss contextual factors that affect their students and how they plan lesson to meet those student needs, strategies that meet diversity needs in their classrooms, and the importance of using a variety of assessments. More time needs to be spent on a commitment to inquiry and how to incorporate family and community resources.
Use of Evaluation Results
1. During 2014 our class discussions and some assignments, we focused on the first two Dispositions Rating Scale (DRS) indicators, fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Additional assignments need to be created this year stressing the importance of the other dispositions. The candidates weakest indicators were resourcefulness, professionalism, and dependability.

⬛MED-COU 01: LO CACREP Knowledge Base

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome
Counseling students will demonstrate knowledge in the eight CACREP core areas.*

*Professional Identity
Helping Relationships
Assessment
Group Work
Career Development
Human Growth and Development
Social and Cultural Diversity
Research and Program Evaluation

Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The **two** assessment instruments used in determining acquisition of content knowledge in the program are the **CPCE** (Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam) and the
NCE (National Counselor Exam). The CPCE is offered every semester, and students are eligible to sit for the exam after taking CED 609. The NCE is offered each spring and fall semester, and students are eligible to sit for the exam while they are in their last semester of coursework in the program or within six months of their graduation from the program.
2. Scores from the CPCE are generated through the Center for Credentialing in Education (CCE), an affiliate with the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) which generates the scores for the NCE. The CPCE scores are generated each semester, and the NCE scores are generated twice a year in the spring and fall. The CPCE test summary provides descriptive statistical data to compare program results with national results; the NCE also has national data with comparisons with CACREP and non-CACREP programs.
3. Data from test results are distributed to faculty for review in preparation for a discussion in a faculty meeting (or multiple faculty meetings as needed). At these faculty meetings, strategies are developed that will help students perform better on these instruments, including program preparation workshops, professionally prepared test prep materials, and curricular changes within targeted courses.

Results of Evaluation
In recent years, the majority of students have passed the CPCE. The percentage of students who passed during fall 2014 and spring 2015 is 40%. The first time pass rate was 39%. However, this is a higher percentage than the first-time pass rate for 2012-13, which was 29% although lower than the first-time pass rate of 2013-14 of 47%. One explanation for the low first-time pass rate is that a culture of taking the test prematurely has developed where students take it without sufficient review and knowing they can take it again. Another explanation is a premature move toward more online coursework. It should be noted that only 17% of the test takers (4) did not pass with their second attempt.

Three students took the graduate student administration of the NCE. Two passed and one did not for a 67% pass rate. This is an increase from last year's 40% pass rate.

Summary Tables

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) Pass Rates

CPCE Administration Dates	# of Students Tested	# of Students Passed	Pass Rate %
4/15	9	3	33%
2/15	6	0	0%
11/14	4	2	50%
10/14	7	6	86%
9/14	4	1	25%
3/14 Retest	9	7	78%
2/14	16	7	44%
10/13	3	2	67%
9/13 Retest	3	0	0%
6/13	4	3	75%
4/13	6	1	17%
12/12 Retest	1	0	0%
3/12	4	0	0%
4/12 Retest	3	3	100%
6/12	4	1	25%
8/12 Retest	4	2	50%
11/12	7	6	86%
12/11 retake	1	0	0%
10/11	10	9	90%
03/11	5	5	100%
11/10 retake	3	3	100%
11/10	9	6	66%
03/10 retake	1	1	100%
03/10	13	12	92%
10/09 (fall 09) retake	3	1	33%
10/09 (fall 09)	7	6	86%
07/09 (summer 09) retake	4	3	75%
06/09 (summer 09)	6	4	67%
04/09 (spring 09) retake	6	1	17%
03/09 (spring 09)	13	4	31%
10/08 (fall 08) retake	4	1	25%
10/08 (fall 08)	26	19	73%
4/08 (spring 08) retake	4	3	75%
3/08 (spring 08)	10	5	50%
11/07 (fall 07) retake	8	3	38%
10/07 (Fall 07)	12	1	8%
3/07 (spring 07) retake	6	3	50%
3/07 (spring 07)	10	3	30%
11/06 (fall 06) retake	5	4	80%
10/06 (fall 06)	10	7	70%

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences

	Human Growth	Social Cultural	Helping Relation-ships	Group Work	Career	Appraisal	Research	Professional /Ethics	Total	Number Passed	Number
Fall 2007	9.42	8.25	9.42	8.58	8.58	8.58	9.75	9.50	72.08	1	12
Fall 2007 RT	6.63	6.63	8.13	9.88	8.63	8.25	9.13	11.25	68.50	3	8
Spring 2008	10.90	9.90	10.20	11.10	8.40	9.80	9.90	11.90	82.10	5	10
Spring 2008 RT	10.50	7.50	10.25	8.25	9.00	10.50	11.75	12.00	79.75	2	4
Summer 2008	8.00	7.00	8.33	8.33	5.00	8.67	7.67	9.33	62.33	0	3
Fall 2008	10.38	8.75	11.38	9.79	8.00	11.33	8.88	11.58	80.08	18	24
Fall 2008 RT	10.83	9.67	11.83	8.17	8.17	12.17	7.67	11.50	80.00	2	6
Spring 2009	10.64	8.45	10.55	9.09	8.27	10.73	8.27	10.45	76.45	4	11
Spring 2009 RT	9.63	7.50	11.25	9.00	7.88	10.88	8.13	10.88	75.13	1	8
Summer 2009	10.17	10.67	10.00	11.83	8.83	9.33	10.00	12.50	83.33	4	6
Summer 2009 RT	9.20	9.60	10.20	9.60	6.60	9.80	8.00	12.60	75.60	3	5
Fall 2009	10.00	11.17	9.83	12.00	8.33	9.33	9.83	13.00	83.50	4	6
Fall 2009 RT	9.00	7.33	10.33	8.00	7.67	10.00	8.67	11.33	72.33	1	3
Spring 2010	11.18	9.09	10.73	11.64	10.00	9.45	10.64	13.45	86.18	10	11
Spring 2010 RT	10.00	7.00	9.00	11.00	9.00	10.00	13.00	15.00	84.00	1	1
Fall 2010	9.56	7.78	9.67	10.44	8.44	10.89	8.11	9.89	74.78	5	9
Fall 2010 RT	12.33	8.00	10.67	10.33	10.00	8.67	11.00	11.00	82.00	3	3
Spring 2011	10.00	9.80	11.60	9.60	10.00	9.00	8.00	13.20	81.20	5	5
Fall 2011	10.80	9.50	11.10	9.80	9.80	9.40	10.90	13.50	84.80	9	10
Spring 2012	6.25	7.75	7.25	9.50	6.50	8.75	8.50	7.25	61.75	0	4
Spring 2012 RT	12.33	8.33	9.33	7.33	12.00	9.67	10.33	12.67	82.00	3	3
Summer 2012	9.00	9.50	9.50	11.75	7.50	8.25	9.75	9.00	74.25	1	4
Summer 2012 RT	8.00	9.75	8.25	11.00	9.00	8.00	9.25	10.25	73.50	2	4
Fall 2012	11.71	6.43	9.43	11.00	10.57	10.86	9.29	11.14	80.43	6	7
Spring 2012	9.83	5.17	7.17	9.33	8.83	8.83	7.33	11.67	68.17	1	6
Summer 2013 RT	9.50	7.25	7.25	9.50	9.50	10.25	8.25	8.25	74.00	2	4
Fall 2013 RT	6.00	10.00	7.67	10.33	8.67	9.00	10.67	7.00	69.33	0	3
Fall 2013 RT	6.00	11.00	9.67	11.67	9.67	9.00	7.67	11.00	75.67	2	3
Spring 2014	7.50	8.25	7.81	10.69	9.06	9.12	8.50	9.50	70.44	6	16
Spring 2014 RT	9.11	9.67	9.89	11.11	9.33	10.22	8.89	10.11	78.33	7	9
Fall 2014	7.54	9.64	9.12	11.16	9.35	9.45	8.35	10.20	75.87	15	28
Spring 2015	7.89	9.78	8.78	9.67	8.78	9.56	8.44	12.78	75.68	22	37
AVERAGE	9.37	8.63	9.55	10.01	8.73	9.62	9.20	11.08	76.36		

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences
National Counselor Exam (NCE) Pass Rates

NCE Administration	# of Students Tested	# of Students Passed	Pass Rate %
2014	3	2	67%
2013	5	2	40%
2012	2	1	50%
2011	14	9	64%
2010	19	7	37%
2009	17	NA	NA
2008	10	3	30%
2007	15	9	60%
2006	9	4	44%
2005	7	6	86%
2004	10	8	80%
2003	8	7	88%

Use of Evaluation Results
In contrast to the move toward online courses, faculty decided in Fall 2014 to move toward more face-to-face courses. While the online format may be attractive to students because of convenience, the faculty are not seeing an increase in pass rates. Beginning in Fall 2015, there will be fewer online courses. Canvas will be used to supplement on-campus instruction.

Taskstream is now being used for collection of assessment data. With the end of program portfolio now in Taskstream, students have an opportunity to review as they are collecting artifacts for their portfolios.
To address pass rates, the faculty have created a Canvas classroom for students to prepare on the CPCE and the NCE. Faculty are also conducting two review sessions per month.

In Spring 2012, the faculty added a review component into the practicum and internship classes to help students self-assess their strengths and weaknesses relative to the counseling knowledge base and create preparation strategies for the CPCE. Students are now asked to purchase an NCE/CPCE preparation book as a text for the classes. Without requiring the test prep book, students reported they did not review for the test.

There are fewer students taking the CCE than in past years, so it is difficult to make programmatic changes based on the performance of two or three students. However, a significant problem in the costs of the test will mean that some of our students will delay taking the test for the graduate administration and wait until they are closer to licensure so that collecting adequate data is more difficult.

MED-COU 02: LO Counseling Skills

Start: 7/1/2014

End: 6/30/2015

Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology

Learning Outcome

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

Data Collection (Evidence)

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

Results of Evaluation

For 2014-15, all students passed CED 630; one student left the program in Fall 2014 in CED 601 (a DSU recruiter who left because of work/time conflicts); one student was required to repeat CED 604 because faculty determined she needed more time to develop her skills; all students passed CED 609; and all students successfully passed CED 619. One student did not receive credit for CED 610 in Fall 2014 because she did not accumulate the required number of hours at her site. She repeated the course in Spring 2015, passed the course, and graduated. This multiple evaluation procedure is determined by program faculty to be an effective process.

As a result of these requirements, over 12,000 hours of counseling services were provided to DSU students and to communities across the Delta.

Use of Evaluation Results

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

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

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

Faculty have updated documentation and evaluations. This includes the addition of a required form in the absence of tape review in the CED 609, 610, 619 classes. This form requires either the site supervisor or the university supervisor to observe the student live and give immediate feedback.

MED-COU 03: LO Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2014

End: 6/30/2015

Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology

Learning Outcome

Counseling students will demonstrate professional proficiencies as evaluated by core faculty members through the Professional Proficiencies Rubric. Professional proficiencies include qualities

such as ability to establish cooperative relationships with others, ability to accept and implement feedback, ability to deal with conflict effectively, tolerance for differences, and proficiency in written and oral communication.

Data Collection (Evidence)

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

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

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

Results of Evaluation

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

The faculty have adopted the Professional Proficiencies Rubric as a regular opportunity to evaluate students in terms of fitness for our program. As a result of this adoption, all students in both the M.Ed. and the Ed.S. program have been evaluated.

Use of Evaluation Results

Faculty continue to discuss didactic and experiential activities that enhance the curriculum in student acquisition of knowledge of skills. Faculty implemented substantial revisions to the CED curriculum in 2012 reflecting the changes made in implementing the 2009 CACREP standards. Specific strategies related to this goal include intensifying the internship experience with more taped and live observations and creating more awareness in applicants for admission to the program. Where students cannot tape their interactions with clients, live observations are conducted. The didactic portion of the internship is also being increased.

In Fall 2013, faculty adjusted required entry level courses for students admitted in Spring 2014. Spring enrollments are lower in number; therefore, rather than offer CED 600 *Introduction to Counseling*, CED 601, and CED 630 as in the fall semester, Jan. admissions took CED 600, CED 630, and CED 620 *Human Growth and Development*. This did not work as well for Spring 2014, so Spring 2015 returned to the traditional format of CED 600, CED 601 and CED 630. This provides the best entry into the program.

MED-COU 04: LO Appreciation of Research

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Counselor Education and Psychology
Learning Outcome

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

Data Collection (Evidence)

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

Results of Evaluation

Students are observed and/or required to submit documentation of these presentations. In 2014, four students presented papers, and 23 students presented posters at the Woodall Conference. In 2015, nine students had professional presentations at Woodall.

Use of Evaluation Results

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

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

Faculty decided to add poster sessions as an acceptable option during the Woodall Conference in 2013.

MED-EAS 01: LO Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Start: 7/1/2014

End: 6/30/2015

Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

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 XV School Leadership Licensure Assessment Performance

Two of the four members of Cohort XVI passed the School Leadership Licensure Assessment examination on the first attempt; one who did not pass took the examination again and passed. The other student who did not pass has not reported passing scores on the School Leadership Licensure Assessment.

A summary of results follows:

	Cohort XV	XVI
Mean Score	170.2	167.75
Median Score	178	171
Lowest score	154	156
Highest score	180	172
Number included	5	4
MS Passing score	169	
First time pass rate	2/50%	

After reviewing and comparing results of past cohorts, it should be noted that the mean score did drop this year. On average, scores averaged around 171; however, the median score did decrease for Cohort XVI which indicates more students scored lower.

It should be noted that Mississippi's passing scale score of 169 is the highest among all states in the nation that use the School Leadership Licensure Assessment as an exit and licensure exam for school principal/administration candidates. A three-year average is still holding at 80%, so we are still about what the state indicates as not failing.

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

2. None at this time.

MED-EAS 02: LO Program Specific Content
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 four (4) candidates passed the comprehensive examination on the first try by scoring 70% or above.

All candidates passed the exam during the first administration by scoring 70% or above.

Trends Noted
All candidates have passed the comprehensive examination on the first try for the past three years.
Use of Evaluation Results
1 & 2. More emphasis will be placed on analyzing and synthesizing information and documents required for effective decision making. Ideally, the comprehensive exam should mirror and perhaps include multiple choice as well as constructed response. Educational Testing Services has revised School Leadership Licensure Assessment administration dates to mid-April and mid-July.

⇉MED-EAS 03: LO Ability to Plan
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
No data is available at this time.
Use of Evaluation Results
No data is available at this time.

MED-EAS 04: LO Clinical Practice

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
Summary of Results: Data results from the Clinical Correlation are as follow:

Analysis of Results:
Clinical Correlations 1- scores ranged from 2.8 to 4.0 with an overall average of 3.76 (94%)
Clinical Correlations 2- scores were all a 4.0
Clinical Correlations 3- scores ranged from a 3.2 to 4.0 with an overall average of 3.38.

Clinical Correlations 1- The results indicate all students scored an average of a 4 (1005) on the first four areas of evaluation (Clinical, Anchors & Standards, Educational Issues and Descriptions, Alternate actions, Implications & Reflections). The one area where an indication for improvement exists is Mechanical. This area shows that four students received scores of a three, while one student received a score of a one.

Clinical Correlations 2- Results indicate all students mastered the correlations during the second correlation.

Clinical Correlations3 - Results indicate that student strength during the third correlation is Relation to Anchors & Standards (3.75/4), Alternate Actions (3.75/4), and Implications and Reflections.   Challenges appear to be in the areas of Clinical (3.25/4), Educational Issues and Descriptions (3.25/4), and Mechanics (3.0/4).

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.

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

Start: 7/1/2014

End: 6/30/2015

Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research

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 XVI members (N = 4)

Summary of Results:

The results of the ELPPQ questionnaire for 2013 resulted in students rating the M.Ed. Administration & Supervision Program as meets requirements at this level of experience and average for experience.

Analysis of Results of 2014:

Students enrolled in the 2013-2014 program rated the program as average at this level of experience. Students from the last cohort rated the program above expected.

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 XVI

Cohort XVI (2013-14): N=4

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

Masters of Education Leadership Program Exit Survey of Graduates(ELPPQ)
During Last Semester – Cohort 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	4				
1.2 articulate a school vision of learning	4				
1.3 implement a school vision of learning	4				
1.4 steward a school vision of learning	4				
1.5 promote community involvement in a school vision	4				
2. I believe I can:					
2.1 promote a positive school culture	4				
2.2 provide an effective instructional program	4				
2.3 apply best practice to student learning	4				
2.4 design comprehensive growth plans for staff	4				
3. I believe I can manage the:					
3.1 organization	4				
3.2 operations	4				

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

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.

MED-EAS 06: LO Exit Portfolio

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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 2013-14 program year, the class average was a score of three out of four on the portfolio.

A summary of performance of candidates in Cohort XVI shown in tables below.

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Vita **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)

Self Assessment ISLLC/ELCC1 **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.0/4 (75.00%)
Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC2 **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC3 **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00
Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC4 **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC5 **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC6 **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Field Experiences **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.25/4 (81.25%)
Situational Analysis **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.75/4 (68.75%)
Other Samples and Artifacts **Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)

Average of 10 Criterion Averages	3.00/4 (75.00%)

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

Use of Evaluation Results

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

MED-EAS 07: LO Dispositions

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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

Professor Evaluation: Overall, these results indicate that the 2013-2014 candidates are rated as an average group (75%). 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 XVI (2013-14)

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Fairness **Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial **DRF** **Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.0/3 (66.67%)
The Beief That All Students Can Learn Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial **DRF** **Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.33/3 (76.6%)
Professionalism Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial **DRF** **Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.0/3 (66.67%)
Resourcefulness Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial **DRF** **Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.00/3 (66.67%)
Dependability **Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial **DRF** **Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.00/3 (66.67%)
Commitment to Inquiry Folio Area: Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial **DRF** **Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.0/3 (66.67%)
Average of 6 Criterion Averages	**2.05/3 (68.3%)**

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

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

⊟MED-EAS 08: LO Clinical Correlations

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
Summary of Results: Data results from the Clinical Correlation are as follow:

Analysis of Results:
Clinical Correlations 1- scores ranged from 1.4 to 2.8 with an overall average of 2.45 (61.25%)
Clinical Correlations 2- scores ranged from 1.8 to 3.0 with an overall average of 2.5 (62.5)
Clinical Correlations 3- scores ranged from a 2.8 to 3.6 with an overall average of 3.2 (80%).

Trends Noted
In past years, it has been noted that candidates make limited progress or regress slightly during the second internship, due to less feedback from the instruction prior to submission; however, there is usually significant improvement in the last internship. These data indicate a similar trend but with less overall growth. This year, a decrease did not occur during the second correlation.

Cohort XV (2013-14)
Clinical Correlations Summary of Performance
N=5

Clinical Correlations 1

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Number of Clinical Correlations **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Relation to Anchors & Standards **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Educational Issues and Descriptions **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Mechanics **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=2.80/4 (70.00%)
Average of 5 Criterion Averages	**3.76/4 (94.00%)**

Clinical Correlations 2

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Number of Clinical Correlations **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Relation to Anchors & Standards **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Educational Issues and Descriptions **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)

Mechanics **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=4.00/4 (100.00%)
Average of 5 Criterion Averages	**4.00/4 (100.00%)**

Clinical Correlations 3

Rubric Criteria	Results for Group
Number of Clinical Correlations **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.25/4 (81.25%)
Relation to Anchors & Standards **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.75/4 (93.75%)
Educational Issues and Descriptions **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.25/4 (81.25%)
Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.63/4 (90.63%)
Mechanics **Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3 **DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011	**Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%)
Average of 5 Criterion Averages	**3.38/4 (84.38%)**

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.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
2014, a total of 30 online M. Ed. candidates took the comprehensive exam. Ten candidates failed the exam, thus yielding a pass rate of 67%. A majority (20 out of 30) mastered the exam with at least 85% passing for all course areas. The greatest number of failed responses was noted for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory Development and Revision in Elementary Education* (13%) and CEL 620 *Fundamentals of Early Childhood Education* (15%). The least number of failed responses was noted for CEL 610 *Effective Instruction in the Elementary School* (6%), CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction* (6%), and CEL 611 *Classroom Management* (5%). All candidates were required to respond to a prompt from CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*, CEL 610 *Effective Instruction*, and CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education*. As a required item, CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction* yielded the greatest number of target ratings (10 or 33%). Of the choice items, CEL 620 *Fundamentals of Early Childhood Education* yielded the greatest number of target ratings (6 or 30%) as well as the greatest number of unacceptable ratings (3 or 15%). Aligning the content, course activities and the comps items were intended to raise comps pass rates.

2014, a total of 28 Tishomingo M. Ed. candidates took the comprehensive exam. Fifteen candidates failed the exam, thus yielding a pass rate of only 46%. Slightly less than ½ of the candidates (13 out of 28) mastered the exam with at least 85% passing for all course areas. The greatest number of failed responses was noted for CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction* (29%). The least number of failed responses was noted for CEL 621 (5%), CEL 611 *Classroom Management* (9%), and CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* (9%). All candidates were required to respond to a prompt from CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction*, CEL 610 *Effective Instruction*, and CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education*. As a required item, CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction* yielded the greatest number of target ratings (8 or 29%). Of the choice items, CEL 611 *Classroom Management* yielded the greatest number of target ratings (9 or 39%). Aligning the content, course activities and the comps items were intended to maintain comps pass rates. However, the pass rate for 2014 is lower than the 100% for 2012.

Trends Noted

The pass rate for the online program rose to 87% in 2010 and maintained in 2011 after a comps study guide was implemented. It then decreased to 74% for 2012. After highlighting comps content with more student-instructor interactions in the classes, the pass rate rose to 82% in 2013. Since Canvas facilitates synchronous class meetings with enhanced instructor-student interactions, the increased pass rate was expected. However, the pass rate for 2014 decreased to 67%.

Tishomingo cohort candidates had maintained a strong pass rate for the comprehensive exam for the past 4 years. Beginning spring 2010, discussions and readings that emphasized comps topics were added to all of the courses that are tested on the comprehensive exam. Cohort class meetings highlighted comps content as well as elaborated on the online discussion assignments that covered comps material. The content theses candidates received was consistent with that received by other cohorts. The cohort candidates receive the same study guide as the online candidates; however, the Tishomingo cohort participates in 2 face-to-face classes per course. Nonetheless, the pass rate plummeted in 2014 (46%).

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Course discussions and readings that are covered on the comprehensive exam will continue to be highlighted during synchronous online class meetings, assignments, and discussions. Course discussions and readings for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education* that are covered on the comprehensive exam will be highlighted with more faculty-student engagement during class meetings and online discussions.

2. Graduate faculty will continue to review the content and delivery as well as the comprehensive examination items for CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education,* CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School*. Adjunct faculty teaching CEL 618 *Curriculum Theory, Development, & Revision in Elementary Education,* CRD 624 *Literacy Instruction in the Elementary School* will continue to be given the comprehensive examination items to ensure material given in the examination is covered in the class. All adjunct faculty are vetted to ensure they are qualified to teach the course.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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
CORE Writing- minimum score of 162
NTE (Communication Skills) – minimum score of 653

Results of Evaluation

A total of 62 online candidates were admitted to the M.Ed. program in 2014. The verbal ability test scores that were verified indicated that 4 candidates had NTE scores that ranged from 653-675, 55 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 continues to support 174 on the Praxis I Writing examination as opposed to requiring the score of 172 that is acceptable for licensure with the State Department of Education. It is believed that the 174 score is more suitable for graduate students who must demonstrate a higher level of verbal proficiency.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate <u>ability to plan and support planning</u> at both the lower and upper elementary levels using appropriate professional expertise.

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

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

Results of Evaluation
Spring 2014, all (100%) of the candidates in CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* demonstrated the ability to perform the following tasks: select developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards; incorporate diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons; integrate core content knowledge from other subject areas. The greatest weaknesses were noted in the candidates' ability to prepare appropriate assessment and procedures, communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students, and incorporate a variety of informal and formal assessments. Each area yielded an average of 89.58. Additionally, at least one (6.25%) candidate failed to meet the requirement for that area. Fall 2014, all (100%) of the candidates in CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* demonstrated the ability to perform all indicators of the planning as demonstrated by the TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) #1-9.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

A previous concern with the candidates' ability to explicitly align all lessons with learning goals, integrate physical education and health into the unit lessons, effectively use technology, and foster higher thinking skills was addressed with the following: more explicit and specific online discussions regarding planning effective lessons; targeted course readings; and research assignments that focused on specific aspects of the TIAI indicators. Instructor feedback while planning the unit was also implemented. In 2013, previous weak areas have seen improvement with most (at least 90%) candidates meeting all of the indicators. Spring2014 candidates demonstrated a weakness in planning appropriate assessment and procedures, communicating assessment criteria and performance standards to the students, and incorporating a variety of informal and formal assessments. However, Fall 2014 candidates demonstrated no such weaknesses.

Use of Evaluation Results
1. We will maintain an emphasis on technology use, differentiating instruction, and fostering higher order thinking skills. We will continue to monitor candidate performance of indicators 1-9 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI). We will also monitor adjunct perception of acceptable candidate performance.

2. None at this time.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate the ability to teach effectively in a field experience/clinical setting
Data Collection (Evidence)
1 & 2. In CEL 630 *Practicum,* candidates will be evaluated while teaching a lesson.

3. A rubric and a modified Graduate Teacher Work Sample (TWS) incorporating parts of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (indicators 10-34) will be used to evaluate the candidates' teaching.
Results of Evaluation
Spring 2014, all (100%) of the candidates in CEL 630 *Practicum in Elementary Education* demonstrated the ability to convey enthusiasm for teaching and learning, provide opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning, demonstrate knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught, and create and maintain a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. The greatest weaknesses were noted in the candidates' ability to elicit input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses, make adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses, use family and/or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning, monitor and adjust the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning, and establish opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues. Fall 2014, all (100%) of the candidates met all of the indicators.

Trends Noted

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

Use of Evaluation Results

1. The graduate faculty will continue to monitor candidate performance of indicators 10-25 of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), especially in the areas of technology use, differentiating instruction, incorporating family and community resources, and fostering higher order thinking skills. Special emphasis will be put on providing a consistent level of instruction and instructor-student interactions to counteract a lull in performance for either group. We will also monitor adjunct perception of acceptable candidate performance.

2. Graduate faculty who teach this course and evaluate this assessment have done so consistently for the past 5 years. If new faculty are assigned, the Department Chair and program coordinator will engage him/her in rater reliability training.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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

2014, the candidates demonstrated they were able to positively impact student learning and provide evidence of such impact. They demonstrated the ability to develop and implement instruction based on contextual factors, meaningfully interpret student data, and draw appropriate conclusions. Candidates in spring yielded the best evidence while candidates in fall appeared to struggle most with components of developing appropriate learning objectives, instructional decision making, and analysis of student learning.

Spring 2014, candidates performed well in all categories; however, a weakness was noted in their ability to develop appropriate learning objectives. Fifty percent of the candidates score a 2 (indicator partially met) for clarity of objectives and 12.5% (2 out of 16) candidates scored a 2 (indicator partially met) for significance, challenge, and variety in objectives. Fall yielded similar results for Learning Objectives. One (7.14%) out of 14 candidates scored a 2 on appropriateness of objectives and 1 (7.14%) out of 14 candidates scored a 2 on creativity and higher order thinking. Fall 2014 candidates also demonstrated a weakness in Instructional Decision Making-modifying instruction based on analysis of student learning: 1 (7.14%) candidate scored a 2 in that area. Furthermore, the fall candidates showed weaknesses in analyzing student learning. Two (14.29%) scored a 2 on alignment of analysis with learning goals.

According to the Guiding Principles, (1) candidates demonstrated their understanding that education is a lifelong process; all (100%) candidates accurately represented the content when designing the instruction. (2) Most of the candidates met indicators that showed they understood the interactive and reflective nature of education; they were able to reflect on and articulate implications of contextual factors (98.96% met the indicator), modifications for future lessons (100% met the indicator), and implications for their own professional growth and development (100% met the indicator). (3) Candidates performed well on TWS (Teacher Work Sample) indicators that demonstrated their understanding that education is culturally contextualized. They made adaptations to assessments that were appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students. The adaptations were explicitly delineated and contextualized (100% met the indicator). The weakest performance was noted in their ability to develop appropriate learning objectives that facilitated creativity and higher order thinking (92.86% for each). (4). Strengths were noted in the Spring 2014 candidates' ability to demonstrate knowledge of the dynamic nature of education. They were able to develop varied assessments that appropriately collected evidence of the students' learning (100% met indicator. The weakest performance was noted in their ability to modify instruction based on analysis of student learning: 1 (7.14%). (5) Finally, candidates improved on indicators that demonstrated their understanding that education is enhanced by technology. All (100%) candidates integrated appropriate and available technology that made a significant contribution to teaching and learning.

Trends Noted
In 2010, improvements were noted in candidates' ability to meaningfully interpret student data and draw appropriate conclusions and to demonstrate evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each. Faculty discussed the rigor of this assessment in regards to the task that requires data analysis for subgroups. It was agreed that the M. Ed. candidates needed to complete this task with practicality and usefulness of analysis results. Beginning Spring 2011, task 6 of the TWS was modified to require candidates to analyze prescribed subgroups which reflect current classroom populations, assessments, and school district policies. A review of the 2011 data revealed the candidates were able to follow prescribed data analysis requirements to successfully interpret their impact on student learning. In 2012, candidates maintained an ability to demonstrate impact on student learning. 2013 data continued to support evidence that candidates are able to impact student learning by using contextual factors and assessments to plan and guide instruction and determine impact on student learning. A weakness was noted in the candidates' ability to articulate a clear and compelling explanation of how objectives promote creativity and higher order thinking skills. This weakness was again manifested in Fall 2014

along with a weakness in modifying instruction based on analysis of student learning. These topics will be addressed with specificity through online discussions and during the synchronous online class meetings.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Faculty participated in exercises that involved scoring and comparing scores for each area of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) in an attempt to align expectations for student performance.

2. Online candidates will continue to be supported with synchronous class meetings that focus on elements of the TWS in an effort to maintain strong performance in each area of the TWS, especially Section 1: Contextual Factors.

MED-ELE 06: LO Demonstrate appropriate dispositions

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate <u>appropriate dispositions</u> for candidates who are working toward the M.Ed. degree in Elementary Education

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

2. Data are collected in TaskStream.

3. TaskStream reports provide means and score distributions.

Results of Evaluation
In 2014, according to candidate self-ratings, most candidates perceived they met and exceeded the professional dispositions identified by the College of Education. However, they identified fairness as their greatest weakness. Fall 2014, 12.5% of the candidates rated themselves inadequate in fairness. However, faculty ratings for fairness (overall rating of 79%) were higher than the students' self-assessments. According to faculty ratings, the Belief that all Students Can Learn yielded the strongest ratings (overall rating of 88%) while Resourcefulness yielded the weakest ratings (overall rating of 77%).

A majority (96%) of the candidates met or exceeded expectations in all areas of dispositions. One candidate (4%) earned a 2 (Meets a few expectations but not sufficient) in the area of Fairness in Fall' 14. Fairness yielded the lowest group average (75%) for that semester. For Spring 2014 and Summer I 2014 the lowest group average (75%) was for Resourcefulness. Though all candidates met expectations, no candidate exceeded expectations. For Summer I 2014, The Belief that all Students Can Learn and Dependability yielded strong results with 50% scoring Meets Expectations and the other 50% scoring Exceeds expectations. For Summer II 2014, Commitment to Inquiry yielded the lowest group average of 75%--all students met expectations with no students exceeded expectations. Overall, the Disposition Portfolio assessment showed that candidates demonstrated most of the unit's guiding principles. Candidates demonstrated consistent strengths with the belief that all students can

learn. This indicates their understanding that education is interactive and reflective, as well as culturally contextualized and dynamic. Weak performances in the Resourcefulness category may indicate a weakness in candidates' understanding of the importance of lifelong learning.

Trends Noted

Fall 2010 was the first iteration of the Dispositions Portfolio. Data analysis for future iterations was analyzed for trends. According to faculty ratings, the following means were noted: Fairness- 2.83/4; belief that all students can learn-3.33/4; professionalism- 3.33/4; resourcefulness- 3.17/4; dependability-3.33/4; and commitment to inquiry- 3.17/4. Particular attention was paid to the Fairness category since this was a weakness before the electronic Disposition Portfolio was begun. In 2011, a weakness continued to be noted in the candidates' ability to demonstrate fairness. The faculty developed a tips sheet for helping candidates identify and reflect upon their demonstrations of fairness. The tips were added to the Dispositions Portfolio directions document. The 2012 data revealed that candidates' overall ability to demonstrate fairness improved. In 2013, fairness remained a strong disposition for the candidates; however, commitment to inquiry surfaced as the greatest weakness. For 2014, Resourcefulness presented as the overall weakness. Course instructors will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) the important role of resourcefulness for educators who are working in increasingly diverse school settings.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Currently, Disposition portfolios are scored by the same faculty member. A new member will conference with the current faculty evaluator and engage in rater reliability exercises until a common expectation for portfolio evidence is reached.

2. Resourcefulness is a disposition that is closely tied to all of the other dispositions. Course activities throughout the program will be identified as springboards for emphasizing resourcefulness. Course instructors will explicitly discuss (during synchronous classes or in online discussions) the important role of resourcefulness for educators who are interacting in a very diverse classroom and school setting.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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=39) completed an essay item that evaluated their ability to accept and to meet the diverse needs of students. Thirty-two candidates received acceptable ratings and seven received outstanding ratings. Five candidates received marginal or unacceptable ratings.

A majority of the candidates (92%) were able to demonstrate their ability to accept and to meet the needs of diverse learners during literacy instruction.

<u>Trends Noted</u>
Candidates have consistently demonstrated their ability to accept and meet the needs of diverse learners during literacy instruction.
Using the Disposition Portfolio as a cross reference, candidates demonstrated consistent strengths with the belief that all students can learn. This indicates their understanding that education is interactive and reflective, as well as culturally contextualized and dynamic.
Use of Evaluation Results
1 & 2. The lesson plan/teaching assignment for the course was modified to require candidates to assess and teach a struggling reader in grades K-6. This assignment gave further experience with teaching diverse learners.

MED-HPER 01: Teaching Principles
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Collaborate with program and community members to advocate and promote teaching principles that align with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students in physical education.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Item 1 were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.
2. The TWS and TIAI were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course and reported to the Graduate Coordinator.
3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

MED-HPER 02: Sequencing Curriculum Content
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation

Learning Outcome

Apply the pedagogical knowledge when selecting, assigning and sequencing curriculum content.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS), and the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Items 1-4 and lesson plans were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.
2. The TWS, TIAI and lesson plans were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course reported to the Graduate Coordinator.
3. The HPER Graduate Curriculum Committee met to analyze data.

MED-HPER 03: Professional Development

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of Physical Educators by engaging in continual professional development activities.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Service Learning Form was used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.
2. The Service Learning Forms were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 611: Current Trends and Topics in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course and reported to the Graduate Coordinator.
3. The HPER Graduate Curriculum Committee met to analyze data.

MED-HPER 04: Instruction for Physical Activity Skill

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome

Evaluate, analyze and provide appropriate instructions for physical activity skill performance in order to provide continual student practice and learning opportunities.

Data Collection (Evidence)

1. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Item 1 were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.
2. The TWS and TIAI were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 685: Practicum in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course reported to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted individual and informal program analysis of results to the Graduate Coordinator.

MED-SE 01: LO Demonstrate mastery of the content

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate mastery of the content of the M.Ed. degree program in special education (including, but not limited to, history, philosophy, theories, legal and ethical practices, service delivery, and curriculum and instruction) by successfully completing an essay-type comprehensive examination. The comprehensive examination will be rated on a two dimensional rubric which measures content mastery and writing competency. Candidates must score at least 280 out of a possible 400 points (70%). Program goal is for 70% of candidates to pass the exam in each semester. All candidates must pass the exam to exit the program.

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

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

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

Comprehensive examinations are administered in the candidates' last semester of enrollment in the program.
Results of Evaluation
Summary of Results:

Composite Scores:

Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report
Department: College of Education and Human Sciences

Semester/ Number of Candidates	Did Not Meet Expectations Score below 70% <280	Met Expectations Score 70-89% 280-359	Exceeded Expectations Score 90% or higher 360-400
SPRING 2014 *N*=3	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
SUMMER 2014 *N*=7	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=4 (57.14%)	*n*=2 (28.57%)
FALL 2014 *N*=2	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Total for 2014 *N*=12	*n*=1(8.33%)	*n*=8 (66.67%)	*n*=3 (25%)

Semester/ Number of Candidates	Did Not Meet Expectations Score below 70% (<)70%				Met Expectations Score between 70% and 89% (70%-89%)				Exceeded Expectations Score 90% or above (>)89			
	QA	QB	QC	QD	QA	QB	QC	QD	QA	QB	QC	QD
SPRING 2014 *N*=3	*n*=2 (66.67)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
SUMMER 2014 *N*=7	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=2 (28.57%)	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=5 (71.43%)	*n*=5 (71.43%)	*n*=4 (57.14%)	*n*=3 (42.86%)	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=1 (14.29%)	*n*=2 (28.57%)
FALL 2014 *N*=2	*n*=1 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (50%)	*n*=2 (100%)	*n*=2 (100%)	*n*=2 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Total 2014 (SPRING, SUMMER, & FALL) *N*=12	*n*=4 (33.33%)	*n*=1 (8.33%)	*n*=2 (16.67%)	*n*=1 (8.33%)	*n*=6 (50%)	*n*=9 (75%)	*n*=8 (66.67%)	*n*=7 (58.33%)	*n*=2 (16.67%)	*n*=2 (16.67%)	*n*=2 (16.67%)	*n*=3 (25%)

Analysis of Results of 2014:
Three semesters of data are reported in 2014. In 2013, a total of 12 candidates completed the comprehensive exam in this period, with 11 candidates out of 12 (91.67%) passing. This exceeds the long-term program goal of 70% of the candidates passing the exam.

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

In 2014, twelve candidates took comprehensive examinations. On Question Set A, 8 candidates (66.67%) met or exceeded expectations. On Question Set B, 11 candidates (91.67%) met or exceeded expectations. On Question set C, 10 candidates met or exceeded expectations (83.33%). On Question Set D, 10 candidates (83.33%) met or exceeded expectations.

Performance decreased from 78% to 67% on Question Set A; this does not meet the program goal of at least a 70% average score for each question. For Question Set B, performance increased from 72% to 92%. For Question Set C and Question Set D, performance increased from 72% to 83%.

Use of Evaluation Results

1. Continuing improvement has been a result of several actions taken in the last few years. Specifically, we have backed comps practice activities into CSP 640 *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs* and CSP 651 *Foundations of Special Education in Inclusive Settings*, which are offered to candidates earlier in the program. In addition, in each course of the program, instructors are specifically targeting comps material. As a culmination, in CSP 547 *Internships in Special Education I* and 647 *Field Research in Special Education*, we have focused the special education professional folio more specifically to synthesize material which is covered in comps. We now have two comps practice sessions each semester, one for content and one for writing skills. Because the program is now completely online, we have expanded online resources for comps preparation. Currently, resources are available as part of the course content for CSP 547/557 *Internships in Special Education I/II* and CSP 647 *Field Research in Special Education*. While those materials have remained available in the Canvas shells for those courses, we have added a Canvas shell external to any specific course; this has enabled candidates to access these materials at any time in the program. Each semester, all candidates are enrolled in the Comps Canvas shell.

2. In 2014, we have seen a decline (once again) in Question Set A. As we expand the resources in the Comps practice Canvas shell, it will be important to emphasize the foundations of special education, including the law, procedures, and practices.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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

Summary of Results:

SPRING 2014 FALL 2014	Not Met	Met	Exceeded Expectations
CONTEXTUAL FACTORS			
	Average of Rating		
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	2.6		
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	2.4		
Community, School Factors			

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Individual Student Characteristics			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=7 (87.5%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)
Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)
Skills and Prior Learning			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)
Instructional Implications			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)

LEARNING GOALS	
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	2.87
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	2.64

Significance and Variety			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)
Clarity			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)
Appropriateness			
SPRING 2014 (N=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=4 (50%)
Alignment			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)	*n*=7 (87.5%)
Creativity and Higher Order Thinking Skills (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)
ASSESSMENT PLAN			

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	2.86		
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	2.51		

Alignment			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)
Assessment Plan (New in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)
Clarity			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)	*n*=7 (87.5%)
Multiple Modes			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)
Technical			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)

2014 & FALL 2014			
Adaptations			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 80%	*n*=1 20%
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)
Record Keeping			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)

DESIGN FOR INSTRUCTION			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	2.7		
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	2.47		
Alignment with Learning Goals			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=4 (50%)
Accurate Representation of Content			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)
Lesson and Unit Structure			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)

COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=8$ (100%)
Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=3$ (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=5$ (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=8$ (100%)
Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=1$ (33.33%)	$n=2$ (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=4$ (80%)	$n=1$ (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=5$ (62.5%)	$n=3$ (37.5%)
Use of Technology			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=3$ (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=5$ (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=8$ (100%)
Differentiated Instruction: Reading Level (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=3$ (100%)	$n=0$ (0%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=4$ (80%)	$n=1$ (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=7$ (87.5%)	$n=1$ (12.5%)
Differentiated Instruction: Language (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=3$ (100%)	$n=0$ (0%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=5$ (100%)	$n=0$ (0%)
COMBINED SPRING	$n=0$ (0%)	$n=8$ (100%)	$n=0$ (0%)

2014 & FALL 2014			
Differentiated Instruction: Students on IEPs (new in SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=6 (75%)

Analysis of Results of 2014:
In the Spring 2014 semester, 3 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample. All 3 passed. The mean for Contextual Factors was 2.60, the mean score for Learning Goals was 2.87, the mean score for Assessment Plan was 2.86, and the mean score for Design for Instruction was 2.70. Subscores were reported in 3 levels: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met and 3=Expectations Exceeded. Expectations were met or exceeded in these areas: Content, Use of a Variety of Resources, Use of Contextual Information to Select Resources, Differentiated Instruction in Reading, Differentiated Instruction in Language, and Differentiation of Instruction for Students on Individual Education Plans (IEPs).

In the Fall 2014 semester, 5 candidates completed the full Special Education Teacher Work Sample. All 5 passed. The mean score for Contextual Factors was 2.40, for Learning Goals 2.64, for Assessment Plan 2.51, and for Design for Instruction 2.47.
Areas of relative strength are defined as those with at least 70% of candidates exceeding expectations. Areas of relative weakness are those with more than 50% of candidates met, but did not exceed, expectations. Subscores are reported on the combined Spring and Fall 2014 results due to low *n* in each semester.

Areas of relative strength in the combined Spring and Fall 2014 semesters in the Contextual Factors section were (percentages are of candidates exceeding expectations): Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning (100%, *n*=8) and Instructional Implications (100%, *n*=8). Areas of relative strength in Learning Goals were: Significance and Variety (100% *n*=8), Clarity (100%, *n*=8), and Alignment (87.5%, *n*=7). In the Assessment Plan, areas of relative strength were: Alignment (100%, *n*=8), and Clarity (87.5%, *n*=7). Areas of relative strength in Design for Instruction were: Lesson and Unit Structure 100%, *n*=8), Use of Technology (100%, *n*=8), and Differentiated Instruction: Students on IEPs (75%, *n*=6).

Areas of relative weakness in the Spring 2014 semester in the Contextual Factors Section were (percentages are of candidates who met, but did not exceed, expectations): Individual Student Characteristics (87.5%, *n*=7) and Skills and Prior Learning (75%, *n*=6). The area of relative weakness in Learning Goals was Creativity and Higher Order Thinking Skills (75%, *n*=6). Under Assessment Plan, Multiple Modes were an area of relative weakness (62.5%, *n*=5), as were Adaptations (62.5%, *n*=5), and Record Keeping (75%, *n*=6). Areas of relative weakness in Design for Instruction were: Accurate Representation of Content (75%, *n*=6), Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources (62.5%, *n*=5), Differentiated Instruction: Reading Level (87.5%, *n*=7), and Differentiated Instruction: Language (100%, *n*=8).
Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

1.

   a. Continue the expansion of CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*. to emphasize differentiation across reading, language, math and IEP.
   b. In CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, include unit on classroom assessment including pretesting, progress monitoring and record keeping.
   c. In early lesson planning classes: CSP 672 *Fundamentals of Effective Teaching in Special Education* and CSP 674 *Advanced Instructional Planning in Special Education*, continue to emphasize all elements of planning with particular attention to assessment and differentiation.

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrates maximum impact on student achievement by analyzing instructional decisions and their effect on student learning; and by reflecting on their own performance.
This will be measured by the rubrics in the **Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Post Planning (SETWS:II).** Candidates must score a 2 or higher on each indicator of the rubric. Program goal is for 90% of candidates to meet expectations on each element of the rubric.
Data Collection (Evidence)
Assessment V: Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Post Planning (SETWS:II)

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

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

After teaching the 5-10 day unit, the candidate responds to prompts in three sections of the electronic folio: a) instructional decision making; b) analysis of student learning; and c) reflection and self-evaluation. Each candidate submits individual sections of the folio for review by the course instructor. The unit is approved by the instructor before it is implemented. Final submission of the

entire folio is required after the unit has been taught. The folio is rated on a 3-point rubric. Candidates must score a minimum of a 2 on each of the four sections of the rubric.

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results:

Assessment Five: Special Education Teacher Work Sample Part II (Post Planning)

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3) FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	Not Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Exceeded Expectations
INSTRUCTIONAL DECISION MAKING			
SPRING 2014	2.75		
FALL 2014	2.20		
Sound Professional Practice			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=4 (50%)
Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)
Congruence between Modifications and Learning Goals			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)
Modifications for Future Teaching (new SPRING 2013)			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014	*n*=0	*n*=3	*n*=2

(*N*=5)	(0%)	(60%)	(40%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=4 (50%)

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			
SPRING 2014	2.75		
FALL 2014	2.30		
Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=4 (50%)
Alignment with Learning Goals			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)	*n*=7 (87.5%)
Interpretation of Data			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)
Evidence of Impact on Student Learning			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)

2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)			

REFLECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION			
SPRING 2014	2.53		
FALL 2014	2.12		
Interpretation of Student Learning			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)
Alignment among Goals, Instruction and Assessment			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Implications for Future Teaching			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=2 (25%)

Implications for Professional Development

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=7 (87.5%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)

**H. SETWS Post-planning Ethnographic Study
(new in SPRING 2013)**

SPRING 2014	3.0
FALL 2014	3.0

Knowledge of Special Education Contextual Factors

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)

**Knowledge of Programming and Support Services for Students with ELN and Students
At-Risk**

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)

Knowledge of Direct Services

SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)

Quality of Ethnographic Elements			
SPRING 2014 (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014 (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)
COMBINED SPRING 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=8 (100%)

Analysis of Results of 2014:
In the Spring 2014 semester, 3 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample. All three of them passed.
In the Fall 2014 semester, 5 candidates completed the post-planning component of the Special Education Teacher Work Sample. All five of them passed.

In the Spring 2014 semester, 3 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample Part II. In the Fall 2014 semester, 5 candidates completed a Special Education Teacher Work Sample Part II. The mean score for Instructional Decision Making was 2.75 in the Spring and 2.20 in the Fall. The mean score for Analysis of Student Learning was 2.75 in the Spring and 2.30 in the Fall. The mean score for Reflection and Self-Evaluation was 2.53 in the Spring and 2.12 in the Fall. The mean score for Ethnographic Study was 3.00 in the Spring and in the Fall. Subscores were reported in 3 levels: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met, and 3=expectations Exceeded. Expectations were met or exceeded on all subscores.
Areas of relative strength are defined as those with 70% of candidates exceeding expectations. Areas of relative weakness are those with more than 50% meeting, but not exceeding, expectations. In the combined semesters of Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 in the area of in Instructional Decision Making, there were no areas of relative strength. Two areas of relative weakness were found: Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning and Congruence between Modifications and Learning Goals. Areas of relative strength in Analysis of Student Learning were: Alignment with Learning Goals (87.5% exceeded). Areas of relative weakness were Interpretation of Data (75% met but did not exceed), and Evidence of Impact on Student Learning (75% met but did not exceed).
There were no areas of relative strength in Reflection and Self Evaluation or in the Ethnographic Study.

An area of relative weakness in Instructional Decision Making was Interpretation of Student Learning (75% met, but did not exceed). In Alignment among Goals in Instruction and Assessment 100% met but did not exceed. In implications for Future Teaching, 75% met but did not exceed. In Implications for Professional Development, 87% met but did not exceed. In Ethnographic Study, all areas were of relative strength in that 100% exceeded.
Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes:
Continue to Expand CSP 686 *Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* to emphasize differentiation across reading, language, math and IEP.

1. In CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, include unit on classroom assessment including pretesting, progress monitoring and record keeping.

2. In early lesson planning classes (CSP 672 *Fundamentals of Effective Teaching in Special Education* and CSP 674 *Advanced Instructional Planning in Special Education*), emphasize all elements of planning with particular attention to assessment and differentiation

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

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
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.

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

For SPRING 2014 *N*=7 (for A and B) For FALL 2014 *N*=10 For the first evaluation (Formative)	Did Not Meet Expectations (0)	Partially Met Expectations (1)	Met Expectations (2)	Exceeded Expectations (3)

(A), *N*=9 for the third evaluation (Summative) (B), *N*=8. **A=first rating (Formative), B=third rating (Summative)**			
	DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION (items 1-6)		
	SPRING 2014		
	FALL 2014		
	1. Selects developmentally appropriate, performance-based objectives that connect core content knowledge for lessons based on Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks/Common Core State Standards. (InTASC 4, 7; M-STAR Domain I – 4; NCATE 1a; CEC 5Standard 7)		
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=2 (50%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=2 (40%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (55.56%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=2 (25%)

	2. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. Uses knowledge of student backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, interest inventories, surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful. (InTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 7; M-STAR Domains I – 2, III – 10; NCATE 1c, 4a; CEC Standard 2;7)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=7 (77.78%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	3. Integrates core content knowledge from other subject areas in lessons. (InTASC 4, 7; M-STAR Domain I – 1; NCATE 1a; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)

FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=3 (33.33%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)
	4. Plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative and interesting introductions and closures, and uses a variety of teaching materials and technology. (InTASC 1, 4, 5, 7, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 1, I – 4, III – 10; NCATE 1a, 1b; CEC Standard 4;7)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=1 (25%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (66.67%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)
Both Semesters B (Summative)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=2 (25%)

Combined (*N=8*)				
	5. Prepares appropriate assessments (ex. pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, and/or checklists) based on core content knowledge to effectively evaluate learner progress. (InTASC 6, 7; M-STAR Domains II – 5, II – 6, III – 9; NCATE 1a, 1d; CEC Standard 7;8)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=4*)	*n=0* (0%)	*n=2* (50%)	*n=1* (25%)	*n=1* (25%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=3*)	*n=0* (0%)	*n=0* (0%)	*n=2* (66.67%)	*n=1* (33.33%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n=1* (20%)	*n=1* (20%)	*n=3* (60%)	*n=0* (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n=0* (0%)	*n=1* (20%)	*n=3* (60%)	*n=1* (20%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n=1* (11.11%)	*n=3* (33.33%)	*n=4* (44.44%)	*n=1* (11.11%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n=0* (0%)	*n=1* (12.5%)	*n=5* (62.5%)	*n=2* (25%)
	6. Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge (ex. – use of pre/post assessments, surveys, inventories, remediation, and enrichment activities). (InTASC – 1, 2, 7, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 2, II – 5, II – 6; NCATE 1a, 1d, 4a; CEC S 7)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=4*)	*n=0* (0%)	*n=2* (50%)	*n=2* (50%)	*n=0* (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth	*n=0* (0%)	*n=1* (33.33%)	*n=1* (33.33%)	*n=1* (33.33%)

rating) (Summative) (N=3)				
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	n=2 (40%)	n=1 (20%)	n=2 (40%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (60%)	n=2 (40%)	n=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	n=2 (22.22%)	n=3 (33.33%)	n=4 44.44	n=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	n=0 (0%)	n=4 (50%)	n=3 (37.5%)	n=1 (12.5%)
	DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT (items 7, 8)			
	SPRING 2014			
	FALL 2014			
	7. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides timely feedback on students' academic performance. (InTASC 6; M-STAR Domains II – 5, II – 6; NCATE 1a, 1d; CEC Standard 7;8)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (N=4)	n=1 (25%)	n=1 (25%)	n=2 (50%)	n=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (33.33%)	n=2 (67.66%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	n=4 (80%)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (20%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (60%)	n=2 (40%)	n=0 (0%)

Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=5 (55.56%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=3 (33.33%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	8. Incorporates a variety of <u>informal and formal</u> assessments (ex. – pre/post assessments, quizzes, unit tests, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (InTASC - 1, 2, 7, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 2, II – 5, II – 6; NCATE 1d; CEC Standard 7;8)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=4*)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=3*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=7 (77.78%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION (items 9-19)			
	SPRING 2014			
	FALL 2014			

	9. Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction. (InTASC 5; M-STAR Domain III – 11 ; CEC Standard 9)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=2 (50%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=6 (66.67%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=6 (75%)
	10. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities. (InTASC 8; M-STAR Domain III – 11; CEC Standard 4;9)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=2 (50%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)

FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=5 (55.56%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)
	11. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students. (InTASC 2; M-STAR Domains I – 3, IV – 15; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (N=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=1 (25%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=6 (75%)
	12. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning. (InTASC 3, 4; M-STAR Domain IV – 15, IV – 16; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2014A (first	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=1 (25%)

rating) (Formative (N=4)				
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=6 (66.67%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=6 (75%)
	13. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. (InTASC - 1, 3, 5; M-STAR Domains III – 8, IV – 15; NCATE 1b; CEC Standard 4;5)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (N=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (%)	*n*=4 (%)	*n*=0 (%)

Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=5 (55.56%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	14. Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught. (InTASC 4; M-STAR Domain III -7; NCATE 1a, 1b; CEC Standard 4;9)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (N=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (33.33%)	*n*=6 (66.67%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)
	15. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) to enhance student learning. (InTASC 8; M-STAR Domain III – 8, III – 9; NCATE 1b; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)

(*N*=4)				
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=6 (66.67%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	16. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e., enrichment/remedial needs). (InTASC 1, 2, 8; M-STAR Domain I – 2; NCATE 1c; CEC Standard 4;7)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=3 (33.33%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=0 (0%)

Combined (*N=9*)				
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	17. Engages students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking through higher-order questioning and provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. (InTASC 4, 5, 8; M-STAR Domains I – 3, II – 6, III – 8, III – 9; NCATE 1b, 1c; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=4*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=3*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=3 (33.33%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)
	18. Elicits input during lessons and allows sufficient wait time for students to expand and support their responses. Makes adjustments to lessons according to student input, cues, and individual/group responses. (InTASC 1, 5, 8; M-STAR Domains II – 5, II – 6, III – 9; NCATE 1c, 1d ; CEC Standard 4;5)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)

(N=4)				
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=2 (67.66%)	n=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	n=1 (20%)	n=2 (40%)	n=1 (20%)	n=1 (20%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	n=0 (0%)	n=4 (80%)	n=0 (0%)	n=1 (20%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (N=9)	n=1 (11.11%)	n=4 (44.44%)	n=3 (33.33%)	n=1 (11.11%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (N=8)	n=0 (0%)	n=4 (50%)	n=2 (25%)	n=2 (25%)
	19. Uses family and/or community resources (special guests or materials) in lessons to enhance student learning. (InTASC 10; M-STAR Domain III – 10: NCATE – 1c, 1g; CEC Standard 4;5;10)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (N=4)	n=1 (25%)	n=3 (75%)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=3)	n=0 (0%)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (100%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (N=5)	n=3 (60%)	n=1 (20%)	n=1 (20%)	n=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (N=5)	n=0 (0%)	n=3 (60%)	n=2 (40%)	n=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative)	n=4 (44.44%)	n=4 (44.44%)	n=1 (11.11%)	n=0 (0%)

Combined (*N=9*)				
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)	*n*=0 (0%)
	DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT (items 20-24)			
	SPRING 2014			
	FALL 2014			
	20. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning. **(InTASC 3: M-STAR Domain IV – 12, IV – 13, IV – 16; NCATE 1d; CEC Standard 5;6)**			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=4*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=3*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (33.33%)	*n*=6 (66.67%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=2 (25%)
	21. Attends to or delegates routine tasks. (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 12; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2014A (first	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=0 (0%)

rating) (Formative (*N=4*)				
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=3*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=1 (20%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=7 (77.78%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=0 (%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=4 (50%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)
	22. Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 13, IV – 16; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=4*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=3*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 *n*= (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=1 (20%)
Both Semesters A	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=5 (55.56%)	*n*=0 (0%)

(Formative) Combined (*N*=9)				
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=7 (87.5%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)
	23. Creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students. (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 13; CEC Standard 5)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=1 (25%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (100%)
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N*=5)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=2 (40%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=5 (55.56%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=5 (62.5%)
	24. Maximizes time available for instruction (Uses instructional time effectively). (InTASC 3; M-STAR Domain IV – 14; CEC Standard 4)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (25%)	*n*=3 (75%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)

rating) **(Summative)** (*N*=3)				
FALL 2014A **(first rating)** **(Formative)** (*N*=5)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=3 (60%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B **(fourth rating)** **(Summative)** (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)
Both **Semesters A** **(Formative)** **Combined** (*N*=9)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=2 (22.22%)	*n*=6 (66.67%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both **Semesters B** **(Summative)** **Combined** (*N*=8)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (25%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)	*n*=3 (37.5%)
	DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (item 25)			
	SPRING 2014			
	FALL 2014			
	25. Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.). (InTASC 10; M-STAR Domain V – 19; NCATE 1g; CEC Standard 10)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N*=4)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (50%)	*n*=0 (0%)
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=2 (67.66%)	*n*=1 (33.33%)
FALL 2014A **(first rating)** **(Formative)** (*N*=5)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=2 (40%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B **(fourth rating)** **(Summative)** (*N*=5)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)

Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)	*n*=6 (75%)	*n*=1 (12.5%)
	26. Demonstrates use of low profile desists for managing minimally disruptive behavior. (InTASC 3, M-Star Domain IV - 12, IV - 13, IV - 16; NCATE 1d)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=0*)	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*
SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=0*)	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=1 (11.11%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (44.44%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
	27. Demonstrates appropriate use of disciplinary action to handle disruptive student misbehavior. (InTASC 3, M-Star Domain IV - 12, IV - 13, IV - 16; NCATE 1d)			
SPRING 2014A (first rating) (Formative (*N=0*)	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*

SPRING 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=0*)	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*N/A*
FALL 2014A (first rating) (Formative) (*N=5*)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
FALL 2014B (fourth rating) (Summative) (*N=5*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters A (Formative) Combined (*N=9*)	*n*=1 (20%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=4 (80%)	*n*=0 (0%)
Both Semesters B (Summative) Combined (*N=8*)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (100%)	*n*=0 (0%)

Analysis of Results of 2014:
Due to the low numbers of candidates who participated in this assessment during the Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 semester, we combined the two semesters for reporting purposes. Candidates were observed four times, but we are reporting the first and the fourth. Indicators are in five domains: Domain I: Planning and Preparation (indicators 1-6), Domain II: Assessment (indicators 7-8), Domain III: Instruction (indicators 9-19), Domain IV: Learning Environment, and Domain V: Professional Responsibilities (indicator 25). The first observation is considered to be formative (in essence); therefore, category (domain) skills are from the fourth (summative) observation.

Candidates were rated on 25 indicators (items) across all domains on a 3-point Likert-type scale, with these values: 1=Expectations Not Met, 2=Expectations Met, and 3=Expectations Exceeded. Areas of strength were those in which at least 60% of the candidates obtained a score of 3; areas of weakness were those in which less than 30% of the candidates obtained a score of 3.
Indicators 1-6 represent candidate performance in Domain I: Planning and Preparation. In the first rating, there were no areas that appeared as a relative strength on either observation. In fact, all indicators on both observations were areas of relative weakness.

Indicators 7 and 8 represent Domain II: Assessment. In the first observation, there were no areas of relative strength; all indicators were areas of relative weakness. In the last rating for Domain II: Assessment, there were no areas that appeared as a relative strength on either observation. In fact, all indicators on both observations were areas of relative weakness.
Indicators 9-19 represent Domain III: Instruction. In the first observation in this domain, there were no areas of relative strength. In fact, all indicators were areas of relative weakness.
In the last observation in Domain III: Instruction, there were 4 areas of relative strength. These included: 9 – Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction; 10 – Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities; 11

– Communicates high expectations for learning to all students; 12 – Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning. All other indicators ware areas of relative weakness.

Indicators 20-24 represent Domain IV: Learning Environment. For the first observation, all areas were relative weakness. In the last observation, 23 – Creates and maintains a climate of fairness, safety, and respect was an area of relative strength. Indicators that were areas of relative weakness were: 20 – Monitors and adjusts classroom environment to enhance social relationships, 21 – Attends to or delegates routine tasks, and 22 – Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior.

Indicator 25 represents Domain V: Professional Responsibilities. It has only one indicator: Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians and professional colleagues (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, professional development opportunities, conferences, etc.). In the first rating, there were no areas that appeared as a relative strength on either observation. In fact, all indicators on both observations were areas of relative weakness.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

In the Fall 2013 semester, the new and simpler TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) lesson plan was first used as a pilot project in CSP 674 *Advanced Instructional Planning in Special Education* and in CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*. Moreover, it is was used in the capstone courses, CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education I* /CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*. In CSP 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs*, candidates developed and taught a 3-day unit using the new TIAI lesson plan. They were rated on the revised 25-indicator TIAI. Even though the new TIAI lesson plan has a simpler format than the previous horizontal plan, it contains embedded prompts specifying where one should address TIAI rubric indicators 1-8, as well as several other indicators that have proven problematic over time.

We have begun to implement the following changes:

1. Train candidates to write the new TIAI lesson plan beginning in CSP 672 *Fundamentals of Effective Teaching in Special Education* and introduce the TIAI rubric.
2. Follow through with training by using the simpler plan for both methods courses, CSP 640 *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs* and 643 *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs* and for the capstone courses, CSP 547 *Internship in Special Education I*, CSP 557 *Internship in Special Education II*, and CSP 647 *Action Research in Special Education*.
3. Draw candidates' attention to the SETWS Contextual Factors section and rubric, which calls for them to describe a community resource that will be used in the unit.
4. Insert a module into CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment* to teach candidates about specific informal assessments, including pre-posttests as well as formal assessments.
5. Emphasize how the Design for Learning Differentiated Elements narrative and planning chart direct candidates to: (a) write remedial and enrichment activities into the plan, and (b) implement them during lessons. Continue to emphasize the use of differentiated instruction in CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion*.
6. Embed units within earlier courses leading to capstone courses that educate candidates on engaging students in analytic and critical thinking. In earlier courses, continue to teach domains of knowledge (DOK) levels and how to maintain rigor.

7. Insert in both methods courses mini lessons on classroom management, including attending to and delegating routine tasks.

MED-SE 05: LO Demonstrate skills associated with analyzing student data and developing teaching/learning strategies based on the analyses.

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Analyze developmental level (general characteristics, language skills, motor skills, social skills, inclusion needs) of a student with significant learning, motor, sensory, cognitive, or social needs, and prepare intervention plan for that student.

Data Collection (Evidence)
This is a new way of assessing these outcomes. The Alternate Assessment (MAAECF) Language Project is an exploration of the language section of the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF). The assessment has five sections, a) Application of Alternate Assessment Process, b) Targeting Objectives, c) Alignment to General Education, d) Use of Accommodations, and e) Use of Supports. Each section is scored on a rubric from 0-3. In order to earn a passing score on the assessment, each candidate is expected to score a 2 or higher in each area.

The candidate is given samples of the Present Level of Performance and Accommodations in Assessment pages for three students. Two of the samples will be from students who qualify for alternate assessment; one student would not be eligible for alternate assessment. The candidate is asked to choose one of the students who qualifies for alternate assessment, justify the selection and then create an Alternate Assessment Portfolio for that student. Alternate assessment in Mississippi covers the areas of language, math and science. The candidate will only create the language section.

The Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF) for students with significant cognitive disabilities (SCD) is part of the Mississippi Statewide Assessment System. It is designed to assess the educational performance of students with disabilities who cannot participate in the general education curriculum, even with accommodations. Students in grades 3–8 and 12 who meet the state's three SCD criteria are eligible to participate in the MAAECF. In general, eligible students are those who have a history of requiring extensive individualized instruction and have been classified as being severely to profoundly cognitively disabled or experience a pervasive developmental disability.(MDE, 2012)

This is administered in CSP 550 *Programming for Individuals with Severe/Multiple Disabilities.*
Results of Evaluation
Summary of Results for Summer 2014 (*N*=15)

	0 (Unacceptable)	1 (Emerging)	2 (Acceptable)	3 (Target)

Section 1: Application of Alternate Assessment Process	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (33.33%)	*n*=10 (66.67%)
Section 2: Targeting Objectives	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (33.33%)	*n*=10 (66.67%)
Section 3: Alignment to General Education	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=7 (46.67%)	*n*=8 (53.33%)
Section 4: Use of Accommodations	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (33.33%)	*n*=10 (66.67%)
Section 5: Use of Supports	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=0 (0%)	*n*=5 (33.33%)	*n*=10 (66.67%)

Analysis of Results of 2014:

There were a total of 15 candidates who participated in this assessment. Fifteen out of the fifteen (100%) the candidates passed. The weakest area was Section 3: Alignment to General Education. Eight out of fifteen (53%) scored target; in all other sections, 10 out of 15 (67%) scored target. This is a new assessment, first implemented during the Summer semester of 2013. It is based on a Mississippi assessment process for students with severe disabilities. This process is not covered in detail in any other class. Therefore, during the Summer 2013 semester, the program was first able to examine weaknesses and strengths in these areas. In revising the course, more time was spent examining the Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF), with particular attention to the requirements for the use of accommodations and supports.

Unfortunately, the State of Mississippi has changed the alternate assessment process. Therefore, a new instrument will need to be created to address the CEC competencies in this area.

Use of Evaluation Results

Recommended Changes:

In revising the course, a new instrument will need to be created to meet two purposes: (a) to train candidates in the new alternate assessment process and (b) to meet the CEC standards covered by the previous instrument.

MED-SE 06: LO Demonstrate competency in the use of multidimensional assessment in special education

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome

Demonstrate competency in the use of multidimensional assessments in special education to a) identify students with learning problems, b) to plan and adjust daily instruction c) and to plan for inclusion and classroom differentiation. The competency will be measured by the rubrics in the Special Education Assessment Folio. Candidates must score a 2 or higher on each element of the rubric. Program goal is 70% of candidates meeting the standard.

Data Collection (Evidence)

Assessment for fall 2011: Special Education Assessment Folio

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

Results of Evaluation

Summary of Results: Special Education Assessment Folio

1=Adequate 2=Emerging 3=Developing 4=Achieving	Formal Assessment	Informal Assessment*	Assessment for Long-Term Planning
*Spring 2014			
Fall 2014	1=Adequate n=0 (0%) 2=Emerging n=2 (18.18%) 3=Developing n=6 (54.55%) 4=Achieving n=3 (27.27%) (N=11)	1=Adequate n=0 (0%) 2=Emerging n=2 (16.67%) 3=Developing n=2 (16.67%) 4=Achieving n=8 (66.67%) (N=12)	1=Adequate n=0 (0%) 2=Emerging n=0 (0%) 3=Developing n=2 (40%) 4=Achieving n=3 (60%) (N=15)

*We do not currently know why there was no analysis of the Spring 2014 data available.

Analysis of Results of 2014:

Data from this assessment is weak. In 2011, in an effort to meet specific CEC requirements for assessment, a previous version of this instrument was re-tooled with the idea that parts would be administered across three classes. Because our candidates are not in a cohort, they were arriving at the parts of the assessment in different semesters. This made administration of the instrument inconsistent and collection of data disorganized. Additionally, the rubric for this instrument is insufficient in detail to make instructional decisions or track student progress. This instrument will be redesigned for Fall 2015 in the following ways:

1. It will be made into a single assessment to be administered each fall in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*.
2. It will have multiple rubric elements for each of the three dimensions of assessment: formal assessment, informal assessment and assessment for long-term planning.
3. The section on informal assessment will be aligned with the TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) and the TWS (Teacher Work Sample).

Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes:
This assessment will be redesigned for Fall 2015 in the following ways:

1. It will be made into a single assessment to be administered each fall in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*.
2. It will have multiple rubric elements for each of the three dimensions of assessment: formal assessment, informal assessment and assessment for long-term planning.
3. The section on informal assessment will be aligned with the TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) and the TWS (Teacher Work Sample).

MED-SE 07: LO Demonstrate mastery of the content knowledge associated with the Council for Exceptional Children Standards.

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate mastery of the <u>content knowledge</u> 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:

Special Education Praxis Score Summary:

Analysis of Results of 2014:

Praxis 0354 Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications
Candidates now report the Praxis 0354 Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications test for licensure. The cutoff score was 142; it changed to 152 in the Fall 2014 semester. In the 2014 school year, a total of 12 candidates took the test. The scores ranged from 153 to 180, meeting or exceeding the new cutoff score of 152. The subtest areas are: Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners, Domain II: Planning and the Learning Environment, Domain III: Instruction, Domain IV: Assessment, and Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities. Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners (Standard 2) covers human development and behavior, theoretical approaches to student learning and motivation, basic characteristics and defining factors for each of the major disability categories, impact of disabilities to certain individuals, co-occurring conditions, how family systems contribute to the development of individuals with disabilities, and the environmental and social influences on student development and achievement. Domain II: Planning and the Learning Environment (Standard 5 and 7) includes questions about characteristics and elements of an effective lesson plan, learning objectives that are measurable and appropriately challenging, means of providing access to the curriculum, organizing the learning environment, how to understand and manage students' behaviors, theory and practice of effective classroom management and the design and maintenance of a safe and supportive classroom environment that promotes student achievement. Domain III: Instruction (Standard 4) asks questions about instructional strategies or techniques that are appropriate to students with disabilities, strategies that facilitate maintenance and generalization of concepts, selection and implementation of research-based interventions for such students, options for assistive technology, strategies that support transition goals, and preventive and intervention strategies for at-risk learners. Domain IV: Assessment (Standard 8) covers evidence-based assessments that are effective and appropriate for students, the uses of various assessments, how to interpret assessment results and the use of assessments results. Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities (Standards 1 and 10) includes questions about Federal definitions, federal requirements for the pre-referral, referral, and identification , federal safeguards of the rights of the stakeholders, components of a legally defensible individualized education program, major legislation, roles and responsibilities of other professionals who deliver special education services, strengths and limitations of various collaborative approaches, communication with stakeholders, and potential bias issues that may impact the teaching and interactions with students and their families.

All candidates met or exceeded the Mississippi State Department of Education (MDE) standard for licensure (152). The MDE does not stipulate a cutoff score for subscores, nor does it require these subscores to be reported. Again, as a program, upon the suggestion of CEC reviewers, we have begun to group subscores in terms of program expectations: 1=Did Not Meet Expectations, 2=Met Expectations, and 3=Exceeded Expectations. These categories do not connote an absolute standard for candidates; rather, they allow the program to identify strengths and weaknesses in preparation. Candidate scores were compared to the average range of scores for the administration period in which they took the examination, as reported by ETS. A simple system of categorizing the scores is not possible as the averages reported by ETS change with each administration. Candidates may have taken the examination any time within a 5-year period of submitting scores for licensure. Therefore, in a single semester, the program completers may have taken the test in several different time periods. The program designates their score as not meeting the expectation if it fell below the average range reported for the respective subscore when the candidate took the test, met expectation if it fell in the average range and exceeding expectation if it fell above the average.

Out of the 5 major domains, the strongest areas were Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners, with 90% (9 out of 10) of the candidates meeting or exceeding the expectation, Domain II: Planning and the Learning Environment, 90% (9 out of 10) of the candidates meeting or exceeding the expectation, Domain IV: Assessment, 80% (8 out of 10) of the candidates meeting or exceeding the

expectation, and Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities, with 80% (8 out of 10) of the candidates meeting or exceeding the expectations. These scores indicate slight program improvement in Domains II: Planning and the Learning Environment and IV: Assessment, with significant improvements in Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners and Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities. We believe the improvements may be due to the addition of CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion* and the deepening of the emphasis on characteristics of learners in CSP 640 *Education of Preschool and Elementary Children with Exceptional Learning Needs*. Moreover, in CSP 545 *Special Education Assessment*, there was a focus on the clarification on the assessment procedures. In CSP 550 *Programming for Individuals with Severe/Multiple Disabilities*, there was also an expanded emphasis on specific alternate assessment procedures. Weak performance was reported on Domain III: Instruction, with 60% (6 out of 10) of the candidates meeting or exceeding expectations. This domain was also a weak area in 2013. This may be due to the fact that many or most of our candidates do not have an undergraduate degree in education. Therefore, we have geared much of the content in the method courses toward basic instructional principles. We have not been consistent in providing in-depth procedural knowledge for accommodating and modifying instruction for students with specific disabilities.

For Domain I: Development and Characteristics of Learners, CSP 640 *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs* was redesigned in the Spring 2013 semester, with a more rigorous emphasis on typical and atypical development across all developmental levels. For Domain II: Instruction, a new course was added to the curriculum during the Summer 2013 semester, CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion*. This course emphasizes differentiated instruction, co-teaching practices, grouping strategies, specialized instruction, and research-based interventions. To strengthen Domain V: Foundations and Professional Responsibilities, beginning in the Fall 2013 semester, candidates without classroom experiences now take two semesters of internship. In the first semester, they shadow a special education teacher and complete an ethnographic study of the special education internship setting. The ethnographic study has been added as a new section to Assessment V: The Special Education Teacher Work Sample: Post-planning, during the Spring 2013 semester. For candidates who are already teaching, this ethnographic study is completed in their one semester internship.

Praxis 0354 (Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications)

Note: Average range for scores is reported for each separate administration. Levels are determined by the average scores listed for the administration period in which the scores were recorded. Did not meet standard: score is not in average range Met standard: score is in average range Exceeded standard: score is above average range						
Semester of Program Completion	**Domain I – Development and Characteristics of Learners**	**Domain II –Planning and the Learning Environment**	**Domain III – Instruction**	**Domain IV – Assessment**	**Domain V – Foundations and Professional Responsibilities**	**Range of Composite Scores (all candidates met standard; must have passing score to complete program) (Cutoff=142; changed to 152 in**

						FALL 2014)
SPRING 2014 *N*=4	Did not meet standard *n*=1 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	Did not meet standard *n*=1 Met standard *n*=3 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=2 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=2 Met standard *n*=1 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	Did not meet standard *n*=2 Met standard *n*=1 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	153-180 (cutoff 142)
Summer 2014 *N*=5*	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=4 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=4 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=3 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	Did not meet standard *n*=1 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=3 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	165-183 (cutoff 142)
FALL 2014 *N*=3*	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=1 Met standard *n*=1 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Did not meet standard *n*=0 Met standard *n*=2 Exceeded Standard *n*=0	153-171 (cutoff 152)
Total 2014 *N*=12*	Did not meet standard *n*=1 Met standard *n*=8 Exceeded Standard *n*=1	Did not meet standard *n*=1 Met standard *n*=9	Did not meet standard *n*=3 Met standard *n*=5	Did not meet standard *n*=3 Met standard *n*=5	Did not meet standard *n*=2 Met standard *n*=6 Exceeded Standard *n*=2	153-180

90% met or exceeded standard	Exceeded Standard *n*=0	Exceeded Standard *n*=1	Exceeded Standard *n*=2	80% met or exceeded standard	
	90% met or exceeded standard	60% met or exceeded standard	70% met or exceeded standard		

Use of Evaluation Results
Recommended Changes:
Recommended Changes Based upon this Analysis:

1. Because the MDE cutoff scores for the 0354 specialty test increased from 142 to 152, we made an increased effort through required coursework to raise scores. We successfully raised scores for all domains except for Domain II: Instruction. Due to the fact that many or most of the candidates do not have an undergraduate degree in education, the courses in the program have a dual function – to teach basic principles of instruction while also training candidates in differentiation of instruction specific to disability areas. While we have improved the performance of our candidates in basic instruction, we need to our efforts in helping our candidates to better meet the needs of individual students through differentiation of instruction. One way we have begun to address this is through focusing the secondary methods course (CSP 643: *Programming for Adolescents with Mild/Moderate Disabilities*) on unit instruction and transition and focusing the elementary methods course (CSP 640: *Education of Young Children with Exceptional Learning Needs*) on daily lesson planning. Additionally, CSP 686 *Teaching for Inclusion* will be adding more intensive training in differentiation in reading and in math.

MS-SHP 01: Knowledge-Based Expertise
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate knowledge-based expertise in the areas of health, fitness and recreation activities required for Sport Managers or Sport Administrators.
Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The Comprehensive Examinations were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted examination results to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The HPER Graduate Curriculum Committee performed an analysis in light of the comprehensive examination results.

MS-SHP 02: Tests and Measurements

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Design, conduct and analyze tests and measurements in health, fitness and recreation activities research in order to provide evidence-based programs for athletes, recreationalists or fitness clients.
Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The Comprehensive Examinations were used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Graduate Faculty of the Division of Health, Physical Education and Recreation submitted examination results to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The HPER Graduate Curriculum Committee performed an analysis in light of the comprehensive examination results.

MS-SHP 03: Professional Development

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Learning Outcome
Demonstrate dispositions that reflect professional growth and development required of Physical Educators by engaging in continual professional development activities.
Data Collection (Evidence)
1. The Service Learning Form was used to determine the achievement of this learning outcome.

2. The Service Learning Forms were collected and evaluated by the instructor of the PER 611: Current Trends and Topics in Health, Physical Education and Recreation course and reported to the Graduate Coordinator.

3. The HPER Graduate Curriculum Committee met to analyze data.

Gen Ed Learning Outcomes

✎ CEL_300_GE07: Cultural Awareness

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Outcome: Cultural Awareness
Developing an understanding of the need to be accepting of the variety of cultures future students will bring into the classroom and developing the ability to articulate that understanding particularly as it relates to education and their future students.
Data Collection
1. Assessment methods will include test items (multiple choice) and written research papers.
2. Data will be collected via item analysis of the test data which will come from the online management system used for testing. Data from written reports will be collected by the instructor of the course. A scoring rubric will be used to assess the written reports.
3. Data will be compiled into a report by the instructor. Data will then be presented to the faculty of the department. As a collective team, faculty will determine the level of success by students and the changes, if any, that need to be incorporated into the course.
Results of Evaluation
Analysis of data revealed that students have been successful in developing an understanding of the need to be accepting of the variety of cultures future students will bring into the classroom. They demonstrated the ability to articulate that understanding as they relate to future students.
Use of Results
1. No specific recommendations were made due to the students meeting the learning outcome.
2. No changes are being proposed.

✎ FCS_215_GE03: Quantitative Skills

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Enhancing abilities for symbolic and numeric reasoning and the ability to use and understand statistical and other quantitative techniques to interpret data

Data Collection
Students in Personal Finance are required to complete a personal budget. They are required to calculate their income and expenses, then to construct and analyze a realistic, workable personal budget. These budgets are evaluated by the instructor for quantitative accuracy, and to make sure that they look realistic and workable. They receive a percentage grade. At least 85% of the students will complete the budget, and the average grade for those completed will be at least 85%.

- 📄 Budget Assignment

- 📄 syllabus

Results of Evaluation

The percentage of those completing the assignment was 89%. The mean average percentage grade earned by students in personal finance for the academic 2014-15 year was 95%, indicating that the students who completed the assignment showed good understanding of the budgeting process and the quantitative skills required in its completion.

Use of Results
The students showed good understanding of the budgeting process and the quantitative skills required in its completion.
There are no plans to change the assignment.

Related Items
GE 03: Quantitative Skills

FCS_215_GE04: Inquiry and Technology

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Building the skills for the search, discovery, evaluation, and application of information, including an understanding of the nature and limits of appropriate technologies.

Data Collection
In FCS 215 Personal Finance, students are required to review research literature in the library or through the electronic databases related to areas of personal finance. They are to analyze the findings and write a reaction paper related to the articles. The paper should be based on personal insights and responses to the information.

- Reaction Paper

- syllabus

Related Items
GE 04: Inquiry and Technology

FCS_270_GE05: Self

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Developing a fundamental understanding of the intricate nature of humans and the knowledge, interests, and skills to promote well-being and health.

Data Collection
In FCS 270 Individual and Family Development, two of the objectives are as follows:

- Describe the developing person at different periods in the lifespan
- Provide a perspective on the changes that take place during an individual's life from birth to death

Students are given the assignment of writing a reaction paper. They are to search the library and the electronic databases to find two related articles from journals and periodicals concerning middle aged adults. The paper should be self-reflective and include the student's response to the information. It should reflect their insights, opinions, and reactions.

Papers are evaluated and given a percentage grade, based on the following criteria:

- quality of the article selected
- grammatical correctness of the writing
- personal reaction to content in the paper
- degree to which student followed instructions

- [Reaction Paper](#)

- [Syllabus 270](#)

Results of Evaluation
Students wrote two papers with 90% completing both assignments. The average grade for the assignments was 89%.

Use of Results
Students achieved an excellent result for this assignment and it appears to be accomplishing the goals established. There will be no changes in the assignment for the coming year.
Related Items
GE 05: Self

FCS_270_GE08: Perspectives
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Gaining a knowledge and appreciation of human endeavors in all aspects of life-including artistic, scientific, historic, economic, psychological, and social.

Data Collection
In FCS 270 Individual and Family Development, two of the objectives are as follows:

- Describe the developing person at different periods in the lifespan
- Provide a perspective on the changes that take place during an individual's life from birth to death

Students in the course are given the assignment of interviewing an elderly person.

They are then asked to write a reaction paper in response to the information that they acquired during this interview. The paper should reflect the perspective of the student interviewer and the life perspective of the interviewee. The student should synthesize what they have learned academically regarding the aging process and what perspective they have gained from the personal interview.

The papers are evaluated and given a percentage grade based on the following criteria:

- clarity with which personal thoughts and feelings were expressed in writing
- degree of insight and perspective shown in the paper
- grammatical correctness of the writing
- degree to which instructions were followed

- [Interview Paper]

Results of Evaluation
Analysis of the assignments submitted indicated that 90% of the students completed the assignment. Of those who completed the paper, the mean percentage grade was 90%.

Use of Results
Students achieved an excellent result for this assignment and it appears to be accomplishing the goals established. There will be no changes in the assignment for the coming year.
Related Items
GE 08: Perspectives

FCS_325_GE05: Self

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Developing a fundamental understanding of the intricate nature of humans and the knowledge, interests, and skills to promote well-being and health.

Data Collection
Students in FCS 325 Marriage, Family and Sex Education are required to write a 450 word reaction paper
related to the area of human intimacy. The article should come from research journals in the library or from an electronic database. In the paper, they are to share their reactions based on their personal feelings and thoughts about the article. They are to self-reflect about the subject. Papers are evaluated by the instructor, based on quality of the article selected, grammatical correctness of the writing, personal reaction to content in the paper, how well you followed instructions. Papers are given a percentage grade.

- [Reaction Paper]

- Syllabus 325

Results of Evaluation
The instructor analyzed how many students completed the reaction paper, and calculated the mean grade. Over both semesters,
91% of the students completed the assignment. Of those who completed the paper, the average grade was 85%, with students showing good insight.

Use of Results
While completion of the assignment was good and the average grade for the assignment was very acceptable, improvement in these scores will be addressed next semester. For the next year, the instructor will further encourage all students to complete the assignment, with a goal of 94% completion, and at least an average percentage grade of 90.

Related Items
GE 05: Self

FCS_325_GE06: Social Institutions
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Understanding the major institutions of society and the contemporary world, including families, work, voluntary associations, and government.

Data Collection
Since marriage and family are social institutions, the data used to assess students' level of understanding of marriage and family, how those institutions are described, and how they function within the macro-environment includes both calculating the mean final course grade, and calculating the mean percentage of all of the tests given during the semester.

The goals are for the mean of all students' course grades to be at least 75% and for the mean test grade to be 75%, with at least 95% of the students completing all online tests.

- Syllabus FCS 3235

Results of Evaluation
Analysis of the test grades in FCS 325 revealed that 97% of the students completed all five tests online. The average of the completed five test grades in the course was 74%.

Use of Results
The tests met the goals for the year related to completion rates and test average of the students. Tests will be examined to determine if any of the questions need further coverage in the course. Course grades will also be examined on a regular basis, to make sure content is being covered adequately.
Related Items
GE 06: Social Institutions

FCS_343_GE05: Self

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Developing a fundamental understanding of the intricate nature of humans and the knowledge, interests, and skills to promote well-being and health.

Data Collection
In Nutrition and Physical Fitness, students are required to complete two assignments that help them gain insight about themselves. Both of the projects focused upon self-improvement. The first assignment was on individual weight management. Students learned about energy balance through the calculation of appropriate calorie needs and energy usage through physical activity. Students were able to better understand factors that influenced their own weight.
In the second assignment, students were required to compare food labels and terms used on these labels while grocery shopping. This assignment provided the guidance needed to make better choices at the grocery store.

- Grocery Store Assignment
- Syllabus FCS 343
- Weight Management Assignment

Results of Evaluation
Students report that they find these assignments quite enlightening. In addition, of the students who submitted the assignments, 100% scored an 86% or better on the grocery store assignment and an 85% or better on the weight management assignment. The end of the year survey revealed that students found assignments to be adequate and practical.

Use of Results
Students did not recommend changes for assignments in FCS 343. Such activities will remain in the course to promote real world application of skills that are learned through each assignment.
Related Items
GE 05: Self

PER_100_GE 05: Self

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Developing a fundamental understanding of the intricate nature of humans and the knowledge, interests, and skills to promote well-being and health.

Data Collection

Fitness assessments, skill tests, and/or activity logs were used in PER 100 level activity courses. These assessments are collected and evaluated by the instructor of the course. The evaluations are also shared with each student.

Related Items

GE 05: Self

PER_101_GE 05: Self

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)

Developing a fundamental understanding of the intricate nature of humans and the knowledge, interests, and skills to promote well-being and health.

Data Collection

Unit assignments in PER 101 Concepts of Physical Education are collected and evaluated by the instructor of the course. The topics include Managing Stress, Improving Cardiovascular Endurance, Increasing Flexibility, Increasing Muscular Strength & Endurance, Choosing a Nutritious Diet, and Maintaining a Healthy Body Composition & Body Weight.

PSY _101_GE 01: Critical and Creative Thinking

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)

Outcome 01 (Critical and Creative Thinking): Developing sound analytical and reasoning skills and the ability to use them to think critically, solve problems, analyze logically and quantitatively, and effectively respond to change

Data Collection

Specific Objectives: Solve critical thinking exercises from textbook.
Recognize and describe aspects of the scientific method.
Recognize or describe essential features of descriptive, correlational, and experimental research

Content will be specifically taught in each PSY 101 course section when covering the research methods chapter (e.g., scientific method, essential features of descriptive, correlational, experimental research).

The competency will be specifically assessed using a uniform multiple-choice quiz in the Blackboard/Canvas course shells for all PSY 101 sections. Each quiz consists of 20 items. Students

must obtain a score of 75% or higher to achieve satisfactory attainment (75% is a conventional criteria of competency in a content area).

Results of Evaluation
Mean percentage scores on the Outcome 01 competency quiz were:
Fall 2014 = 88% (N = 263) 28 students did not pass the competency quiz with at least a 75%.
Spring 2015 = 70% (N = 186) 59 students did not pass the quiz with at least a 75%. However, of the 151 students who passed the quiz with at least 75%, their score average was 95%.

Fall 2013 = 82% (N = 188)
32 students did not pass the competency quiz.
Spring 2014 = 80% (N = 172)
48 students did not pass the competency quiz with at least 75%.

Fall 2012 = 78% (N=168)
Spring 2013 = 81% (N=110)

The average scores in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 exceeded the 75% satisfactory attainment criteria.

Use of Results
A uniform assessment for Outcome 01 in all PSY 101 sections was implemented in Fall 2012. The mean percentage scores for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 indicate satisfactory attainment of the Outcome 01 competency. Fifty-nine students (N=186) did not pass the competency quiz in Spring 2015. However, of the 151 students who passed the quiz with at least 75%, their score average was 95%.

Each semester, the Psychology Program Curriculum Committee systematically tracks the assessment process and mastery/ understanding of the competency.

Psychology faculty were encouraged to see a 3%-point increase from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013. This increase from fall to spring semester has not continued. Thirty-two percent of the students in the spring semester did not pass the competency quiz. There are several possible reasons, and one may be that with the changing of the General Education courses and with PSY 101 no longer being required, students were not sufficiently motivated to take and pass the quiz.

In order to increase competency scores and completion rates, the psychology faculty made the Outcome 01 competency quiz a course requirement rather than a bonus point opportunity, and increases were seen until Spring 2015.

PSY_101_GE 05: Self
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Gen Ed learning outcome (competency)
Outcome 05 Self – Developing a fundamental understanding of the intricate nature of humans and the knowledge, interests, and skills to promote well-being and health

Data Collection
Specific Objectives: Recognize and describe the nature of human beings according to psychodynamic, behavioral, cognitive, or humanistic models.
Understand issues in personal development and apply these to present situations.

Content will be specifically taught in each PSY 101 course section when covering the human development chapter.

The competency will be specifically assessed using a uniform multiple-choice quiz in the Blackboard/Canvas course shells for all PSY 101 sections. Each quiz consists of 20 items. Students must obtain a score of 75% or higher to achieve satisfactory attainment (75% is a conventional criteria of competency in a content area).

Results of Evaluation
Mean percentage scores on the Outcome 05 competency quiz were:
Fall 2014 = 86% (N = 263). 40 students did not achieve at least 75% on the competency quiz.
Spring 2015 = 80% (N = 186) 35 students did not achieve at least 75% on the competency quiz.

Fall 2013 = 80% (N = 188)
29 students did not pass the competency quiz with at least 75%.
Spring 2014 = 80% (N = 172)
64 students did not pass the competency quiz with at least 75%.

Fall 2012 = 80% (N=170)
Spring 2013 = 88% (N=111)

The average scores in fall 2013 and spring 2014 exceeded the 75% satisfactory attainment criteria.

Use of Results
A uniform assessment for Outcome 05 in all PSY 101 sections was implemented in Fall 2012. The mean percentage scores for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 indicate satisfactory attainment of the Outcome 05 competency. However, the increased number of students who are not passing is being addressed by tying the competency quizzes to the course average.

Each semester, the Psychology Program Curriculum Committee systematically tracks the assessment process and mastery/ understanding of the competency.

In order to increase competency scores and completion rates, the psychology faculty have made the Outcome 05 competency quiz a course requirement rather than a bonus point opportunity.

User Outcomes

FE 01: UO Field Experiences and Internship Placements

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

User Outcome

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

Data Collection (Evidence)

An exit survey is given to all interns at the conclusion of the internship semester by the use of Task Stream, the College of Education and Human Sciences' electronic database. Questions 12-15 relate directly to the Office of Field Experiences. Reports on the exit surveys are run and made available to the various program coordinators. The data from these questions are then analyzed by the Director of Field Experiences at the end of each semester.

Results of Evaluation

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

 Survey items:
 12. Rate your overall internship experience.
13. Rate your overall internship placement.
14. Rate your support from your DSU supervisor.
15. Rate your support from your cooperating teacher.
 Fall 2014 = 34 interns

	Rating of 5	Rating of 4	Rating of 3	Rating of 2	Rating of 1
Question 12.	79.41%	11.76%	8.82%	0%	0%
Question 13.	79.41%	8.82%	8.82%	0%	2.94%
Question 14.	70.59%	20.59%	8.82%	2.94%	0%
Question 15.	82.35%	8.82%	5.88%	0%	0%

Spring 2015 = 32 interns

	Rating of 5	Rating of 4	Rating of 3	Rating of 2	Rating of 1
Question 12.	62.50%	21.88%	15.63%	0%	0%
Question 13.	75%	12.50%	9.38%	3.13%	0%
Question 14.	84.38%	6.25%	9.38%	0%	0%
Question 15.	78.13%	12.50%	3.13%	6.25%	0%

Use of Results and Recommendations

Ratings indicate that overall candidates were very satisfied with placements and their overall internship experience. A very small percentage (2.94% or one candidate) was not satisfied with his/her internship placement and another small percentage (2% or one candidate each semester) was not satisfied with support from the DSU supervisor. In addition, another small percentage (6.25% or 2 candidates) were not satisfied with support from their cooperating teacher. In cases of such a small percentage in satisfaction with the placement, dissatisfaction is due to the candidate not receiving his/her first choice in placement location. In cases of such small percentages with supervisors and/or

cooperating teachers, dissatisfaction is generally due to personality conflicts. Relationships and responsibilities of supervisors and cooperating teachers continue to be an emphasis for supervisor and cooperating teacher trainings held each semester by the Director of Field Experiences.

Each semester, the Director of Field Experiences will continue to monitor placements and will adjust the list of placements as needed. It is noted, though, that occasionally a placement is not satisfactory simply due to a personality clash between candidates and cooperating teachers and/or supervisors. Also, candidates do not always receive the exact placement that they want due to specific qualifications of cooperating teachers. Sometimes a particular school may not have a cooperating teacher that meets the criteria in a specific subject area and candidates may not be placed in the particular school that was his/her first choice. The Director of Field Experiences will continue to strive to place candidates with the most qualified and experienced teachers even if that means candidates aren't placed in their requested district and/or school. In addition, the Director of Field Experiences will continue to provide quality training for cooperating teachers and supervisors so that candidates have the best experience possible for their capstone experience of internship.

Unit Goals

⟳CEDP 2015_01: Division Enrollment and Retention

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Unit Goal
The division, through targeted recruitment and innovative course/program offerings, will increase overall enrollment in the undergraduate and graduate program by 1%. The division will continue to monitor market demand and trends, and recruit strategically through the university admissions office, the community college system, and interest meetings for targeted populations. Retention efforts will focus on the advisement system, with the practice of contacting advisees to encourage them to register for courses and following up with students who did not register and providing need support. This will involve tracking student enrollment in a semester by semester practice. - Goal modified and continued from previous year.
Evaluation Procedures
Review of enrollment from Institutional Research and Planning and retention reports. Track the number and type of productive recruitment efforts.
Actual Results of Evaluation

1. Total CED enrollment over the past three years 182 in 2012-13, 260 in 2013-14, and 279 in 2014-15. Three-year and two-year trend data indicate that CED enrollment increased 53% from 2012-13 to 2014-15 and increased 7% from 2012-13 to 2013-14. In order help increase retention, the CED program increased the fall and spring new student orientation from three hours to a day-long orientation and included a workshop on writing and plagiarism in order to address noticeable weaknesses in student writing. The orientation also gives students a clear program description in the spirit of thorough informed consent in order for the students to gain a better understanding of the nature of the program and expectations concerning rigor. The CED program also implemented an EDS counseling program which has helped increase enrollment. Even though trend data indicates that enrollment is increasing, the CED program will continue to have some attrition due to the gate-keeping function inherent in the ethics of counselor education. However, even though enrollment for CED appears flat from Fall 2014 to Spring 2015, this does not take into account that 12 graduated in December, so there was a slight increase in 2014-15 although it is not as large as the December 2013 to January 2014 enrollment increase.

Total PSY enrollment over the last three years was 151 in 2012-13, 173 in 2013-14, and 175 in 2014-15. Three-year and two-year trend data indicate that PSY enrollment increased 15% from 2012-13 to 2014-15 and increased 1% from 2013-14 to 2014-15. Because of a past decreasing enrollment trend, the division has engaged in more vigorous recruiting practices. In Fall 2012, the division continued an enrollment and retention plan developed by CEAC. This involves academic advisors personally contacting all advisees for early registration and then following up with advisees who do not sign up for advising. The practice is continued every semester. Additionally, the Psychology program created and submitted a proposal to develop a 2+2 Online Degree Program with Holmes Community College. The proposal has been approved and implemented; however, no one has signed up for any courses to date. Also, faculty have been active at all recruitment fairs on and off campus. One past trend to note is that in years when there are larger numbers of graduates, the following years often see a temporary decline in enrollment. Accomplishing the following goals

will help increase enrollment by major: CEDP 2016_01, CEDP 2016_04, CEDP 2016_06, and CEDP 2016_11.

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

Related Items

SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services

SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

CEDP 2015_02: Division Data Integrity

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
The Division will continue to implement the recommendations from the Division Data Integrity Committee concerning data integrity policy and process. In doing so, the division will be in compliance with the University's "Data Integrity" Policy. – Goal modified and continued from previous year.

Evaluation Procedures
Maintain minutes from the Division Data Integrity Committee and agendas/sign-in sheets from training session.

Actual Results of Evaluation

1. The division implemented a policy for managing sensitive data in accordance with the University's "Data Integrity" Policy and integrity in data collection, analysis, and use. The policy will be maintained each semester. According to the policy, student files are to be kept in a file cabinet in a room off the main office. Advisors are to keep files in the file cabinet.

Use of Evaluation Results

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

Related Items
SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

CEDP 2015_03: CED faculty training and support

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Hire, train, and support two new CED faculty to replace faculty departing 2014.

Evaluation Procedures
Course evaluations, in-class chair observations, annual chair evaluations, weekly meetings with program coordinator, and mentorship meetings with division chair.

Actual Results of Evaluation
One faculty member was hired 2013-14 to replace a faculty member who resigned. Another faculty member resigned during the summer of 2014 before the 2014-15 academic year. Another faculty member resigned in December effective May 2015. The Program Coordinator resigned effective June 30, 2015. A search was conducted for all positions, and three people were offered the positions beginning Fall 2015. Two have accepted as of June 30. In spite of the frequent turnover, the program is still able to maintain CHP and graduation rates.

Use of Evaluation Results
The division has continued to develop and strengthen the program faculty through the hiring of two new faculty members. This has helped improve all CED faculty in teaching, scholarship, and service.
Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

CEDP 2015_04: CED Reaccreditation

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Continue assessment and planning for ongoing CACREP and NCATE reaccreditation. Specifically, implement and evaluate assessment plan submitted to CACREP after the Fall 2012 site visit.

Evaluation Procedures
Accreditation was certified by CACREP in Spring 2013. The faculty developed clear concise means of self-study through an ongoing assessment plan for both the MEd Programs and the EdS program.

Actual Results of Evaluation
A complete review of syllabi and implementation of appropriate databases and Taskstream showed adequate data collection took place. The division uses the data for analysis of available data toward an enhanced learning environment. Review of syllabi is ongoing.

Use of Evaluation Results
Reports available for program evaluation by program faculty, DSU administration, and outside stakeholders. Continued growth toward program enhancement and data to guide program migration to hybrid/online environment.
Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

CEDP 2015_05: CED EDS program enhancement and evaluation

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Program faculty matriculate students through the Ed.S. in Counseling with school concentration.

Evaluation Procedures
Course curriculum, admissions process, and enrollment

Actual Results of Evaluation
Eleven students graduated from the Ed.S. program in 2014-15. The now populated Ed.S. program will continue with cohorts of 10 to 12 students taking the four core courses. Program faculty in concert with other counselor education faculty will evaluate program outcomes and teaching methods in order to enhance student learning and practicum experiences.

Use of Evaluation Results
Faculty meeting minutes and data collected in databases and on Taskstream are evidence of a self-reflective process for this degree program. Uses include program enhancement and recruitment of the best candidates for admission to the program.
Related Items
SP3.Ind09: Professional development

CEDP 2015_06: CED Program faculty research

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Program faculty will continue to engage in regular discussions about current research and publication efforts including but not limited to: Journal article submissions and potential submissions, conference presentations, book chapters, and involvement of students in scholarly efforts. – Goal continued and modified from previous year.

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

Actual Results of Evaluation
The faculty formed a research group to conduct and disseminate research findings. The research group met weekly. Through the group, there will be an increase in submissions of journal articles and presentations. There will be evidence of student involvement in faculty scholarship.

Collectively faculty reported 3 conference presentations (which include collaborative efforts) and 8 workshops (which include collaborative efforts).

Use of Evaluation Results
The research group engages in the refinement of the support system in order to facilitate individual and collaborative scholarship efforts.

Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

CEDP 2015_07: CED Hybrid and online offerings

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Program faculty will identify at least three more courses that are suitable for hybrid or fully online offerings and will have syllabi and peer-review for offerings in coming semesters. The program will consider a marketable alternative hybrid program as it continues to grow in online technology.

Evaluation Procedures

Scheduling and review of at least three hybrid or on-line courses.

Actual Results of Evaluation
Spring 2015, eight courses were offered online or hybrid. Program minutes reflect discussions, decisions, and progress toward implementing more and more online facilitation.

Use of Evaluation Results
Online or hybrid courses are an achievable goal with the possibility of creating more interest in the program in the future. However, it was noted with the CPCE exam results of the past year that students may not be achieving as well. Before increasing the amount of courses offered online, the program needs to evaluate the quality of the online/hybrid courses.

CEDP 2015_08: CED Play Therapy Clinic
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Program faculty will assist in working with Dr. Mistie Barnes to implement a Play Therapy Community Counseling Center using grant funds from the Baxter International Corporation and USDA. – Goal modified and continued from previous year.

Evaluation Procedures

The number of counseling hours provided to community children and their families in the play therapy counseling center.

Actual Results of Evaluation
Two play therapy interns completed hours sufficient for their community counseling internship requirements which provided over 480 hours of direct services to Delta children, families, and individuals.

Use of Evaluation Results
The Play Therapy Training Institute provided the ongoing establishment of a funded community counseling facility serving the children, and the families of the Delta region. However, the division does not have adequate licensed faculty members to offer a Community Counseling Clinic. Efforts have been directed to sustain the Play Therapy Training Institute.

Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

CEDP 2015_09: PSY Research Methods Redesign

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Continue the process of assessing the Research Methods Redesign. The redesign needs to be recalibrated by changing the course sequence of PSY 330, 331, and 332. PSY 331 (Statistics) will be offered at the beginning of the sequence in order to allow students to take more topical psychology courses to learn more about psychology before being required to initiate a research proposal in PSY 330 (Research Methods I). – Goal modified and continued from previous year.

Evaluation Procedures

Grade distributions of PSY 332 in fall 2013, spring 2014, fall 2014, spring 2015, as compared to previous semesters.

Actual Results of Evaluation

PSY 332	2011/2012	2012/2013	F13	S14	F14	S15
Test 1	0.77	0.77	0.84	0.91	0.89	0.71
Test 2	0.70	0.77	0.71	0.75	0.91	0.64
Test 3	0.81	0.87	NA	NA	NA	NA
Test 4	0.79	0.74	NA	NA	NA	NA
Talk	0.82	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.74
Bib	0.66	0.77	0.71	0.62	0.80	0.66
Draft 1	0.65	0.74	NA	0.77	NA	NA
Draft 2	0.8	0.83	NA	0.75	NA	NA
RP	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.80	0.76
FE	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.80	0.70
HW	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.83	0.70
Sem. Avg.	0.77	0.79	0.78	0.81	NA	NA

Qui z Avg .	NA	0.55	0.72		0.7 7	0.7 1	0.8 3

Use of Evaluation Results
PSY 330 should better prepare students to succeed in PSY 332 resulting in higher PSY 332 grades (and fewer failing). Results are used to modify the curriculum and psychology program in the future. One problem is that the same assessment measures have not been used, making it difficult to compare progress across several years. However, it would appear that students continue to find the PSY 330, 331, 332 sequence difficult to maneuver.

Related Items
🌀📊**SP3.Ind09: Professional development**

🔴CEDP 2015_10: PSY Research agenda

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

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

Evaluation Procedures
Minutes of faculty meetings, presentations, and publication submissions.

Actual Results of Evaluation
Faculty members presented at 6 conferences. Three presentations were included in conference proceedings. There were three additional publications.

Use of Evaluation Results
The program engages in the refinement of the support system in order to facilitate individual and collaborative scholarship efforts. Presentations need to be leveraged into publications.
Related Items
🌀📊**SP3.Ind01: Faculty and staff hiring**

🔴COE 2015_01: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal

The College of Education and Human Sciences, through strategic planning, recruitment, and retention efforts will increase overall enrollment in the College by 1% over AY 2013-14, with a corresponding increase in Credit Hour Production. In support of this goal, the COEHS will work with Institutional Research to identify effective means of tracking retention within the College.

Evaluation Procedures

Analyze data and identify trends based on Institutional Research enrollment data. Study credit hour production to determine if/how it corresponds to enrollment patterns. Analyze graduation percentages in comparison to enrollment percentages to determine if a pattern exists. Study recruitment and programming with respect to enrollment patterns.

Actual Results of Evaluation

Results were mixed for enrollment for the period under review; for example, UG enrollment for fall and spring were up from AY 2014 (2.63% for Fall 14; 2.34% for Spring 15), though down slightly for Summer 15 (-1.46%). Graduate enrollment is a challenge to analyze this current year due to a shift in reporting semesters for Teach for America(TFA) enrollees. Overall, graduate enrollment is down, likely due to cohorts of grant-funded candidates graduating in advanced programs (Tishomingo County Cohorts).

Individual program variances are discussed in detailed in division reports. In terms of 3- and 5-year trends, patterns are similar. However UG enrollment at the three-year increment (13-15) reflects a 9.86% increase in UG enrollment in Fall 2014, with an 11.35% increase in Spring 2015. Graduate patterns held, with decreases due to earlier spikes in cohort and online programs, followed by declines in market/funding--a general leveling off.

Total credit hour production increased 23.15% over the five-year period (11-15), 7.24% for the three-year increment (13-15), with a decline of 8.11% from AY14-AY15. This represents the fluctuation represented by increasing, then declining cohorts and varying sizes of TFA cohorts.

Use of Evaluation Results

As a result of the evaluation, the COEHS is working with Graduate and Continuing Studies to recruit at the community college system in the state for advanced level programs. Innovative program planning is under review to expand Alternate Route track offerings as well. Online course offerings are being enhanced and expanded. Faculty are working with Enrollment Services to have a strong presence at campus fairs and recruiting visits.

In terms of retention, the CEAC standardized academic advisement expectations and communications with the Student Success Center in an effort to improve retention.

Related Items

SP1.Ind03: Academic and support services

SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training

SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

COE 2015_02: Partnerships and Funding

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
The College of Education and Human Sciences, through grants, contracts, and partnerships, as well as private donor contributions, will secure funding to support student tuition scholarship and innovative programming that supports the COEHS mission. (Minimum of $500,000 in funding to be secured.)

Evaluation Procedures
All grants, contracts, and scholarship files will be reviewed to collect data. Sources will include the Institutional Grants Office and the Delta State University Foundation.

Actual Results of Evaluation
Total grant funding available during the period under review was approximately $1.5 - $1.6 million, exceeding the goal minimum of $500,000. Several grants increased access to programming in the COEHS for AY 14-15. Primarily, these were available for graduate programs. Yet, funds from these grants allowed for the employment of faculty who increased the overall viability and efficacy of all programs. They provided professional development, travel, and resources for faculty who taught in undergraduate programs, and at times were interdisciplinary in nature. They included the following:
Math/Science Partnership Grant ($297,584 - Year Two of 3-year grant totaling $924,096)
Delta School Leadership Pipeline Grant ($186,026 - Year Two of 5-year grant totaling $1,129,000)
Literacy Across the Curriculum Grant ($89,814)
Tri-State - Master's Cohort in Educational Leadership ($83,366 was awarded in addition to continued scholarship payments for other cohorts completing degrees-funded through previous awards)
HRSA: Enhancing Mental Health Grant ($356,481 - Year One of 3-year grant totaling $1,069,443-providing stipends for graduate student interns)

In addition, the College benefitted from significant funding through other grants and awards that supported program efficacy in a variety of ways. They included the following: Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Coahoma County (BCBS, $501,750), USDA Health Services grant to fund a Play Therapy Program, Teach Mississippi Institute Funding to support teacher candidates, National Gates Teacher grant funding to prepare board-certified teachers, and the Dean's Discretionary Fund ($10,000) from Tri-State Educational Foundation.

Use of Evaluation Results

The grant funds will be utilized to shape program planning for the future and to market programs. Programs will be monitored by a Grants Coordinator and program faculty will continue to renew applications for continued programming, as well as seek additional funding to support programming.

Related Items

SP3.Ind08: Evaluations

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

COE 2015_03: Research

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal

The College of Education and Human Sciences will support faculty members to develop both collaborative and independent research agendas focused on meeting the needs of the rural region served by DSU. As a result, the frequency of faculty contributions to publications and presentations will increase by 5%.

Evaluation Procedures

Collect and analyze data from the Meritorious Achievement Documents (MAD) and Faculty Activity Reports (FAR).

Actual Results of Evaluation

Twenty-two faculty members engaged in presentations for AY 14-15. The frequency of faculty involvement in presentations was 57, with 12 faculty members collaborating on a presentation. Sixteen faculty members were involved in publications, with 12 publications. While scholarship comparisons to AY 2014 for combined publications/presentations decreased during this period (118 to 73), there were mitigating factors. The unit went through preparation for three accreditation reviews (teacher preparation, family and consumer sciences/dietetics). Additionally, there were decreased numbers for travel to professional meetings for dissemination. Additionally, while the emphasis on scholarship remains strong, the unit was affirmed by NCATE that it is primarily a teaching institution impacted this goal area. Another factor was the number of new and junior faculty members who are members of the COEHS and have not yet maximized their publishing and research agendas. Key faculty were also engaged in writing program reports and self-studies for accreditation which, while not counted as research, certainly are critical to the scholarship and rigor of the programs in the COEHS.

Use of Evaluation Results

The results will be used by chairs to assist individual faculty members in setting appropriate scholarship goals and research agendas for the coming year.

Related Items

🔹📰**SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores**

🔹📰**SP3.Ind09: Professional development**

🔴**COE 2015_04: Diversity**

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
The College of Education and Human Sciences will foster diverse perspectives and interactions among all stakeholders. This will be accomplished through creative partnerships within the community and region that enhance recruitment of both diverse students and faculty, as well as through the curriculum.

Evaluation Procedures
Review Field Placement Chart (Office of Field Experiences), partnership activities in each Division, Recruitment and Hiring Reports (Office of Human Resources), Curriculum Committee minutes/CEAC minutes, unit-wide retreat minutes, and Faculty Activity Reports.

Actual Results of Evaluation
The COEHS unit has diversity proficiencies upon which candidates are measured and for which data aggregated and monitored to ensure that all candidates exit programs demonstrating these proficiencies. Revised instruments such as the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) and Teacher Work Sample (TWS) are aligned same with the diversity proficiencies to ensure consistent assessment of these proficiencies. The COEHS closely follows the policies of Delta State University to encourage and support the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty. During the period, three faculty members representing diverse populations (African American, European)
were recruited/hired.
A review of field placement charts reveals that diverse placements in field experiences were provided for candidates. Faculty members participated in university-sponsored activities to increase their awareness of a full range of diversity issues. Faculty also continued analysis of text and curriculum to ensure that a range of diversity issues are addressed appropriately throughout the curriculum.

Use of Evaluation Results
The results will be reviewed annually to guide curriculum revision, professional development, field placements, hiring practices, and all aspects of operations within the COEHS to ensure sensitivity to the spectrum of diversity dimensions.
Related Items
🔹📰**SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs**

🔹📰**SP3.Ind06: Diversity**

COE 2015_05: Identity

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
The College of Education and Human Sciences will review all programs in light of accreditation expectations, modifying programs as necessary to meet rigorous national and regional accreditation guidelines. For programs without designated accreditation bodies, industry standards will be used to review programs. In addition, through this review, the COEHS will develop plans to ensure that all programs are offering the most innovative and rigorous programs possible.

Evaluation Procedures
Review of pertinent accreditation reports; review of self-studies and/or reviews by appropriately credentialed external reviewers. Review of program and curriculum proposals for revisions, program redesign.

Actual Results of Evaluation
The unit received continuing accreditation from the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, with all standards met and no areas for improvement cited. Counselor Education programs were reviewed by the American Association for Family and Consumer Sciences, resulting in continuing accreditation. The Accreditation Council for Education in Dietetics and Nutrition reviewed the Coordinated Program in Dietetics, resulting in its being placed on probation, emphasizing its failure to meet the minimum pass rate. All other programs underwent annual review within the College to ensure that candidates were making satisfactory progress on key assessments within each program.

Use of Evaluation Results
Accreditation review comments were used to strengthen curriculum, modify programs, and guide policy development. The Coordinated Dietetics program has revised curriculum, increased candidate preparation and support for the registered dietitian lilcensure exam, and reorganized courses and internship structures in efforts to make program improvements that will positively impact student learner outcomes, particularly in the area of the licensure exam pass rate. All programs have made necessary curriculum modifications based upon program reviews.

Related Items

SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP3.Ind06: Diversity

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

COE 2015_06: Data Standards/Integrity Efforts

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal

The COEHS unit will expand its unit assessment system to include training for all faculty and staff on accessing data through Banner. Within the assessment system, procedures will be identified for not only how data is to be accessed, but also how it is to be used in advising and program planning.

Evaluation Procedures

COEHS unit assessment manual; training agendas

Actual Results of Evaluation

The Unit Assessment Manual was updated and regular training sessions were held by the Unit Assessment Director and Field Experiences Director with all program faculty to train them in how to use various data sources and electronic data management systems to archive and track data. Simultaneously, meetings were held with key stakeholders on campus to further discussion about how to best access data, especially in terms of how data can be tracked more seamlessly through Banner h and more closely dovetail with data aggregated through TaskStream.

Use of Evaluation Results

The University is exploring additional capabilities of Banner that will address key assessment issues and that will also expand its use for advising, recruiting, and retaining students. The COEHS will be engaged in these ongoing conversations in an effort to improve its unit assessment system.

FCS 2015_01: Create career simulations

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal

Enhance strategies in upper-level classes to simulate career-related situations.
(Life course development, Capacity building)
COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

Evaluation Procedures

An analysis is made of the upper-level FCS courses that utilize role playing techniques and mock interviews.
Exit interviews will further solicit information from graduates regarding their laboratory, internship, field study and supervised practice experiences. Instructors will document the numbers and types of experiences identified below. Course evaluations are also reviewed.

Actual Results of Evaluation

Explain if the evaluation is not complete.
Increase strategies in upper-level classes to simulate career-related situations.
Strategies have been increased to include and enhance the following:
• Students in FCS 447 Professional Development class located and reviewed job announcements.

• Students in FCS 488 Internship in Fashion Merchandising located and secured their own internship positions.
• Students in FCS 477, FCS 478, and FCS 479 supervised practice courses for Nutrition/Dietetics, secured their own rotation sites.
• Students in all areas worked through case study simulations.
• Role-plays and mock interviews were used effectively for Dietetics students in FCS 350 Basic Skills in Dietetic Practice and in FCS 480 Senior Seminar in Nutrition/Dietetics.
• Students in all other FCS majors practiced role-playing and mock interviews in FCS 447 Professional Development. All students reported on their written reflections and many indicated on class evaluations and in their exit interviews that these experiences were helpful in simulating reality-based situations.
• All majors are required to participate in internship/supervised practice situations, and concentrated blocks of time are scheduled in all areas to simulate real job situations.
• The internship manual, syllabi and requirements for child development majors were revised to reflect more real life simulations and more relevant internship experiences.

Use of Evaluation Results
How were the results used to improve programs, operation, or services? Indicate if this led to a new goal for the next year.

Faculty have continued to utilize role-plays and other simulation exercises, such as development of a business plan, planning and serving quantity food events, and participating in mock interviews, in clinical and management courses and in FCS 447 Professional Development, which is required of FCS majors with concentrations in Child Development and Fashion Merchandising. These exercises are used with Dietetics students in FCS 480 Senior Seminar in Dietetics. Students indicated in exit interviews that these real-life experiences have been very helpful in developing their skills and increasing their knowledge for the workplace. The required number of credits for FCS 488 Internship in Child Development was increased from three hours to six hours.

Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

FCS 2015_02: Technological capabilities
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Maintain Canvas component in all courses within FCS concentrations to increase students' computer literacy and to provide a practice forum for the Certification Exam for Registered Dietitians. Explore other distance learning or innovative delivery methods of instruction.
(Capacity building, Appropriate use of technology)

COE GP#1, GP#5

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

Actual Results of Evaluation

• Canvas components are incorporated into all classes.

• Canvas was utilized in all Nutrition/Dietetics classes using a hybrid approach (part online, part face-to-face) for the provision of PowerPoint programs, notes, study guides, quizzes and/or exams.

• The Division offers several online classes on a regular basis and several courses are taught hybrid.

• Recommendations for enhancements to online classes were made based on the review of these classes and completion of the Quality Matters score sheet. The College also implemented consistent requirements for all online courses.

• The College has consistent requirements for all online courses.

• Software to practice for the Registered Dietitian (RD) examination was installed on computers in the Nutrition Counseling Center in Ewing Hall. Students can work through all of the review questions, and they also have the opportunity and the requirement to take a simulated examination.

- Software was installed and updated on computers in the Nutrition Counseling Center in Ewing Hall. Students in Experimental Foods are required to analyze recipes before and after modification and analyze differences as part of their project.

Use of Evaluation Results

Canvas provides a communication venue for students and a user-friendly online format to access materials and quizzes. Canvas will continue to be utilized for PowerPoint programs, notes, study guides, quizzes and exams.

Dietetics students are now being required to take a computerized practice RD examination in each supervised practice course as well as in the FCS 480 Senior Seminar class.

Case studies are included in each supervised practice to enhance critical thinking skills.

Canvas will include more problem based learning to enhance critical thinking skills

To provide additional review for the RD Exam, a professional review course is now offered to Delta State students.

All technology additions to programs will:

-include computerized testing to decrease test anxiety with new testing format

-reinforce knowledge base for use in supervised practice/internships (theory to practice)

-include problem based learning to enhance critical thinking skills

Related Items

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

SP4.Ind06: Technology infrastructure

SP4.Ind07: Website

> **SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE**

> **SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings**

> > **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

> **SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education**

> > **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

FCS 2015_03: Visibility

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Formerly Goal #4
The Division of Family & Consumer Sciences will have increased visibility because of its curricula and its impact on individuals, families, consumers, and the community.
COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5
COE 2010 Plan #1: Quality: Capacity: Identify and build relationships with top five funders for the College, as well as funders and agencies for each division.
(Basic human needs, Family strengths, Community vitality, Life course development, Human ecosystem, Capacity building, and Wellness)

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

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

Child Development students and faculty participation:
- The Director of the Child Development Center applied for accreditation by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in 2009 and the site visit occurred during 2010. The Center was granted accreditation for five years from NAEYC. Publicity materials include information about this achievement.
- Parents of children in the Child Development Center are very active in participating with various events and increasing visibility. Publicity is frequently sent to local media regarding all of these activities.

- The faculty in the Division have sponsored and participated in numerous workshops/events in various areas to improve visibility. These are further outlined under Goals # 4 and #6.
- Service-Learning Courses within the Division included: FCS 330 Infant Development, FCS 377 Methods & Materials for Preschool Programs, FCS 378 Principles & Procedures for Preschool Programs, FCS 444 Child Nutrition, and FCS 476 Practicum in Child Development Administration. Numerous activities of DSU students in these classes increased the FCS exposure within the schools and community. Service Learning activities are further delineated under section V 3.
- Delta State provided quality trainings for child care providers, teachers, and other professionals in child care, promoting the importance of quality education for the very young.

Nutrition/Dietetics students and faculty participation:

- Nutrition/Dietetics students participated in several community health fairs.
- Nutrition/Dietetics students and faculty provided a speaker in the fall and spring semesters for the Christian Women's Job Corps.
- Nutrition/Dietetics interns and a faculty member provided diet consultations to the DSU athletes (see separate report)
- Students assisted at fundraiser events for the Cleveland library and the Mississippi Food Network.
- Delta State participated in the Mississippi Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Annual Conference in Flowood, MS April 2015. The Quantity Foods (FCS 360) class provided a healthy snack for one of the breaks at the conference. Two DSU students led the group in a physical activity break.
- Nine Nutrition/Dietetics students and one faculty member participated in the Food and Nutrition Conference & Expo of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics in Atlanta, Georgia October 18-21, 2014. DSU representatives participated in a student recruitment fair and a preceptor recruitment fair; attended professional continuing education events; viewed over 500 exhibits, and networked with other professionals at the conference.
- Webb, Virginia S. (2015, June). *Utilizing the Cafeteria as a Classroom*. Seminar presented at the meeting of the School Nutrition Association of Connecticut, Rocky Hill, CT.
- Webb, Virginia S. (2015, April). *Utilizing the Cafeteria as a Classroom*. Seminar presented at the meeting of the Arkansas School Nutrition Association, Little Rock, AR.
- Webb, Virginia S. (2015, January). *Culinary Techniques for Healthy School Meals*. Seminar presented at the Hinesville, Georgia School Nutrition Education Center, Hinesville, GA.
- Webb, Virginia S. (2014, December). *Flip your Holiday Meals*. Presentation at the Coahoma Higher Education Center, Clarksdale, MS.
- Howell, Ensley (2015, January). *You found it on the Internet!* Presentation at the Mississippi Association of Family and Consumer Sciences. Jackson, MS.

Fashion Merchandising students and faculty participation:

- Fashion Merchandising students were visible at the student design competition at the Mississippi Association of Family & Consumer Sciences state meeting in February 2015. Five students submitted design entries. A Delta State student won the first place and another DSU student won the third place award in the competition.
- Nine design entries were submitted by six talented fashion merchandising students at Dallas Fashion Career Day 2015 sponsored by Fashion Group International. Two of these designs were selected in the top 30 designs and shown on mannequins.

- One student design and two faculty designs were selected for show in the Mounted Gallery Design Competition at the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) annual conference 2015.
- One student design was selected for show in the Live Gallery Design Competition at the International Textile and Apparel Association (ITAA) annual conference 2015.

Use of Evaluation Results

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

Related Items

SP1.Ind04: Job placement

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

SP3.Ind01: Faculty and staff hiring

SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training

SP3.Ind06: Diversity

SP3.Ind07: Credentials

SP3.Ind08: Evaluations

SP4.Ind07: Website

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

FCS 2015_04 : Community partnerships

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Identify increased opportunities for participation in local health fairs, and other public and community forums (schools, churches, cooperative extension and Chamber of Commerce programs). Contact industry representatives as a means of communicating availability and willingness to participate as community partners.
(Family strengths, Community vitality, Life course development, Human ecosystem, Capacity building, Resource development and sustainability, Appropriate use of technology, and Wellness)
COE GP#1, GP#2, GP#3, GP#4

Evaluation Procedures
Evaluate faculty's lists of yearly accomplishments.

Actual Results of Evaluation
All four areas within the Division participated in the events, which particularly focused on early childhood education and health and wellness education.
Students in the Coordinated Undergraduate Program in Dietetics and faculty have been involved in a number of health screenings, health fairs, and community speaking engagements on the subject of nutrition and healthy/wellness. Dietetics participation, promoting health and wellness, included:
- Annual Member and Exhibitor, DSU Health and Wellness Day (since 2005).
- Students/faculty participated in several Health Fairs and Screenings throughout the Delta, at various health fairs, nutritional assessments were provided to faculty, staff, and students and DSU, as well as members of the MS Delta.
- Child Development teachers continued their annual production of a healthy vegetable and fruit garden at the DSU Child Development Center at the Bailey building.
- *Mission Coahoma in Control: Diabetes Self-Management Program* (Oct. 1, 2013-Sept. 30, 2014) was a $10,000 place-based grant funded by the Community Foundation of Northwest Mississippi (CFNWM). It was a hands-on program, with monthly sessions for its Coahoma County participants with diabetes. The objectives were for participants to make healthier food choices, increase physical activity, develop skills in relaxation and stress management, and then adopt all these changes into their lifestyles, in order to reduce their progression of the disease and its complications. A Nutrition/Dietetics faculty member and students assisted the Healthy Campus/Community Initiative in Clarksdale, Mississippi (December 10, 2014; December 12, 2014; provided handout materials for two events).

- Nutrition/Dietetics students assisted the Delta Music Institute in providing the Foods Lab for Russian visitors.

- Nutrition/Dietetics students assisted the Art Department in preparation of foods for Art Receptions (five times).
- A faculty member offered community education, ServSafe® Food Safety training and certification exam.
Child Development participation, in an effort to enhance early childhood education:
- The Director of the Child Development Center provided consultation to Delta area child care programs regarding the requirements of the MS Child Care Quality Step System (QRIS).
- Service learning courses within the Division include: FCS 330 Infant Development, FCS 377 Methods & Materials for Preschool Programs, FCS 378 Principles & Procedures for Preschool Programs, FCS 444 Child Nutrition & FCS 476 Practicum in Child Development Administration.

- *Quality Training for Early Childhood Educators in the Delta* (Oct. 1-2013-Sept. 30, 2014) was a $20,000 grant from the CFNWM that provided for DSU to provide early childhood teachers with knowledge of best practices in early childhood education through professional development opportunities and through demonstrating optimal classroom practices using a model classroom for young children.

Fashion Merchandising students assisted with events with the Bolivar County Extension Service.

A faculty member served on the Board of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Use of Evaluation Results
All four areas within the Division participated in events, which particularly focused on early childhood education and health and wellness education. The general public will become more aware of health-related programs at DSU, and more programs will be generated. Further collaborative efforts are planned in all areas. These provide a blueprint for the future.

Related Items

SP1.Ind04: Job placement

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

SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

SP3.Ind01: Faculty and staff hiring

SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training

SP3.Ind06: Diversity

SP3.Ind07: Credentials

SP3.Ind08: Evaluations

SP4.Ind03: External resources

SP4.Ind07: Website

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

SP5.Ind04: Cultural offerings

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

SP5.Ind07: Economic Development

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

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

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

⏺FCS 2015_05: Use of foods lab

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Formerly Goal #8
Utilize Ada Swindle Mitchell Foods Laboratory for catering and cooking lessons, both of which would be available for donors and their friends of Delta State University as well as the general public.
(Basic human needs, Individual well-being, Family strengths, Community vitality, Life course development, Human ecosystem, Capacity building, Global interdependence, Resource development and sustainability, Appropriate use of technology, and Wellness)
COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

Evaluation Procedures
Evaluate faculty's lists of yearly accomplishments.

Actual Results of Evaluation
A number of events were offered in the Ada Swindle Mitchell Foods Laboratory, in addition to the regular class use. Some of these events included:

- The Christmas party for the Division of Family and Consumer Sciences was catered by the FCS 312 Meals classes.

- The February meeting of the Student Association of Family and Consumer Sciences was catered by the FCS 360 Quantity Food Procurement and Production class, featuring healthy and economical meals.
- The College of Education and Human Sciences Recognition of Achievement Program was catered by the FCS 360 class.
- "Junior Chefs" was taught as a weeklong class for Kids' College.
- Several Art Receptions were catered by the FCS 360 and FCS 460 classes.
- The FCS 360 class operated "Okra Café" as a one-day class project.
- The FCS 312 class provided a Thanksgiving Lunch for children and staff from the Child Development Center.
- The Foods Lab was used for several Continuing Education events, including children's holiday classes, Pinterest classes, and ServSafe classes.

- Community education was offered in the foods lab, including ServSafe® Food Safety training and certification exam (October 2014).

Use of Evaluation Results
Plan further collaborative efforts for the future. Continue the "Foodie Fridays."
Related Items
SP1.Ind05: Diversity -- access to diverse ideas/programs

SP3.Ind01: Faculty and staff hiring

SP3.Ind02: Salary

SP3.Ind04: Technology training

SP3.Ind05: Retention of personnel

SP3.Ind06: Diversity

SP3.Ind07: Credentials

SP3.Ind08: Evaluations

SP3.Ind09: Professional development

SP4.Ind03: External resources

SP4.Ind07: Website

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind04: Cultural offerings

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind07: Economic Development

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

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

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

FCS 2015_06: Wellness

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Formerly Goal #9
Develop annual wellness program, collaborating with representatives from industry, campus, and nonprofit organizations, and invite the public to attend.
(Basic human needs, Individual well-being, Family strengths, Community vitality, Life course development, Human ecosystem, Capacity building, Global interdependence, Resource development and sustainability, Appropriate use of technology, and Wellness)
COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

Evaluation Procedures

Determine accomplishments of the campus wellness program, including the accomplishments of the Nutrition Counseling Center, and other health and wellness activities that students and faculty have participated in.

Actual Results of Evaluation

The DSU Health and Wellness Committee was initially charged to develop a university-wide program to increase awareness about health and physical fitness.

Nutrition/Dietetics Faculty, along with Dietetics students, participated in Health Fairs and Screenings throughout the Delta.

The Nutrition Counseling Center has received increased usage, particularly by DSU athletes.

Many of these accomplishments are further delineated in Goals #3 and #4.

Use of Evaluation Results

Wellness and nutrition events on the DSU campus will be continued, collaborating with representatives from industry, campus, and nonprofit organizations and the public will be encouraged to participate.

Related Items

SP1.Ind07: Resources: access to appropriate library and learning resources

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

SP3.Ind05: Retention of personnel

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

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

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

FCS 2015_07: Recruitment
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Formerly Goal #3
Continue to enhance and update recruiting materials and the website, meet with DSU Admissions/Recruiting staff about Family & Consumer Sciences programs and maintain presence at recruitment fairs.

Evaluation Procedures
Compare enrollment data for the current academic year to enrollment data from the prior year. Evaluate website on a regular basis.

Actual Results of Evaluation
There were 134 Family & Consumer Sciences majors in fall 2014, compared to 116 Family & Consumer Sciences majors in fall 2013, which represents a 15.5% increase. These numbers show an increase. This is a positive sign.

Program coordinators and the secretary are becoming webmasters for their areas. They are learning to continually update information on the website.

Use of Evaluation Results
• The latest brochure revision includes a direct link to the web pages for each concentration.
• An intensified recruiting program is being implemented.
• The Division website continues to be enhanced and updated. This site provides information on programs to prospective students.
• Faculty in the Division participate in campus recruiting events, and as many off campus events as possible.
• Recruiting information has been provided to recruitment personnel to take to high schools and community colleges.
• Students have been asked to help with recruitment at various events.
• Faculty will increase their involvement with recruitment even more this next year.
• The Division secretary and the DSU Office of Communications and Marketing are working on

developing a presence for all concentrations on the Social Networking sites. Efforts continue to have Communications and Marketing enhance the Division's presence on their social networking sites.
• The Dietetics students participated in health fairs and wellness events, incorporating promotional efforts into their presence.
• DSU had a recruiting booth at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics in and the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Food and Nutrition Conference and Expo.
• Eleven students have been accepted into the Coordinated Program in Dietetics for the 2014/15 year.
Recruiting efforts need to continue to be refined and enhanced. The strategies noted above will be continued. These results will be used in setting goals and improving recruitment efforts.

Related Items
SP1.Ind04: Job placement

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

SP1.Ind06: Advising -- access to improved, comprehensive, and directed/targeted advising

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

SP4.Ind03: External resources

SP4.Ind07: Website

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

> **SP5.Ind04: Cultural offerings**

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

> **SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives**

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

> **SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach**

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

> **SP5.Ind07: Economic Development**

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

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

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

FCS 2015_08: Faculty
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
The Division of Family & Consumer Sciences will maintain a strong faculty. The faculty will have excellent communication skills and technological capabilities, facilitating productivity. Each faculty member will also have the necessary depth of professional knowledge in a specific area of specialization, and will exhibit above satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
COE GP#1, GP#4, GP#5

COE Goal: Promote effective teaching in the College of Education through the identification of indices of quality

Evaluation Procedures

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

Actual Results of Evaluation

The faculty attended a number of professional meetings at the district, state and national levels. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members made refereed presentations at national meetings. They also attended some faculty development workshops or trainings on various topics. Each semester students complete an evaluation of all classes in Family & Consumer Sciences. These assessments are used in faculty evaluations to establish goals when needed. Most student evaluations were very good. Several faculty members submitted grant proposals. The grants that were funded were primarily DSU internal grants. There is one external grant for 2015 from Cotton Incorporated obtained by the Chair and Fashion Merchandising faculty member. The faculty provided service to the university and to the public through presentations to a variety of groups on various topics. One faculty member successfully submitted her two-year pre-tenure portfolio. One faculty member is a licensed Marriage and Family Therapist. He provided consultations to the public. The Registered Dietitians also provided consultations to various individuals, groups and agencies on food and nutrition topics. The Child Development faculty member served on many community committees. The faculty member in the Food Science area made several presentations at university and community events. The Chair and Fashion Merchandising faculty member served on the Board of the Mississippi Association of Family & Consumer Sciences (MAFCS) for 2014 and as Secretary of the Collegiate Assembly of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences for a second term.

Use of Evaluation Results

Each faculty member benefits from the knowledge gained and skills acquired at each meeting or workshop attended. In turn, the Division and the University benefit from the faculty member's knowledge and skills as demonstrated in the classroom and in various service activities around the state.

Related Items

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

SP3.Ind01: Faculty and staff hiring

SP3.Ind02: Salary

SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training

SP3.Ind04: Technology training

SP3.Ind05: Retention of personnel

SP3.Ind06: Diversity

SP3.Ind07: Credentials

SP3.Ind08: Evaluations

SP3.Ind09: Professional development

SP4.Ind03: External resources

SP4.Ind07: Website

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

SP5.Ind01: Distance Education Offerings

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind04: Cultural offerings

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind05: Diversity initiatives

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind07: Economic Development

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

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

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

FCS 2015_09: Data standards/integrity efforts or plans
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Continue to meet accreditation guidelines for all applicable accrediting bodies for the Division and maintain relevant and imperative assessment data.

Evaluation Procedures
External assessments of programs by evaluators.

Actual Results of Evaluation
This was a ten-year re-accreditation year for both the Nutrition/Dietetics program by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND) and by the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). This involved much overtime work by the Director of the Dietetics Program and the Division Chair. Faculty also provided input. The Dietetics Program submitted their self-study for re-accreditation in August 2014, with a site visit in November 2014. There were several commendations from ACEND on the Dietetics Program, but it currently remains on probation due to its first-time pass-rate on the Registration Examination for Dietitians (RD Exam). In February of 2015 a Site Visit Response report was submitted to ACEND. In April of 2015 a report on the pass-rate was submitted to ACEND. The site visit as well as the site visit response report and pass rate report will be reviewed at the June 2015 ACEND Board meeting.

The AAFCS site team provided high praise for the comprehensive self-study, the Division Chair and the faculty. There were ten commendations and five recommendations, which were quite general. This was the best review and report ever received from AAFCS.

For the MS Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) of the Child Development Center, the report identified the Center as falling one one-hundredth short of being rated a five-star Center. There are very few centers in the state who have all of the ages from six months to five years who receive a four-star, and far fewer who receive a five-star rating.

Use of Evaluation Results
During the accreditation years, feedback from advisory groups, the self-studies and the site visit reports has provided valuable information. Results of periodical and annual reports provided valuable information for improvement of the curricula and facilities. Feedback provided by accrediting bodies will help guide decisions for program changes and improvements. During the accreditation years, the self-studies and the site visit reports provide information for program review.
With the change in leadership of the Division, some of the feedback from AAFCS and commendations are no longer valid, and will need to be addressed with the AAFCS Council.

The NAEYC site visit will occur in fall 2015 and results from the NAEYC report will provide recommendations for the Child Development Center. As a response to the last NAEYC site visit, improvements to the playgrounds have been made, with special focus on the Bailey facility for the three and four-year-olds. For the Child Development Center, results of the accreditation visit from the Mississippi Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) reviewer provide information for improvement of the curricula and facilities.

Related Items
SP1.Ind01: Pass rates: developmental and intermediate courses

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

SP2.Ind04: Degrees

SP3.Ind05: Retention of personnel

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP5.Ind02: Continuing Education

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind03: Campus facilities and space for use by external constituents

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

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

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

FE 2015_01: Field Experiences Database
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
To use the field experiences database, with a revised candidate checklist, to monitor diversity within experiences and to ensure continued collaboration with P-12 school partners and clinical faculty by meeting with program coordinators, supervisors, methods course faculty, and clinical faculty at least once each semester.

Evaluation Procedures
Use checklist to evaluate the types of diverse experiences candidates are having with field experiences for NCATE/CAEP reporting purposes. NCATE/CAEP requires that candidates have experiences with at least two different ethnic groups, students with different socioeconomic backgrounds, English language learners, and students with exceptionalities. In addition, examine minutes and agendas from meetings with educational partners.

Actual Results of Evaluation
Databases and diversity checklists were analyzed and undergraduate field experiences contain enough diverse settings to meet NCATE/CAEP requirements. However, the graduate checklist review again revealed that some candidates are not getting enough experiences with diverse candidates as many of them complete field experiences in their own classrooms or schools. Some graduate candidates need more experiences with different ethnic groups as they are in settings which

are primarily Caucasian or primarily African American. The review also showed that most candidates still need more experiences with English Language Learners.

- ![] Field Experiences - Undergrad - Fall 2014

- ![] Field Experiences - Undergrad - Spring 2015
- ![] Field Experiences Diversity Checklist - 14-15

Use of Evaluation Results
Undergraduates will continue to be placed in diverse settings for field experiences and internship. Graduate program coordinators have access to this data and will continue to plan more diverse experiences for those candidates who need it. In addition, the collaborative partners list continues to be expanded to include further quality schools. The Director of Field Experiences will continue to explore possible sites for both graduate and undergraduate candidates in which students are receiving English Language Learner (ELL) accommodations. Faculty have been asked to share information with the Director of Field Experiences regarding possible new sites for placements and/or experiences with ELL students to further expand the placement site list.

Related Items
SP1.Ind04: Job placement

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

SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

FE 2015_02: Monitoring of elementary and secondary education programs
Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
To continue to monitor field experiences, subject content preparation, differentiation of instruction, classroom management, recruitment and retention, strong partnerships, and accountability for elementary education and secondary education programs.

Evaluation Procedures

Examine methods course syllabi, agendas and minutes from faculty meetings, Teacher Education Council, and candidate evaluations. Conduct focus groups of candidates and educational partners. Examine agendas and minutes from partner meetings. Attend meetings of advisory councils of community leaders, superintendents, principals, and other stakeholders and examine minutes and agendas from these meetings. Review field experience request forms and candidate, faculty, and clinical faculty formal and informal evaluations.

Task Stream reports helps in monitoring this goal. Reports on internships and methods courses are run by the Director of Field Experiences and made available to program coordinators. Program coordinators and respective faculty analyze the reports and make "data-driven" decisions to make programmatic changes if needed.

Actual Results of Evaluation

An examination of methods course syllabi for all programs confirmed partnerships with varied school districts as well as appropriate content for the subject areas. Faculty use a variety of teaching strategies including simulations and activities, group projects, cooperative learning, problem-based learning, video critiques, and discussion. Faculty also report using team-based learning, small-group collaboration, Canvas discussion boards, Canvas virtual classroom, presentation and discussion of research, virtual class meetings with PowerPoint, video or audio clips, Promethean board flipcharts, student presentations, student research, and student-directed lessons to adequately prepare candidates for the classroom.

Evaluations and examination of data reveal that areas that continues to need improvement are differentiation of instruction, classroom management and candidate use of community resources in their teaching.

A sample of Task Stream internship reports appear below. All assessment data in TaskStream can be accessed in complete reports at https://www.taskstream.com/ts/manager201/DeltaStateUniversity The first password is dsureports and the second password is DSUreports (case sensitive).

- Teaching internship - Elementary Campus - Fall 2014

- Teaching internship - Elementary Hinds - Spring 2015
- Teaching internship - PE - Fall 2014
- Teaching internship - Science - Spring 2015
- Teaching internship - Social Studies - Fall 2014

Use of Evaluation Results

The Director of Field Experiences will continue to make field experience and internship placements in quality settings most likely to prepare candidates to become master teachers. Regarding the weaknesses, faculty continue to plan workshops and additional training in planning for diversity, differentiation, family/community involvement, and integration of all subject area content knowledge. In addition, seminars and field trips on diverse settings are being planned and implemented for candidates struggling in these areas.

Data have been shared with faculty and they are aware of the need to continue working with candidates on these areas and in particular, classroom management strategies and differentiation strategies. Interns will continue to attend seminars specifically designed to help struggling candidates in these areas.

Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

SP5.Ind06: Community Outreach

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

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

> **SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents**

FE 2015_03: Leadership skills and collaboration

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
To continue to increase leadership skills by working to improve collaboration and cohesiveness between elementary and secondary education programs by providing general information meetings each semester as well as providing TWS trainings throughout the year. Workshops for Praxis I/CORE, the PLT, and the elementary content area will be provided each semester. Resources and assistance will be offered to secondary faculty to conduct workshops in respective content areas for Praxis.

Evaluation Procedures
Examine candidate exit surveys and run reports in Task Stream as well as having Institutional Research access Praxis pass rates through Banner reports. Examine course evaluations, training evaluations, and solicit formal and informal feedback from faculty and graduates through focus groups, advisory groups, and phone surveys.

Actual Results of Evaluation
According to candidate exit surveys, candidates are better prepared through their respective programs for field experiences and for internship. Program coordinators for each teacher education

program received the Praxis pass rates from Institutional Research and access to the exit surveys for each program through Task Stream.

First-time pass rates on Praxis content exams are improving. However, the state of MS no longer recognizes Praxis I Reading, Praxis I Mathematics, or Praxis I Writing as admission requirements to teacher education programs. Instead, candidates must take the Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE) exams in reading, writing, and math for admission to teacher education. The CORE is based upon Common Core standards and is reported to be much more difficult than Praxis I. Analysis of candidate results show that first-time pass rates are low for many candidates. The data show that candidates are having great difficulties with the mathematics portion of the CORE exam and more success with the reading and writing portions. More candidates are choosing to take the ACT and try to score a 21 or above for admission to teacher education rather then taking the CORE test. The ACT is a viable option for candidate admission to teacher education provided that the candidate has a composite score of 21 or above on the ACT with no subscore less than 18.

All programs continue to work together for the common goal of attracting and retaining quality candidates for the teaching profession.

A sample of student exit surveys are found below. All exit surveys in TaskStream can be accessed in complete reports at https://www.taskstream.com/ts/manager201/DeltaStateUniversity The first password is dsureports and the second password is DSUreports(case sensitive).

- Exit survey - Elementary Campus - Fall 2014

- Exit survey - Elementary Hinds - Spring 2015
- Exit survey - English - Spring 2015
- Exit survey - PE - Fall 2014
- Exit survey - Science - Spring 2015

Use of Evaluation Results
CORE workshops are being provided for candidates each semester. The elementary education program coordinator, along with the elementary faculty, has created a Canvas shell entirely devoted to the CORE test. The shell can be accessed by DSU students and provides a multitude of resources to assist with taking the CORE test. Mathematics faculty have been alerted as to the continued need for rigorous help for candidates in preparing for the CORE exam. Program faculty continue to offer Praxis II workshops in respective areas coordinated by the Director of Field Experiences. Trends in first-time pass rates on the CORE are being established as more candidates take the tests. General meetings with candidates and program faculty will continue each semester.

Related Items
SP1.Ind08: Curriculum Development and Revision

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

SP4.Ind09: Institutional review process / Accreditations/IE

SP4.Ind10: Data Integrity

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

SP5: Improve the quality of life for all constituents

HPER 2015_01: Recruitment

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal

Increase recruitment efforts and increase HPER majors over the 2014-2015 year.

Evaluation Procedures

1. Faculty representation at events
2. Numbers of majors
3. Numbers of on-campus visits

TELR 2015_01: Increased enrollment of graduate students and retention of undergraduate students.

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal

Increase the number of graduates in the graduate Teacher Education Programs, by an average of 1% over five years, with the baseline year as AY 2008-2009, and maintain enrollment in undergraduate programs.

Evaluation Procedures

Continue to hold recruitment events in strategically identified areas. Track the number of events, as well as the number of prospective applicants who attend. Continue to develop strategic retention activities at the program level. Continue to track graduation numbers.

Related Items

SP2.Ind01: Enrollment

SP2.Ind02: Retention

SP2.Ind03: Graduation Rate

TELR 2015_02: Increase Faculty Publications

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

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.
Related Items
SP3.Ind07: Credentials

SP3.Ind09: Professional development

TELR 2015_03: Use results of Quality Matters evaluations to improve online courses

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Use the results of Quality Matters evaluations to improve online courses.

Evaluation Procedures
The Chair will work with Program Coordinators and the Director of Instructional Support to plan, prioritize work, and implement procedures for addressing online course weaknesses.
Related Items
SP1.Ind07: Resources: access to appropriate library and learning resources

SP3.Ind03: Distance Education training

SP3.Ind04: Technology training

TELR 2015_04: Increase scores on new state-required CASE examination for undergraduate students

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015

Unit Goal
Train faculty in procedures for increasing CASE scores and GPA with students in undergraduate programs.

Evaluation Procedures

Evaluate test results to see if scores have been increased.

Related Items

SP1.Ind02: National / Standardized Test Scores

Executive Summaries

⚙ES--College of Education and Human Sciences
Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress

Candidates in the COEHs preparing for roles as teachers and other school professionals participate in field experiences in diverse settings that allow them to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to ensure that all children learn. The Director of Field Experiences tracks the placements for each ITP UG candidate to ensure that placements include children of varying SES, at least 2 ethnic/racial groups, children with exceptionalities, and ELLs. (Attached are the Field Placement Charts for fall 2014/spring 2015). Additional diverse field experiences were added during the review period through the utilization of virtual mediums that provided access to settings not available locally (particularly ELL). These have been very beneficial in advanced programs, although tracking of advanced field experience sites revealed that the settings utilized meet expectations for candidates to have experience working with diverse populations. All syllabi have been updated to include appropriate diverse experiences.

Faculty/Staff

All searches during the past year sought diverse candidates through advertising and through making direct contact with HBCUs and other universities with diverse populations. In several instances, an ethnically diverse candidate was a finalist/preferred candidate for a position in the COEHS, but accepted employment elsewhere due to competitive salary, location, and/or other circumstances. However, an effort was made to hire candidates who had experiences working with diverse populations. As a result several Caucasian faculty hired during this period had broad experience in working in diverse locales and with varied populations. Adjunct faculty include international fauclty and African-American faculty.

Economic Development Initiatives and/or Impact

N/A

Grants, Contracts, Partnerships

For 2014-2015, the COEHS received the following grant funding:

- Healthy Campus/Community Initiative Clarksdale ($501,750)
- Math and Science Partnership Grant (third year funding, $924,096)
- Bill Gates Teacher Grant (second year funding, $30,000)
- Delta Health Alliance (recovery funds, $23,624)
- Delta School Leadership Pipeline Grant (year two, $186,126)
- USDA Health Services Grant (year two, $200,463)
- Literacy Across the Curriculum Initiative (LACI) ($89,814)
- Teach Mississippi Funding ($2,047)
- Tri-State Foundation, Dean's Discretionary Fund ($15,000)

    Total Funding

Committees reporting to unit

Department or Division Curriculum Committees (College of Education and Human Sciences and College of Arts and Sciences:Proposed changes are submitted to the departmant/division chair. If the change relates to curriculum, admissions requirements, or other University programs, it then proceeds to the Administrative or Chairs' Councils for approval. Changes related to the doctoral program are submitted to the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council (DACC).

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

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

Graduate Education Programs Council (GEPC): The GEPC serves as the governing authority for the graduate education programs at Delta State University. The general purpose of the GEPC is to provide leadership in the process of educating and graduating professinoals in the fields of education, counselor education, and educational leadership.

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

Department: College of Education and Human Sciences
Overview (brief description of scope)
The College of Education and Human Sciences at Delta State University (COEHS) is composed of four divisions: Counselor Education and Psychology; Family and Consumer Sciences; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research. The College is served by 32 faculty members and 19 staff members. Additionially, the *Office of Field Experiences* and the *Delta Area Association for the Improvement of Schools (DAAIS)* function as support offices for the divisions. The College of Education Administrative Council (CEAC) is comprised of the four chairs of the COEHS divisions, the Director of Field Experiences, the Director of the Delta Area Association for the Improvement of School (DAAIS), and the Dean. DAAIS is a 30-member consortium of Delta school districts that is housed in and supports the functions of the COEHS.

Accreditation

The College of Education and Human Sciences utilizes a continuous improvment model to ensure that all programs reflect current best practice in the associated disciplines and are responsive to data from formative and summative assessments of candidates enrolled in professional programs. The Unit Assessment Director provides oversight for the unit assessment system, including data collection and analysis, as well as program review, and ensures that programs adequately meet national program accreditation standards. Within the assessment framework, where appropriate, the standards of professional accrediting agencies provide benchmark data that document program integrity and improvement. During the period under review, NCATE conducted an institutional review which resulted in continued accreditation for programs in teacher educationn and other professional preparation programs. AAFCS also reviewed programs within Family and Consumer Sciences and continued accreditation, although the Coordinated Dietetics Program is currently on probation due to an insufficient pass rate. During the evaluation period, program faculty made several program improvements to address the pass rate, including the provision of a study course, realignment of curriculum, improved internships, and case studies. The Athletic Training program was withdrawn during this period due to low enrollment and will be phased out by Fall 2016.
Comparative data

Results were mixed for enrollment for the period under review; for example, UG enrollment for fall and spring were up from AY 2014 (2.63% for Fall 14; 2.34% for Spring 15), though down slightly for Summer 15 (-1.46%). Graduate enrollment is a challenge to analyze this current year due to a shift in reporting semesters for Teach for America(TFA) enrollees. Overall, graduate enrollment is down, likely due to cohorts of grant-funded candidates graduating in advanced programs (Tishomingo County Cohorts).

Individual program variances are discussed in detailed in division reports. In terms of 3- and 5-year trends, patterns are similar. However UG enrollment at the three-year increment (13-15) reflects a 9.86% increase in UG enrollment in Fall 2014, with an 11.35% increase in Spring 2015. Graduate patterns held, with decreases due to earlier spikes in cohort and online programs, followed by declines in market/funding--a general leveling off.

Total credit hour production increased 23.15% over the five-year period (11-15), 7.24% for the three-year increment (13-15), with a decline of 8.11% from AY14-AY15. This represents the fluctuation represented by increasing, then declining cohorts and varying sizes of TFA cohorts.

As a result of the evaluation, the COEHS is working with Graduate and Continuing Studies to recruit at the community college system in the state for advanced level programs. Innovative program planning is under review to expand Alternate Route track offerings as well. Online course offerings are being enhanced and expanded. Faculty are working with Enrollment Services to have a strong presence at campus fairs and recruiting visits.

In terms of retention, the CEAC standardized academic advisement expectations and communications with the Student Success Center in an effort to improve retention.