

**DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY: ACADEMIC ANNUAL REPORT**  
**Academic Year 2005-06**

**Unit Title:** Center for Rural School Leadership and Research

**School or College:** College of Education

**Unit Administrator:** Lynn W. Varner, Ph.D.

## II. A. Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

### Master of Education in Educational Leadership (Educational Administration and Supervision)

<p><b>Learning Outcome</b>  <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection and Analysis</b>  <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p>	<p><b>Results of Evaluation</b>  <i>What were the findings of the Analysis Team? List any specific recommendations.</i></p>	<p><b>Use of Evaluation Results</b>  <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p>
<p><b>Note: The College of Education has been accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education since 1954. As a part of the ongoing accompanying self-study, this newly formed division has continuously engaged in program evaluation and improvement even as this division was previously a part of another division. We have recently developed several new instruments in order to formalize data collection and analysis. Also note that all coursework for the master's</b></p>			

<p>degree is numbered at the 600 level, indicating the required level of rigor above that of undergraduate courses.</p> <p><b>Develop and articulate a school vision of learning</b></p>	<p>School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Comprehensive Examination<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>Continued 100% Pass Rate for our students (summer '05). 25% scored at or above the 75<sup>th</sup> National Percentile. Women slightly out- performed men. Our students scored slightly higher than the state average in Analysis of Information and Decision Making and slightly lower in the other three areas. Have maintained a 100% pass rate on the SLLA for at least eight years.</p> <p>All 15 students passed in summer. Comprehensive examinations have always been given for this program and have been similar to the SLLA for at least eight years. All students have successfully passed the examination (is a requirement for graduation) with</p>	<p>Emphasized the Evaluations of Actions and Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving in practice sessions and comprehensive examination. Will evaluate again in fall '06 when summer '05 scores are received. Individual student scores as well as overall group trends are evaluated each year and curricular changes are made based upon strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Will evaluate again in summer '06 as we consistently do every year</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ)<sup>4</sup></p>	<p>approximately 5-10% requiring two attempts to be successful.</p> <p>This survey represents an attempt to gather more consistent quantitative data: we have always collected feedback from stakeholders in informal interviews, advisory meetings, and personal contact. We realized the need for a more systematic and formal process for receiving feedback from stakeholders. Received surveys from 49 current students, graduates, employers, and other stakeholders. 80% of respondents marked Above Expected at This Level on question number 8 (internship); 79% marked this response on question number 5 (ethics); and 76% marked this response on question number 1 (vision). 29% marked Average for Experience on question number 4 (community) and on question number 6 (larger context).</p>	<p>Have established a new advisory board, the School Leadership Council, to facilitate the formal feedback process from a sample of all stakeholders including students, faculty, P-12 teachers and administrators, and community leaders. This group meets each semester and corresponds more frequently via email. Will discuss at fall faculty meetings and continue collecting data</p>
--	--	---	---



<p><b>Collaborate with families and other P-12 community members</b></p>	<p>Growth Portfolio<sup>6</sup></p> <p>Comprehensive Examination<sup>3</sup> School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>100% of students scored passing grades in summer '05</p> <p>All 15 students passed in summer '05</p> <p>Continued 100% Pass Rate for our students (summer '05)</p>	<p>Have developed a detailed scoring rubric. Will evaluate again in summer '06</p> <p>Will evaluate again in summer '06</p> <p>Will evaluate again in summer '06</p>
<p><b>Act with integrity and ethically within a school context in a professional manner</b></p>	<p>Dispositions Rating Scale Self-evaluation<sup>7</sup></p> <p>Dispositions Rating Scale Faculty Evaluation<sup>7</sup></p>	<p>Given in early spring 2006 and again in late spring 2006. Students scored themselves lowest on items 4.1, 13.1, and 15.2. They scored themselves highest on 7.1, 7.2, 8.2, 14.3, 16.3, and 16.4.</p> <p>The faculty scored the students slightly higher than they scored themselves overall.</p>	<p>This group of students rated themselves lowest on creativity and dependability and highest on grooming and appearance and ethics. Multiple individual conferences were held with faculty and students about individual needs.</p> <p>The largest difference was in creativity. Faculty will facilitate students' appreciation for their own creativity and take a broader definition of creativity. Each student will be evaluated again before the end of the program to ensure that all items are at a satisfactory</p>

			level prior to graduation.
<b>Understand the larger educational context including cultural differences and legal ramifications for school leaders</b>	Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey <sup>8</sup>  Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ) <sup>4</sup>	Given to all MEd students in spring 2006. 83% or greater scored a 4 or 5 on every item except item number 5 (I enjoy taking courses that challenge my beliefs and values). 67% scored a 4 or 5 on that item.  Received information from program graduates that in the past students had not been given enough feedback on assignments.	Will address in fall faculty meetings and continue to address diversity issues in courses.  Developed new rubrics and scoring guides and gave a great deal of instructor feedback to students on assignments.

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>The SLLA is a national examination which our Masters level students take near the completion of the program. It is published by Education Testing Service and is based upon the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)<sup>2</sup> Standards for School Leaders and a passing score of at least 154 is required by the state of Mississippi in order to be eligible for a School Administrators License.

<sup>2</sup>The ISSLC standards are parallel to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards and are attached (see Attachment A).

<sup>3</sup>The Comprehensive Examination is taken during the last semester of the program and is modeled after the SLLA (see Attachment B). It is a written individual assessment designed to demonstrate the student's knowledge and understanding as well as analyze, apply, and synthesize information from the entire program of study.

<sup>4</sup>The ELPPQ is a questionnaire based upon the ISSLC standards which is given to a sample of current students, graduates, employers, and other community stakeholders anonymously (see Attachment C).

<sup>5</sup>The Internship Mentor (Site Supervisor) Evaluations are completed by the mentor 6 weeks into each internship (Internship Mid-Term Feedback form) and at the end of each 12 week internship (Internship Performance Assessment form). Please see Attachment D.

<sup>6</sup>The Growth Portfolio is a cumulative product consisting of student work samples and projects that assess the student’s ability related to the ISLLC standards including self analysis of strengths/weaknesses, and plans for continued growth. Although the student collects work through out the program, the final portfolio is presented near the end of the program.

<sup>7</sup>The Dispositions Rating Scale (see Attachment E) is given to all students as a self-evaluation during the required, core class, ELR 605 (Educational Research and Statistics) and is intended to ensure that all students understand our expectations for them ethically and professionally. Faculty feedback is given throughout the entire program in the form of placement of flags for deficient or exemplary behavior in the student’s file, student/faculty conferences, improvement plans when necessary, and faculty review for all students upon application for comprehensive examinations (see Attachment F for the protocol which is followed).

<sup>8</sup>The Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey is give to all students during the required, core class, EPY 601 (Psychology of Learning) (see Attachment G).

**B. Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan**

**Educational Specialist Degree in Educational Administration and Supervision (Educational Leadership)**

<p><b>Learning Outcome</b> <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection and Analysis</b> <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p>	<p><b>Results of Evaluation</b> <i>What were the findings of the Analysis Team? List any specific recommendations.</i></p>	<p><b>Use of Evaluation Results</b> <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p>
<p><b>Note: The College of Education has been accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education since 1954. As a part of the ongoing</b></p>			

<p>accompanying self-study, this newly formed division has continuously engaged in program evaluation and improvement even as this division was previously a part of another division. We have recently developed several new instruments in order to formalize data collection and analysis. Also note that all coursework for the specialist degree is numbered at the 700 level, indicating the required degree of rigor above that of master's level courses.</p> <p><b>Develop and articulate a school vision of learning</b></p>	<p>Comprehensive Examination<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Comprehensive examinations have always been given for this program and have been similar to the SLLA for at least four years. Coursework and comprehensive examinations have a higher degree of difficulty in the specialist program than in the masters. For example, the comprehensive exam at the master's level is allotted 2 hours and at the specialist level it is allotted 3 hours. All</p>	<p>Continue examination based upon SLLA</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ)<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>students have successfully passed the examination (is a requirement for graduation) with approximately 15% requiring two attempts to be successful. 13 took exam and all passed; 2 of those had follow-up interviews in order to verify adequate knowledge base.</p> <p>This survey represents an attempt to gather more consistent quantitative data: we have always collected feedback from stakeholders in informal interviews, advisory meetings, and personal contact. We realized the need for a more systematic and formal process for receiving feedback from stakeholders. Received surveys from 49 current students, graduates, employers, and other stakeholders. 80% of respondents marked Above Expected at This Level on question number 8 (internship); 79% marked this response on question number 5 (ethics); and 76% marked this response on</p>	<p>Have established a new advisory board, the School Leadership Council, to facilitate the formal feedback process from a sample of all stakeholders including students, faculty, P-12 teachers and administrators, and community leaders. This group meets each semester and corresponds more frequently via email. Will discuss at fall faculty meetings and continue collecting data</p>
--	--	---	---

		question number 1 (vision). 29% marked Average for Experience on question number 4 (community) and on question number 6 (larger context).	
<b>Manage a school's operation and resources</b>	Practicum Projects <sup>4</sup>	Results for fall 2005 and spring 2006 consisted of 58% receiving a rating of "exceeds expectations" and 28% "meets expectations" and 12% Incomplete. These grades were taken from the four action research projects completed for each course.	We have required more variety in the project sites and given more direct instructions about the type of acceptable projects. We will pursue avenues to decrease the percent of students who are unable to complete the course in one semester (mainly through advisement and initial instructor course explanations). Because an Incomplete is computed into the overall GPA as an F, students are motivated to finish the course quickly or they are placed on academic probation.
	Comprehensive Examination <sup>1</sup>	13 took exam and all passed; 2 of those had follow-up interviews	Continue examination based upon SLLA
<b>Collaborate with families and other P-12 community members</b>	Comprehensive Examination <sup>1</sup>	13 took exam and all passed; 2 of those had follow-up interviews	Continue examination based upon SLLA

	Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ) <sup>3</sup>	Received surveys from 49 current students, graduates, employers, and other stakeholders. 80% of respondents marked Above Expected at This Level on question number 8 (internship); 79% marked this response on question number 5 (ethics); and 76% marked this response on question number 1 (vision). 29% marked Average for Experience on question number 4 (community) and on question number 6 (larger context).	Will discuss at fall faculty meetings
<b>Act with integrity and ethically within a school context in a professional manner</b>	Dispositions Rating Scale Self-evaluation <sup>5</sup>  Dispositions Rating Scale Faculty Evaluation <sup>5</sup>	Given to all students in ELR 702 in February. Students scored themselves highest in grooming and appearance and sensitivity and lowest in poise and confidence and collaboration.  There were no major faculty/student differences in scores.	By administering the scale to the students, we are defining concretely expected dispositional behaviors. We expect that the class discussions and self-evaluations will improve our students' dispositions.  These will be continuously addressed by faculty by use of the flag system for exemplary or problem behavior and all students must have successful scores in order to take comprehensive examinations.

<b>Understand the larger educational context including cultural differences and legal ramifications for school leaders</b>	Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey <sup>6</sup>	Given to all EdS students in spring 2006. 71% or greater scored a 4 or 5 on every item except item number 5 (I enjoy taking courses that challenge my beliefs and values). 64% scored a 4 or 5 on that item.	Will address in fall faculty meetings. Possibly advanced students have well-established beliefs and values and do not enjoy challenging those.
	Philosophy Statement <sup>7</sup>	7 students earned ratings of “exceeds expectations”; 5 earned “meets expectations”; and 5 earned “minimally acceptable”	Will give an example paper of excellence to students when make assignment next time. Will emphasize APA and written expression more when give the assignment.

- Notes:*
- <sup>1</sup>The Comprehensive Examination is taken during the last semester of the program and is modeled after the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) (see Attachment A). It is a written individual assessment designed to demonstrate the student’s knowledge and understanding as well as analyze, apply, and synthesize information from the entire program of study. The SLLA is a national examination which our students take prior to licensure as a state administrator (most of our students have already passed the SLLA before they begin the specialist program). It is published by Education Testing Service and is based upon the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)<sup>2</sup> Standards for School Leaders and a passing score of at least 154 is required by the state of Mississippi in order to be eligible for a School Administrators License.
- <sup>2</sup>The ISSLC standards are parallel to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards and are attached (see Attachment B).
- <sup>3</sup>The Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ) is a questionnaire based upon the ISSLC standards which is given to a sample of current students, graduates, employers, and other community stakeholders anonymously (see Attachment C).
- <sup>4</sup>Students take six hours of Practicum coursework which requires eight projects (action research) in area schools or districts (excluding where they are currently working) and requiring a minimum of 160 hours of work. Please see Attachment H for Course Directions and Attachment I for an example of the Contract Form the students complete.
- <sup>5</sup>The Dispositions Rating Scale (see Attachment E) is given to all students as a self-evaluation during the required, core class, ELR 702 (Educational Research Design) and is intended to ensure that all students understand our expectations for them ethically and

professionally. Faculty feedback is given throughout the entire program in the form of placement of flags for deficient or exemplary behavior in the student’s file, student/faculty conferences, improvement plans when necessary, and faculty review for all students upon application for comprehensive examinations (see Attachment F for the protocol which is followed).

<sup>6</sup>The Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey is give to all students during the required, core class, CUR 701 (Philosophy of Education) (see Attachment G).

<sup>7</sup>The Philosophy Statement is a written statement of the student’s personal philosophy of education as it relates to the philosophies studied and the student’s educational practice (aims of education, morality/ethics, curriculum, instructional methods, and role of the teacher and school leader).

### C. Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

#### Doctor of Education Degree in Professional Studies

<p><b>Learning Outcome</b> <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection and Analysis</b> <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p>	<p><b>Results of Evaluation</b> <i>What were the findings of the Analysis Team? List any specific recommendations.</i></p>	<p><b>Use of Evaluation Results</b> <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p>
<p><b>Note: The College of Education has been accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education since 1954. As a part of the ongoing accompanying self-study, this newly formed division has continuously engaged in program evaluation and improvement</b></p>			

<p>even as this division was previously a part of another division. We have recently developed several new instruments in order to formalize data collection and analysis. Also note that all coursework for the specialist degree is numbered at the 800 level (with a few 700 level courses included), indicating the required degree of rigor above that of specialist level courses.</p> <p><b>Develop and articulate a school vision of learning</b></p>	<p>Comprehensive Examination<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Coursework and comprehensive examinations have a higher degree of difficulty in the doctoral program than in the specialist. For example, the comprehensive exam at the specialist level is allotted 3 hours and at the specialist level it is allotted 8 hours. 10 students passed all sections on the first attempt; 7 passed on the second attempt; 10 are still in the process of re-taking.</p>	<p>Continued use of the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council, a group of faculty and staff from across the university to help with decision making for the program. Earlier analysis revealed that our comprehensive examination was not demanding enough and that our students were weak in the area of research. We have added a required research course, strengthened our comprehensive exam, and added study courses and tutoring for our students who</p>
---	--	---	--

	<p>Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ)<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>This survey represents an attempt to gather more consistent quantitative data: we have always collected feedback from stakeholders in informal interviews, advisory meetings, and personal contact. We realized the need for a more systematic and formal process for receiving feedback from stakeholders. Received surveys from 49 current students, graduates, employers, and other stakeholders. 80% of respondents marked Above Expected at This Level on question number 8 (internship); 79% marked this response on question number 5 (ethics); and 76% marked this response on question number 1 (vision). 29% marked Average for Experience on question number 4 (community) and on question number 6 (larger context).</p>	<p>are retaking sections of the comprehensive exam.</p> <p>Have established a new advisory board, the School Leadership Council, to facilitate the formal feedback process from a sample of all stakeholders including students, faculty, P-12 teachers and administrators, and community leaders. This group meets each semester and corresponds more frequently via email. Will discuss at fall faculty meetings and continue collecting data</p>
--	--	---	---

<p><b>Manage a school's operation and resources</b></p>	<p>Practicum Projects<sup>4</sup></p>	<p>Grades for fall 2005 and spring 2006 consisted of 58% A's and 28% B's and 12% Incomplete. These grades were taken from the four action research projects completed for each course.</p>	<p>We have required more variety in the project sites and given more direct instructions about the type of acceptable projects. We will pursue avenues to decrease the percent of students who are unable to complete the course in one semester (mainly through advisement and initial instructor course explanations). Because an Incomplete is computed into the overall GPA as an F, students are motivated to finish the course quickly or they are placed on academic probations.</p>
	<p>Comprehensive Examination<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>10 students passed all sections on the first attempt; 7 passed on the second attempt; 10 are still in the process of re-taking.</p>	<p>Earlier analysis revealed that our comprehensive examination was not demanding enough and that our students were weak in the area of research. We have added a required research course, strengthened our comprehensive exam, and added study courses and tutoring for our students who are retaking sections of the</p>

			comprehensive exam.
<b>Collaborate with families and other P-12 community members</b>	Dissertation <sup>5</sup>	3 graduates this year; titles: Cultural Implications of Indigenous Blues Music in the Mississippi Delta; Teacher-Student Interaction: Analyzing Hinds County School District Classrooms; Impact of Intermediate Courses on First Year Retention and Academic Performance in English Composition and College Algebra at a Southern Regional University	We have dropped or reconfigured dissertation committees for our inactive students. We have offered training for dissertation chairs and committee members and developed a new dissertation manual and a new program student handbook. We have changed the minimum number of hours for the dissertation from 9 to 12 to more realistically reflect the typical timeframe for completion of the dissertation.
	Comprehensive Examination <sup>1</sup>	10 students passed all sections on the first attempt; 7 passed on the second attempt; 10 are still in the process of re-taking.	Earlier analysis revealed that our comprehensive examination was not demanding enough and that our students were weak in the area of research. We have added a required research course, strengthened our comprehensive exam, and added study courses and tutoring for our students who

			are retaking sections of the comprehensive exam.
<b>Act with integrity and ethically within a school context in a professional manner</b>	<p>Dispositions Rating Scale Self-evaluation<sup>6</sup></p> <p>Dispositions Rating Scale Faculty Evaluation<sup>5</sup></p>	<p>Given to all students in ELR 702 in February. Students scored themselves highest in grooming and appearance and sensitivity and lowest in poise and confidence and collaboration.</p> <p>There were no major faculty/student differences in scores.</p>	<p>By administering the scale to the students, we are defining concretely expected dispositional behaviors. We expect that the class discussions and self-evaluations will improve our students' dispositions.</p> <p>These will be continuously addressed by faculty by use of the flag system for exemplary or problem behavior and all students must have successful scores in order to take comprehensive examinations.</p>
<b>Understand the larger educational context including cultural differences and legal ramifications for school leaders</b>	<p>Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey<sup>7</sup></p> <p>Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire (ELPPQ)<sup>3</sup></p>	<p>Given to all EdD students in spring 2006. 73% or greater scored a 4 or 5 on every item except item number 5 (I enjoy taking courses that challenge my beliefs and values). 64% scored a 4 or 5 on that item.</p> <p>Received surveys from 49 current students, graduates, employers, and other stakeholders. 80% of</p>	<p>Will address in fall faculty meetings and continue to address diversity issues in courses. Possibly advanced students have well-established beliefs and values and do not enjoy challenging those.</p> <p>Will discuss at fall faculty meetings and continue collecting data</p>

		<p>respondents marked Above Expected at This Level on question number 8 (internship); 79% marked this response on question number 5 (ethics); and 76% marked this response on question number 1 (vision). 29% marked Average for Experience on question number 4 (community) and on question number 6 (larger context).</p>	
--	--	---	--

- Notes:*
- <sup>1</sup>The Comprehensive Examination is taken during the semester before Dissertation Seminar, covers academic areas from the program, and is based upon the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) (see Attachment A). It is a written individual assessment designed to demonstrate the student’s knowledge and understanding as well as analyze, apply, and synthesize information from the entire program of study. The SLLA is a national examination which our students take prior to licensure as a state administrator (most of our students have already passed the SLLA before they begin the doctoral program). It is published by Education Testing Service and is based upon the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)<sup>2</sup> Standards for School Leaders and a passing score of at least 154 is required by the state of Mississippi in order to be eligible for a School Administrators License.
- <sup>2</sup>The ISSLC standards are parallel to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards and are attached (see Attachment B).
- <sup>3</sup>The ELPPQ is a questionnaire based upon the ISSLC standards which is given to a sample of current students, graduates, employers, and other community stakeholders anonymously (see Attachment C).
- <sup>4</sup>Students take six hours of Practicum coursework which requires eight projects (action research) in area schools or districts (excluding where they are currently working) and requiring a minimum of 160 hours of work. Please see Attachment H for Course Directions and Attachment I for an example of the Contract Form the students complete.
- <sup>5</sup>All Doctor of Education students are required to complete a Dissertation before graduation. The doctoral dissertation is the written record of the candidate’s individual, original research and scholarship and successfully advances the limits of human knowledge. The topic must be appropriate to and significant in the academic field, require a mastery and exhaustive exercise of research techniques, and demonstrate critical thought and facility of expression. The dissertation must, in the professional opinion of the graduate faculty,

make an original contribution, and it must demonstrate the candidate's fitness to continue the advancement of knowledge in the student's competency.

<sup>6</sup>The Dispositions Rating Scale (see Attachment E) is given to all students as a self-evaluation during the required, core class, ELR 702 (Educational Research Design) and is intended to ensure that all students understand our expectations for them ethically and professionally. Faculty feedback is given throughout the entire program in the form of placement of flags for deficient or exemplary behavior in the student's file, student/faculty conferences, improvement plans when necessary, and faculty review for all students upon application for comprehensive examinations (see Attachment F for the protocol which is followed).

<sup>7</sup>The Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey is given to all students during the required, core class, SUP 831 (Supervisory Techniques) (see Attachment G).

## II. Division/Department Goals for 2005-06

**A. Goal 1:** Division will continue curricular development and sequencing of research course strand (1 year) and leadership courses (3 years).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 1

**C. Expected Results:** Curriculum will be better defined and aligned.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Faculty will evaluate course syllabi, program curricula, and programs of study.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *A new research course (ELR 805) was added; sequencing of other research courses was established; all syllabi were updated; a new curriculum matrix for the MEd program was developed. All programs and courses are being evaluated at faculty meetings and faculty retreats. Successfully completed the state annual process and performance review.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to develop syllabi and curriculum matrices.

**A. Goal 2:** Doctor of Education degree program will be revamped (3 years).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 1

**C. Expected Results:** Program will be strengthened.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** DACC and faculty will develop new programs of study for the tracks, procedures, and handbooks. Admittance criteria and procedures will be evaluated.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Revised the admission criteria and procedures; developed a new Dissertation Manual and Doctoral Program Handbook; developed a scoring rubric for the admission portfolio; student orientation workshop; new program brochures; new website; dissertation chair and committee member training; re-vamped comprehensive examination and scoring procedure.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** New manuals, handbooks, criteria, and procedures are in place.

**A. Goal 3:** Research refresher workshops will be offered for students and faculty (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 1

**C. Expected Results:** Students and faculty will feel more competent in this area.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure that the workshops are held and attended.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Held 3 faculty and 5 student free workshops on research and statistics topics in the fall of '05. Thirty-nine faculty and fifty-three students attended.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Workshops were well-attended and received positive feedback from participants.

**A. Goal 4:** An orientation workshop will be offered for all EdD students to positively impact student retention (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** Students will be better informed about changes in the program and expectations.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure that the orientation is held and attended.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Held September 17, 2005 with 60 students and 18 faculty/staff in attendance.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Good attendance numbers; positive feedback. Will make an annual event.

**A. Goal 5:** Student scholarships will be increased to augment enrollment (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** Quality students will be rewarded and encouraged to continue their education.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Look at the number of scholarships awarded.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Awarded 4 MEd scholarships (\$20,000 each) and 1 EdS and 1 EdD scholarships (increase of 3 over last year).*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to raise the scholarship commitment as long as funds are available.

**A. Goal 6:** On-line and alternative-schedule courses will be developed to increase student appeal (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** Students will have more convenient access to courses.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Compare numbers to last year's: 4 on-line courses, 1 video-conference course, and 3 weekend/alternative courses.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Offered 9 on-line courses, 6 video-conference courses, and 9 weekend/alternative schedule courses. Combined, this represents 44% of all courses taught.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Students have been receptive and complementary. Will continue these course offerings as much as possible.

**A. Goal 7:** Dissertation committees for current EdD students who are ABD will be coordinated to spur graduation rates (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** The students and faculty will be aware of committee makeup and inactive students will either become active or be dropped.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Look at the number of assignments.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Went from 19 student dissertation chair assignments to 44. Three students graduated; 9 were moved to inactive status; and 13 new students were added. Letters were sent to all ABD students informing them of the Student Orientation seminar and their status in the program. New handbooks and training workshops and student orientation.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** New committee lists have been generated.

**A. Goal 8:** Dissertation committees for current EdD students who will be ABD will be coordinated to spur graduation rates (3 years/RESOURCES).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** The students and faculty will be aware of committee makeup and inactive students will either become active or be dropped. Faculty will be more willing to serve on dissertation committees.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Look at number of assignments and offer training for committees.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Added a monetary compensation package for chairs and committee members paid upon successful dissertation defense. Changed procedures so that comprehensive examination must be successfully completed before take Dissertation Seminar. Administered 27 comprehensive examinations to EdD students. Offered study sessions and online and in person tutorial sessions to prepare for comprehensive examinations and re-writes. New committee assignments have been made for 21 students this year.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** New committee assignments have been made and additional faculty have become involved with dissertations.

**A. Goal 9:** The CTL's Learning Curve will be utilized to meet remedial needs of students in the lab setting rather than having each faculty member address individual student needs (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 3

**C. Expected Results:** Students' individual needs will be better diagnosed and met.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure that faculty are aware of the Learning Curve and are requiring the Technology Assessment in required courses.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Basic Technology Assessment was administered to all MEd, EdS, and EdD students in three required courses as a condition of course completion (99 students).*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** 80 students have successfully completed the Basic Technology Assessment. The other 18 have Incompletes for the required course and will finish the Assessment soon in order to get their final grades.

**A. Goal 10:** TaskStream and WebCT will be used to enter our students' SLLA scores and as communication tools (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 3

**C. Expected Results:** Assessment data will be easily stored, accessed, and analyzed.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Look at data and number of WebCT courses.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Used Excel instead of TaskStream for SLLA scores. WebCT was used to enhance 67% of courses offered. Continued 100% pass rate on the SLLA.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will attempt again to use TaskStream more; learning curve on this system is steep and with practically all new faculty, it was not a priority. Will utilize Excel for data analysis. Faculty are realizing the benefits of using WebCT to enhance their courses.

**A. Goal 11:** Regular email, a new doctoral student handbook, and monthly faculty meetings will address communication concerns and possible solutions (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 3

**C. Expected Results:** Communication will flow freely; people will have the information they need.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Minutes and agendas from faculty meetings, emails, and a handbook will be available.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Held monthly faculty meetings, a two-day faculty retreat, and maintained constant email contact. Developed new doctoral student handbook.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Have received good feedback concerning student handbook and faculty meetings. Faculty feel there are too many emails and sometime are not able to retrieve needed information. A training session on email folders and organization would be extremely helpful.

**A. Goal 12:** A written vision statement for the Center for Rural School Leadership and Research will be developed (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 4

**C. Expected Results:** The Center will have a defined purpose and direction.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure that a written document is developed jointly with faculty.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Was developed at the faculty meetings all fall and finalized at the faculty retreat in February. Input was received from current leadership students, graduates, and area administrators.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** The vision, mission, and goals will guide the Center.

**A. Goal 13:** A public Grand Opening celebration for the Center for Rural School Leadership and Research will be held (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 4

**C. Expected Results:** Stakeholder awareness of the new Center will be enhanced.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure activity is held.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *The Leadership Celebration (State Superintendent of Education keynote speaker) was well attended on April 18, 2006. The Grand Opening has been postponed until fall to coincide with the naming of the center for Senator Thad Cochran (new development).*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will hold the Grand Opening in the fall of 2006 according to Senator Cochran's schedule.

**A. Goal 14:** A webpage for the Center for Rural School Leadership and Research will be developed (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 4

**C. Expected Results:** Communication will be enhanced and correct information will be available quickly to students.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Visual evaluation of website.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Has been created and is getting very good student traffic since the class schedules have been added in a user-friendly format and several links to critical documents are contained there.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to update information on site and add documents and information to the site.

**A. Goal 15:** Faculty will make presentations during at least two regional professional meetings and will hold at least four professional workshops during the 2005-2006 academic year (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Enhanced professionalism and visibility in the professional community.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Count the number of publications and presentations listed on end of year faculty activity reports.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Scholarship Summary: Professional Publications, 4; Professional Presentations: International, 3; National, 2; Regional/State, 8; Workshops/Professional Development, 23; Students Dissertations: Chairs, 16; Committees, 16; Editoria Boards, 2; Professional Boards & Officers, 5.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to encourage faculty involvement and collaboration.

**A. Goal 16:** Partnership with DAAIS will continue (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Collaboration and communication will continue.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Observe opportunities for partnership.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Successful partnership continued with MEd students, internships, Superintendents Academy, and workshops.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue partnerships.

**A. Goal 17:** MEd student internships will continue (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Excellence in field experiences and clinical practice will continue. Collaboration with schools district personnel will continue.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Observe the number and quality of internship placements.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *16,576 hours of internships were completed in the MEd program. Some excellent new sites were developed.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue internship placements.

**A. Goal 18:** All student dissertations will support the regional mission of Delta State University (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Knowledge of current issues important to the region will be increased.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Review of dissertations.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:** *Titles of the current year graduate's dissertations:*

*Cultural Implications of Indigenous Blues Music in the Mississippi Delta; Teacher-Student Interaction: Analyzing Hinds County School District Classrooms; Impact of Intermediate Courses on First Year Retention and Academic Performance in English Composition and College Algebra at a Southern Regional University.*

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Dissertations will be published and students will be encouraged to write additional articles and make presentations on their topics.

**III. Data and information for department:**

- **Enrollment by Major – Table 1**
- **Graduates by Major – Table 2**
- **Credit Hour Production by Discipline – Table 3**
- **Enrollment by Major, Comparison of 2004 – 2005 – Table 4**

**Table 1**

<b>Enrollment by Major*</b>			
<b>Major</b>	<b>Summer 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>
<b>Educational Administration</b>	58	61	81
<b>Professional Studies</b>	58	67	56
<b>Total</b>	116	128	137

**\*Some courses not included by Inst. Res. (continuing education, CUR, CML)**

**Table 2**

<b>Graduates by Major*</b>		
<b>Major</b>	<b>December 2005</b>	<b>May 2006</b>
<b>MEd-Educational Leadership</b>	15	0
<b>Educational Leadership Specialist</b>	5	4
<b>Professional Studies Doctoral</b>	1	2
<b>Total</b>	21	6

**\* from Graduation Bulletins**

**Table 3**

<b>Credit Hour Production by Discipline*</b>			
<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Summer 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>
<b>AED</b>	192	366	336
<b>CAD</b>	0	0	0
<b>CML</b>	42	0	0
<b>CUR</b>	201	129	87
<b>EDL</b>	238	140	196
<b>ELR</b>	267	294	273
<b>SUP</b>	0	0	87
<b>Total</b>	940	929	979

**\*from Banner enrollment numbers 5/18/06**

**Table 4**

<b>Comparison of 2004 and 2005 Enrollment by Major*</b>						
<b>(*from 2004-05 Annual Report &amp; Insti. Res.-some courses omitted)</b>						
	<b>2004</b>			<b>2005</b>		
	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Fall</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Fall</b>
<b>Educational Leadership</b>	44	50	55	70	58	61
<b>Professional Studies</b>	62	39	61	73	58	67

**IV. Personnel:**

**A. Faculty for the Division, 2005-2006**

**Full time:**

**Dr. Kathleen Jenkins (17% salary from DEI grant)**

**Dr. Dan McFall (100% salary from DEI grant)**

**Dr. Lynn Varner (22% salary from DEI grant)**

**Dr. Jenetta Waddell**

**Part time:**

**Dr. Arthur Cartlidge (100% salary from DEI grant)**

**Dr. Eurmon Hervey (100% salary from DEI grant)**

**Dr. Ann Harland Webster (100% salary from DEI grant)**

**Staff:**

**Shameka Baker**

**Adjunct Faculty for 2005-2006:**

<b>Summer 2005</b>	<b>Fall 2005</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>
Dr. Kathleen Jenkins	Dr. Tyrone Jackson	Dr. Montrell Greene
Dr. Sue Jolly	Mrs. Susan Lee	Dr. Bonita Potter
Dr. Kris Kaase	Dr. Susan Rucker	Dr. Ilean Richards
Dr. Frank McArthur		Dr. Jimmy Smith
Dr. Jim Nicholson		
Dr. Susan Rucker		
Dr. Brad Teague		

**B. Other Noteworthy Division Activities and Accomplishments:**

**1. Teaching**

- Commencement address: December, 2005
- Participated in the review and redesign of the conceptual framework and the assessment plan for the college
- Revised syllabi to appropriately reflect the conceptual framework as well as national standards
- Made appropriate preparations and revision, and hosted team for annual MDE Process and Performance Review
- Revised and expanded the assessment practices and system
- Conducted major revision of the doctoral program
- Continued participation in the Delta Education Initiative and expended carry over funds

- Participated in the Stanford study on school leadership
- Received the IHL Award for Best Practices for the MEd leadership program
- Continued 100% passing rate on the SLLA licensure examination for administrators
- Hosted the Leadership Celebration with Dr. Hank Bounds as keynote speaker
- Hosted the Superintendents Academy
- Created the advisory School Leadership Council
- Continued the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council
- Continued collaboration with the Mississippi Private School Association
- College of Education Faculty Award for Outstanding Teaching, Service, and Research (2005 – 2006)
- Innovative practices in teaching: Creative Scheduling (weekends; alternatives in summer); Technology: WebCT Courses (completely on-line and enhanced), Video Conference Courses, PowerPoint Presentations (instructors and students), Email and Faxes; Variety in Instructional Methods: Problem Based Learning, Role Plays, Small Group Work, Student Presentations, Writing Editing, Lecture (some), Case Studies, Data Analysis, Guest Speakers, Student Reflection, Peer Feedback, Portfolios, Action Research Projects
- Three faculty attended Southern Regional Education Board Train the Trainer, Atlanta, GA, 2005 and 2006

## **2. Scholarship**

McFall, D. (2006). *Characteristics and Perceptions of Graduate School Distance Learners*. Presentation at the Faculty Research and Scholarship Symposium, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Hervey, E. (2005). *The P-16/Prision Pipeline*. Presentation at the Delta Regional Authority Educational Summit, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS

House, L., & Varner, L. (2006). Developing leaders to foster instructional change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Diego, CA.

The Hutchison School Alumnae Magazine. (2005). *Alumnae in action: Outstanding alumnae in academia*. Memphis, TN: Author.

Varner, L. (2005). Ten things they never told you before you became a teacher. Keynote address at the annual district meeting

of the Mississippi Private School Association, Cleveland, MS.

Varner, L. (2005). Third graders' reading scores significantly improve after using a computer-managed program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, San Antonio, TX.

Varner, L. (2005). MCT scores significantly improved after using reading program. *Delta Education Journal*, 3(1).

Varner, L. (2005). The Four Agreements for Life. Commencement Address at Delta State University, Cleveland, MS, December, 2005.

Varner, L., & House, L. (2006). School leadership training: A model for success. Paper presented at the College Teaching & Learning Conference, Siena, Italy.

Waddell, J. (2006). *The Educational Autobiography: A Study of Educator Identity*. Presentation at the Faculty Research and Scholarship Symposium, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Waddell, J. (2006). *Identity and Self-Efficacy of Educational Leaders in the Mississippi Delta*. Paper presented at the fifth annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

Waddell, J. (2005). *The Educational Autobiography: A Study In Black And White*. Proposal accepted for Mid-South Educational Research Association annual meeting Baton Rouge, LA. (Meeting cancelled due to Hurricane Katrina)

Waddell, J. (2005). *Using Life History as a Teaching Strategy*. Presentation at the ROMEA Faculty Development Conference, Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Waddell, J. (2005). *Thirty-Six Years Running: An Autobiographical Reflection on Whiteness*. Presentation at 'May We Present,' Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.

Waddell, J. (2005). *Thirty-Six Years Running: An Autobiographical Reflection on Whiteness*. Paper presented at the fourth annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies at McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Division faculty also presented 23 workshops/professional development sessions.

Division faculty chaired 16 student dissertations and served on 16 student dissertation committees.

### **Scholarship Summary**

Professional Publications	4
Professional Presentations	
International	3
National	2
Regional/State	8
Workshops/Professional Development	23
Student Dissertations	
Chairs	16
Committees	16
Editorial Boards	2
Professional Boards & Officers	5

### **3. Service**

- Served on the Mississippi Rural Educators Association Executive Board
- Educational Leadership Program Council Secretary
- Mississippi Board of Examiners for Accreditation: University of Southern Mississippi- March, 2005
- MSERA and DEJ – Editorial Boards
- Served on Executive Board for the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network
- Provided professional development to area school district teachers and administrators
- Utilized a core of area administrators as clinical faculty in the Educational Leadership Program
- Provided judges for regional spelling bee, academic quintathlon, and reading fair

- Accompanied a group of students to the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in Chicago
- Accompanied a group of students to the state legislature and the MDE
- Accompanied a group of students to presentations by Dr. Harry Wong and Dr. Fritz Mengert
- Met with area school administrators to discuss pertinent issues
- Multiple committees across the University
- Multiple community committees and service activities

#### **4. Other**

- Started new center and division: Center for Rural School Leadership and Research
- Set up new office
- Hired 2 full-time and 2 part-time faculty, secretary, research assistant, adjuncts, and consultants
- New website including EdD application procedures, portfolio rubrics, class schedules, announcements, etc.
- Creative scheduling—video, online, off campus, weekends, etc.
- Faculty retreat: new vision, mission, goals, curriculum analysis and improvement
- Mentored new faculty and secretary
- NCATE Coordinator: Assessments, syllabi, conceptual framework, reports, training
- College of Education Administrative Council
- Writing assignment for division...consistent early assignment, rubric, feedback
- Dissertations/Revamped Doc program: DACC, handbooks, student orientation, dissertation chair/committee member training, dissertation re-assignments, new database, portfolio/admission policy, curriculum re-alignment, definition, sequencing
- Faculty reviews/semester, grades
- Surveys: graduates, current students, employers, stakeholders
- Reports: NCATE, strategic plan, DEI, annual reports, learner outcomes, program
- New brochures for all programs, website upgrade, attendance & networking @ state and national meetings
- Comps...MEd, EdS, and EdD; revamped, administered, scored, remediated
- Annual performance reviews for faculty and staff

**C. New position(s) requested, with justification:**

Move Dr. Dan McFall into regular budget. Sixty-three (63%) of Division total salary paid from DEI grant; the grant will not continue indefinitely.

Add an Outreach Coordinator/Faculty member. Courses are currently being taught in Desoto County, Jackson, Grenada, Clarksdale, Greenville, and Yazoo County. There is a great potential for specialist and doctoral program growth in these outlying areas. An instructor, recruiter, adjunct coordinator, and contact for the students in the outreach courses is needed. .  
Seventeen (17) courses were taught by adjuncts during the year.

**D. Recommended change of status**

Dr. Eurmon Hervey completed doctoral degree.  
Dr. Jenetta Waddell completed a 3 year pre-tenure review.

**V. Degree Program Addition/Deletions and/or Major Curriculum Changes:**

**A. Changes made in the past year**

Doctoral program was made more rigorous including admission criteria, addition of a research course, comprehensive examination, and the dissertation process.

**B. Recommended changes for the coming year(s)**

Continue improvement in rigor in all programs and recruitment of high quality students

## VI. Division/Department Goals for 2006-07

**A. Goal 1:** Division will continue curricular development, sequencing, and analyzing leadership courses (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 1

**C. Expected Results:** Curriculum will be better defined and aligned.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Faculty will evaluate course syllabi, program curricula, and programs of study.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to develop syllabi and curriculum matrices.

**A. Goal 2:** Accreditation reports will be submitted for Educational Leadership (ELCC) and College of Education (NCATE) (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 1

**C. Expected Results:** Programs will be strengthened.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Reports will be submitted.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will respond to the results of reviewers.

**A. Goal 3:** An orientation workshop will be offered for all EdD students to positively impact student retention (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** Students will be better informed about changes in the program and expectations.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure that the orientation is held and attended.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to update information for annual orientation; focus will be on new doctoral students and those nearing the end of their coursework.

**A. Goal 4:** Student scholarships will be increased to augment enrollment (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** Quality students will be rewarded and encouraged to continue their education.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Look at the number of scholarships awarded.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to raise the scholarship commitment as long as funds are available.

**A. Goal 5:** On-line and alternative-schedule courses will be continued to increase student appeal (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** Students will have more convenient access to courses.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Compare number of courses to last year.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Students have been receptive and complementary. Will continue these course offerings as much as possible.

**A. Goal 6:** Dissertation committees for current EdD students who are and will become ABD will be coordinated to spur graduation rates (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 2

**C. Expected Results:** The students and faculty will be aware of committee makeup and inactive students will either become active or be dropped.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Look at the assignments.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Committee lists will continue to be updated.

**A. Goal 7:** Regular email, faculty meetings, and a faculty training session on email folders and organization will address communication concerns and possible solutions (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 3

**C. Expected Results:** Communication will flow freely; people will have the information they need.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Minutes and agendas from faculty meetings, emails, and an agenda from the training will be available.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will offer more email training sessions if required and adjust the faculty meeting schedule if faculty see the need.

**A. Goal 8:** A public Grand Opening celebration for the Center for Rural School Leadership and Research will be held (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 4

**C. Expected Results:** Stakeholder awareness of the new Center will be enhanced.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Ensure activity is held.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will hold the Grand Opening in the fall of 2006 according to Senator Thad Cochran's schedule.

**A. Goal 9:** The webpage for the Center for Rural School Leadership and Research will be updated (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 4

**C. Expected Results:** Communication will be enhanced and correct information will be available quickly to students.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Visual evaluation of website.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to update information on site and add documents and information to the site.

**A. Goal 10:** Faculty will make presentations during at least two regional professional meetings during the 2006-2007 academic year (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Enhanced professionalism and visibility in the professional community.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Count the number of publications and presentations listed on end of year faculty activity reports.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue to encourage faculty involvement and collaboration.

**A. Goal 11:** Partnership with DAAIS will continue (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Collaboration and communication will continue.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Observe opportunities for partnership.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue partnerships.

**A. Goal 12:** MEd student internships will continue (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Excellence in field experiences and clinical practice will continue. Collaboration with schools district personnel will continue.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Observe the number and quality of internship placements.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Will continue internship placements.

**A. Goal 13:** All student dissertations will support the regional mission of Delta State University (1 year).

**B. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:** SP # 5

**C. Expected Results:** Knowledge of current issues important to the region will be increased.

**D. Evaluation Procedures:** Review of dissertations.

**E. Actual Results of Evaluation:**

**F. Use of Evaluation Results:** Dissertations will be published and students will be encouraged to write additional articles and make presentations on their topics.

(Attachment A)  
**Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership**  
For Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors  
NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
**Published January, 2002**

**Standard 1.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school community.

**Standard 2.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

**Standard 3.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

**Standard 4.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

**Standard 5.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

**Standard 6.0:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

**Standard 7.0:** Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

(Attachment B)

### **The School Leaders Licensure Assessment**

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) measures whether entry-level principals and other school leaders have the standards-relevant knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice.

The six-hour assessment is divided into four sections:

**Evaluation of Actions I** (1 hour) - Ten short vignettes covering situations a principal might encounter. Candidates respond to a focused question that asks for next steps, factors influencing a decision, or possible consequences of an action.

**Evaluation of Actions II** (1 hour) - Six longer vignettes. Each presents a dilemma based on typical school issues. Candidates analyze the circumstances and respond to a focused analytical question that requires prioritizing action steps or articulating the relevant issues.

**Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving** (2 hours) - Two case studies involving teaching and learning issues. In each case, candidates propose a course of action to address a complex problem, referring to a set of documents, and a short scenario describing a school and its community.

**Analysis of Information and Decision Making** (2 hours) - Seven documents that relate to teaching and learning issues. Candidates answer two questions about each document.

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) consists of 25 constructed-response questions, ranging from short vignettes requiring a brief response to much longer case study exercises.

(Attachment C)  
**Delta State University**  
**College of Education**  
**Center for Rural School Leadership and Research**

**Educational Leadership Preparation Programs Questionnaire**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this short survey. Your input is crucial to us as we continuously seek ways to improve our programs. We welcome any additional information you would like to supply; the contact information is at the end of the survey. Thank you again.

Please respond to each question by marking the appropriate box.

<b>Question: Please base response on graduates' amount of work experience at the time of your contact with them.</b>	<b>Above expected at this level</b>	<b>Average for experience</b>	<b>Below expected at this level</b>	<b>Need Extreme Improvement</b>	<b>Unable to Answer</b>
1. Graduates can facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by a school community.					
2. Graduates can promote a positive school culture, provide an effective instructional program, apply best practice to student learning, and design comprehensive growth plans for staff.					
3. Graduates can manage the organization, operations, and resources of a school.					
4. Graduates can collaborate with families and other community members, respond to community interests and needs, and mobilize community resources.					
5. Graduates act with integrity, fairly, and ethically.					
6. Graduates can understand, respond to and influence the larger context.					
7. During the internships/practicum courses/field experiences					

students are able to apply the above skills and knowledge to an appropriate degree for his/her stage in the degree program.					
<b>Question: Please base response on graduates' amount of work experience at the time of your contact with them.</b>	<b>Above expected at this level</b>	<b>Average for experience</b>	<b>Below expected at this level</b>	<b>Need Extreme Improvement</b>	<b>Unable to Answer</b>
8. Experiences during internships/practicum courses/field experiences are designed to accommodate the students' individual needs.					
9. In your opinion, what are the greatest strengths of the DSU educational leadership programs?					
10. In what ways could the DSU educational leadership programs be improved?					
11. Please make any additional comments here:					

Please mark all of the following that describe you.

Graduate of leadership program: MEd \_\_\_\_\_ EdS \_\_\_\_\_ EdD \_\_\_\_\_

Current student: MEd \_\_\_\_\_ EdS \_\_\_\_\_ EdD \_\_\_\_\_

Employer of graduate(s) from leadership program: MEd \_\_\_\_\_ EdS \_\_\_\_\_ EdD \_\_\_\_\_

Parent of leadership student: MEd \_\_\_\_\_ EdS \_\_\_\_\_ EdD \_\_\_\_\_

Community/business member: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant/adjunct/faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

MS Department of Education: \_\_\_\_\_

(Attachment D)

**Delta State University  
College of Education  
Center for Rural School Leadership and Research**

**Internship Mid-Term Feedback**

**Mentor** \_\_\_\_\_

**Administrative Intern** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

1. On a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 being the highest, please rate the intern’s performance to date and support your rating with a brief explanation: \_\_\_\_\_
2. In what ways has the intern shown initiative and /or leadership potential? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the intern’s strength to date? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What are your concerns about this intern? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you need an immediate visit or contact? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Have you discussed this information with the intern? \_\_\_\_\_

---

Please return to Kathleen B. Jenkins, P. O. Box 3217, DSU, Cleveland, MS 38733 by **September 11, 2006.**

(Attachment D continued)

Delta State University

College of Education

Center for Rural School Leadership and Research

Master's Level Cohort Program

Intern Performance Assessment

2005-06

Intern \_\_\_\_\_

Mentor \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Question: Please base response on graduates' amount of work experience at the time of your contact with them.</b>	<b>Above expected at this level</b>	<b>Average for experience</b>	<b>Below expected at this level</b>	<b>Need Extreme Improvement</b>	<b>Unable to Answer</b>
1. Graduates can facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by a school community.					
2. Graduates can promote a positive school culture, provide an effective instructional program, apply best practice to student learning, and design comprehensive growth plans for staff.					
3. Graduates can manage the organization, operations, and resources of a school.					
4. Graduates can collaborate with families and other community members, respond to community interests and needs, and mobilize community resources.					
5. Graduates act with integrity, fairly, and ethically.					
6. Graduates can understand, respond to and influence the larger context.					
7. During the internships/practicum courses/field experiences students are able to apply the above skills and knowledge to an appropriate degree for his/her stage in the degree program.					
<b>Question: Please base response on graduates' amount of</b>	<b>Above</b>	<b>Average for</b>	<b>Below</b>	<b>Need Extreme</b>	<b>Unable to</b>

<b>work experience at the time of your contact with them.</b>	<b>expected at this level</b>	<b>experience</b>	<b>expected at this level</b>	<b>Improvement</b>	<b>Answer</b>
8. Experiences during internships/practicum courses/field experiences are designed to accommodate the students' individual needs.					
9. In your opinion, what are the greatest strengths of the DSU educational leadership programs?					
10. In what ways could the DSU educational leadership programs be improved?					
11. Please make any additional comments here:					

Please use the checklist below to assess the performance of the cohort member who has interned in your school.

	Superior	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unable to Observe
Punctuality						
Attendance						
Appropriate attire						
Ability to organize						
Ability to perform tasks						
Problem analysis						
Decisiveness						
Ability to use supervision						
Ability to delegate						
Personal motivation						
Judgment						
Teamwork						

Ethical behavior						
Written communication						
Oral communication						
Tact in dealing with stressful situations						
Interpersonal relations						
Ability to work with support staff						
Ability to work with professional staff						
Ability to cope with stress						
Ability to communicate with faculty						
Ability to relate to students						
Sensitivity to diversity issues						
Quality of final project						
Overall leadership performance						

What areas would you recommend for the intern to concentrate on in his/her continued professional development?

Please comment on any other aspect of the intern's performance. You may use the back of the sheet for additional comments.

(Attachment E)

Delta State University  
Center for Rural School Leadership and Research  
Dispositions Rating Scale

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Rater: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Degree Program: \_\_\_\_\_

Appraisal Scale:

- 1 – Does not meet expectations                      3 – Meets expectations                      N/O – No opportunity to observe  
2 – Meets a few expectations but not sufficient                      4 – Exceeds expectations

Characteristic (Disposition)	Rating	Evidence for a 1 or 2 Rating
<b><i>Flexibility:</i></b>		
1.1 responds promptly and effectively to unexpected occurrences in the classroom and to the needs of colleagues and administration		
1.2 adapts willingly to change and contributes positively to the needs of the workplace		
<b><i>Attendance and Participation:</i></b>		
2.1 attends all expected classes, meetings, and trainings Required		
2.2 contributes meaningfully to meetings and does not just “show up”		
<b><i>Punctuality:</i></b>		
3.1 arrives to all expected classes, meetings, and trainings required on or before expected start time		

3.2 completes assignments on or before due dates		
<b><i>Dependability:</i></b>		
4.1 behaves in a consistent and professional manner that contributes positively to the environment		
4.2 shows responsibility in all aspects of professional Functioning		
<b><i>Poise and Confidence:</i></b>		
5.1 handles self professionally in actions and speech		
5.2 carries self with self-assurance without feeling threatened by others' accomplishments or abilities		
5.3 realistically appraises own abilities and the ability to risk despite perceived weaknesses		

<b>Characteristic (Disposition) <i>continued</i></b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Evidence for a 1 or 2 Rating</b>
<b><i>Maturity and Judgment:</i></b>		
6.1 accurately assesses the context of complex situations (in the workplace) and responds appropriately		
6.2 consults with colleagues and administrators as needed and acts independently within the scope of training		
6.3 avoids personalizing conflict in emotionally-charged Situations		
6.4 effectively demonstrates knowledge of safety measures and the handling of emergencies		

<b><i>Grooming and Appearance:</i></b>		
7.1	appears well groomed, attending to both neatness and personal hygiene	
7.2	selects attire that does not detract from professional functioning and is consistent with other professionals within the workplace	
<b><i>Sensitivity</i></b>		
8.1	effectively demonstrates empathy and compassion toward others within the professional context while maintaining learning expectations	
8.2	maintains confidentiality of sensitive student and colleague information	
8.3	effectively demonstrates acceptance of diversity (e.g., exceptionalities, gender, race, SES)	
<b><i>Attitude:</i></b>		
9.1	conveys a positive (helpful, upbeat) disposition in the Workplace	
9.2	takes responsibility for emotional states and behavior and adjusts when needed	
9.3	hears and responds appropriately to feedback from peers and supervisors without becoming defensive	
<b><i>Initiative:</i></b>		
10.1	is proactive and anticipates what a situation calls for and responds appropriately	
10.2	consults with others when necessary	
10.3	asks for feedback about the impact of work	
<b><i>Resourcefulness:</i></b>		

11.1 uses materials appropriately in the classroom and other professional settings		
11.2 employs multiple technologies to aid the teaching Process		
11.3 responds with flexibility		

<b>Characteristics (Disposition) <i>continued</i></b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Evidence for a 1 or a 2 Rating</b>
<b><i>Enthusiasm:</i></b>		
12.1 generates excitement, passion, and interest within students and colleagues		
12.2 motivates self to perform well in spite of circumstances that are not optimal		
<b><i>Creativity:</i></b>		
13.1 is inventive		
13.2 recognizes and uses personal talents to facilitate professional functioning		
<b><i>Collaboration:</i></b>		
14.1 engages in successful home-school partnerships		
14.2 works effectively with community and social services Agencies		
14.3 collaborates appropriately with professional colleagues, as appropriate		
<b><i>Professional Growth:</i></b>		

15.1 demonstrates value of lifelong learning		
15.2 engages in self-reflection for continuous Improvement		
15.3 takes advantage of opportunities for professional Development		
<b><i>Ethics:</i></b>		
16.1 fulfills legal and contractual obligations while applying laws and procedures fairly		
16.2 expects school community to demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior		
16.3 protects the rights of faculty, staff, and students		
16.4 treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and Respect		
16.5 accepts responsibility for school operations and recognizes the impact of administrative decisions of others		
16.6 models strong values, beliefs, and a professional code of ethics		

My signature below indicates that the dispositions assessment system was explained to me by the faculty of the Center for Rural School Leadership and Research and that I received a copy for my reference. I understand that I must exhibit these dispositions consistently throughout the program in order to be recommended as having satisfactorily met all the requirements of my program.

Candidate's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Attachment F)

**Delta State University  
College of Education  
Center for Rural School Leadership & Research  
Proposed Protocol for Dispositions  
Revised February, 2006**

1. Candidates will complete the Dispositions Rating Scale during ELR 605 and ELR 702 as a self-assessment.
2. Flag forms will be placed in each candidate's folder: Yellow for warning, red for deficiency, and green for exemplary.
3. Faculty who note evidence of deficiencies or exemplary practices in a candidate relevant to a disposition area enter this information on the appropriate flag form, provide details related to the reason for concern or commendation, and hold a conference with the candidate regarding concerns.
4. Based upon the number and severity of dispositional deficiencies, faculty will refer the candidate to the advisor or to a faculty committee for counseling. The faculty members and candidate will establish a written plan for improvement that will become part of the candidate's file. The plan will specify how and when the improvement will occur.
5. Upon application for comprehensive examinations, faculty will meet to review each candidate in light of the dispositions. The *Dispositions Rating Scale* must be completed on all candidates at these two assessment points.
6. If the deficiency(ies) persists, the faculty will meet to consider whether or not the candidate should continue in the program.

(Attachment G)

DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY  
COLLGE OF EDUCATION

OPENNESS TO DIVERSITY AND CHALLENGE SURVEY\*

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Major \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Degree Program \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Respond to the following items concerning diversity by circling the number that most closely reflects your attitude. The numerical scale is as follows:

5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

- 5 4 3 2 1      1. I enjoy having discussions with people whose ideas and values are different from my own.
- 5 4 3 2 1      2. The real value of a college education lies in being introduced to different values.
- 5 4 3 2 1      3. I enjoy talking with people who have values different from mine because it helps me understand myself and my values better.
- 5 4 3 2 1      4. Learning about people from different cultures is a very important part of my college education.
- 5 4 3 2 1      5. I enjoy taking courses that challenge my beliefs and values.
- 5 4 3 2 1      6. The courses I enjoy the most are those that make me think about things from a different perspective.
- 5 4 3 2 1      7. Contact with individuals whose background (e.g., race/ethnicity, skills/ability, gender, socioeconomic status, language) is different from my own is an essential part of my college education.
- 5 4 3 2 1      8. I enjoy courses that are intellectually challenging.

\* Used with permission from the following:

Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First- generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 249 – 284. January 20, 2006

(Attachment H)  
**Practicum Project**

**Course Directions**

This course consists of completing four projects in the designated area for the course you are taking. AED 636 (Practicum I) is designed for the building level (principals and assistant principals); AED 736 (Practicum II) is designed for the central office level (assistant superintendents, curriculum coordinators, etc.); and AED 737 (Practicum III) is designed for the superintendent level.

You will be completing four projects in a school or district under the supervision of a mentor of your choice (please see **Mentor Letter**). Each of these projects will require from 20 to 30 hours of YOUR time (not the mentor's). Each mentor may ONLY be used for one of the four projects; you may use a school or district for ONLY one project per course; you may not use your own school for a project.

Before actual work is begun on a project, you will be submitting a contract (see **Contract Form**) to me via email which explains exactly what you plan to do. Upon my approval you may then begin your work. You will be making short presentations to your classmates after the projects are completed which focus on the decision making process, not the results, of your project.

Please see **Syllabus**, **Topic Ideas**, and the **Example Contracts** for appropriate ideas for your projects. Please read the **General Notes** for more direction. Submit a **Self-reflection** assignment after you complete each project. The **Rubric** will be used to score your projects.

Feel free to email me with any questions at . I'm looking forward to working with each of you. I hope you'll find this to be a very useful and practical course which will add to your confidence as you begin or continue your educational administrative careers.

Although there are three courses taught together in this practicum, you will notice that there are two different levels for the course numbers (600 and 700 levels). This should be an indication to the student of differential expectations of quality of work according to level of course for which the student is registered. Not only are there varied appropriate topics for each course, but also the selection of a mentor with a wider range of experience and responsibilities and a higher quality of final product are expected as the course level increases. This higher level should be reflected in the contracts that the student submits for instructor approval.

**Suggested topic ideas:**

AED 636: Your focus is on the principal or assistant principal. You might want to focus on scheduling, policy and procedures, discipline, school climate (and people skills), or instructional leadership (improving teachers).

AED 736: Your focus is on the central office staff. Of particular interest to you would be legal issues, curriculum, central office personnel

roles, and regulations.

AED 737: Your focus is on the superintendent or assistant superintendent. Financial issues, leadership (visioning), and those of public relations (dealing with the community and the board) are possibilities for you.

For example, you might consider: District (or school) improvement plans, needs assessment projects, district (or school) curriculum redesign projects, district (or school) based strategic plans, district (or school) simulations, and district (or school) intervention plans.

FYI:

**Verbs that CAN be measured**

The following verbs are good ones to use for your contract objectives: write, label, solve, read, demonstrate, identify, participate, compare, construct, analyze, summarize, differentiate

**Verbs NOT to use**

The following are verbs that CANNOT be measured and therefore should not be used for contract objectives: understand, believe, instill, know, comprehend, foster, appreciate, grasp, enjoy

(Attachment I)  
**Practicum Project Contract**

**Instructions: Please complete one form for each contract. You may then copy it to an email and send it to me at.....**

Check which course: AED 636 \_\_\_\_\_; AED 736 \_\_\_\_\_ or AED 737 \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Student ID Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Contract Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**EACH CONTRACT WILL REQUIRE 20-30 HOURS OF THE STUDENT'S TIME.**

**Describe the demographics of the school or district you are using for this project:**

**(most of this information can be located on the MS Dept. of Ed. website)**

**Include: Location; Grades (i.e. P-2; K-5; etc.); Number of students enrolled; Number or percent eligible for free and reduced lunch; Racial breakdown; Gender breakdown; Achievement Level of the school (i.e. Priority, Level 4, etc.)**

**I. School or district demographics:**

**II. A. Learning Objectives:** State as objectives the performance outcomes of this contract (approximately three.)

What do you expect to learn from completing this project?

**For each learning objective list all ELCC Standard Elements which you believe completing this objective will meet for you (i.e. 2.1, 2.4, 3.1, 3.4, and 5.2)**

**B. Activities/Learning Resources and Strategies:** Briefly describe how each objective will be accomplished. Include the "Time" involved and the "Material Resources Needed." What actions will you take and exactly what will you do?

**C. Evidence of Accomplishment of Objectives:** For each objective, indicate how the results will be judged. What will you turn in to show that you accomplished each objective?

**D. Criteria and Means for Validating Evidence:** How can outcomes be verified, reviewed or checked. Include "**Target Completion Date.**"