# Unit Missions

## TELR Mission Statement

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

# Learning Outcomes

## 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 appropriate content and skills.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**
1. Institutional reports and individual score reports for the Praxis II Subject Area Test in Elementary Education and the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) were the assessment tools used. In addition, all Praxis attempts have been captured in Banner to provide a more detailed analysis of first-time pass rates.

2. These assessments are norm-referenced measures, the passage of which is required to receive a teaching license in Mississippi. The assessments are taken by all candidates prior to admission to the teaching internship.

3. The assessment results were analyzed using Task Stream reports. Data results were compared with those of past years to identify trends in strengths and weaknesses in candidates' knowledge of content and pedagogy

**Results of Evaluation**
Praxis II Subject Area Test
Spring 2014 – Campus – N = 16
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.

Spring 2014 – Hinds – N = 8
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.

Fall 2014 – Campus – N = 14
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.

Fall 2014 – Hinds – N = 16

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 content knowledge.

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

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

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

**Results of Evaluation**
This summary reports on four groups of candidates. Group one consists of on-campus students taking the C-Base test in Spring 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.

Spring 2014 – Campus Group – N=20
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.

Spring 2014- Hinds Group – N=12

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.

Trends noted

Social Studies has been an area where the candidates consistently average the lowest score each year. After averaging the mean scores from the years 2012-2014, 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 pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to successfully complete the teaching internship and be deemed safe to practice.

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

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

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

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

- Appendix A, Instrument 2

**Results of Evaluation**

*Domain II focuses on Assessment*
Spring 2014 (Campus)

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.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)

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.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=13)
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.

CEL 318 (N= )
N/A

CEL 496 Internship (N=8) Cooperating Teacher Ratings
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.

CEL 496 (N= 8) DSU Supervisor
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.

Fall 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)
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*
Spring 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)
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.

CEL 318 (N= 15)
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.

CEL 496 Internship (N=16) Cooperating Teacher Ratings
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.

CEL 496 (N= 16) DSU Supervisor
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.

Spring 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=13)
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.

CEL 318 (N= 8)
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.

CEL 496 Internship (N=8) Cooperating Teacher Ratings

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.

CEL 496 (N= 8) DSU Supervisor

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.

Fall 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)

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.

CEL 318 (N= 16)

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.

CEL 496 Internship (N=15) 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; 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.

CEL 496 (N= 15) DSU Supervisor
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.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)
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.

Fall 2014 (Campus)

CEL 317 (N=16)
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.

CEL 318 (N= 16)
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.

CEL 496 Internship (N=15) Cooperating Teacher Ratings
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.

CEL 496 (N= 15) DSU Supervisor
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.

Fall 2014 (Hinds)

CEL 317 (N=9)
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.

CEL 318 (N= 9)
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.

CEL 496 Internship (N=11) Cooperating Teacher Ratings
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.

CEL 496 (N= 10) DSU Supervisor
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.

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

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

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

---

## 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 diagnose and remediate deficits in reading skills.

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

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

3. The scores were analyzed in Excel.

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

- Appendix A, Instrument 4

**Results of Evaluation**
Spring 2014 Campus Program
(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.

Spring 2014 Hinds Program
(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.

Fall 2014 – Campus Program
(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 synthesize views of education that are commensurate of best practices and professionalism.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**
1. Each semester, all teacher candidates in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education/*CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* develop a brief position paper that synthesizes the

candidate's views of education, providing rationale related to beliefs about the purposes of and influences upon education, personal goals, factors associated with the teaching/learning climate, content to be taught and influences upon it, and professional growth expectations and responsibilities. Candidates refine their philosophies during the teaching internship semester. The grading rubric contains a 4-point scale (Unacceptable, Emerging, Acceptable, and Target).

2. Both philosophies were graded with the same grading rubric. However, scores assigned to candidates in CEL 301 *Introduction to Elementary Education/*CUR 302 *Orientation and Field Experiences* are given with the consideration that they are novices to education and have not yet had an opportunity to attain much of the knowledge and engage in key experiences that are necessary for synthesizing an appropriate view of the teaching/learning interaction.

3. Scores for each indicator were entered into TaskStream and analyzed for means, medians, and score distributions.

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

- Appendix A, Instrument 6

**Results of Evaluation**

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

Spring 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.

---

## 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 faculty training 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 rigor during the process of students gaining entry to the program. Naturally, fairness and consistency 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 faculty training 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 rigor 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, fairness

and consistency 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

| 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 rigorous level of assessment. This faculty member met with the previous instructor for this course for faculty training, 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 fairness and consistency in evaluation.

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.

---

## 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**<br>1 = A<br>2 = B<br>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** | **2012N=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 verbal ability adequate for success in a graduate program

**Data Collection (Evidence)**
A satisfactory writing proficiency score must be submitted by the student during the first 12 hours of coursework in order to receive full admission. Candidates may choose one choose of the following assessments:
CAAP – minimum score of 3
GRE Writing – minimum score of 4.0
MAT – minimum score of 30
Praxis I Writing (PPST or CBT) – minimum score of 174
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.

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

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

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

---

## 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 impact on student learning and support of an environment that supports learning.

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

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

**Results of Evaluation**
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 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 content knowledge the Mississippi Department of Education requires for Alternate - Route Teacher Education candidates through the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree Program.

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

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

**Results of Evaluation**
100% of the Cohort VIII candidates passed the comprehensive examination during the Spring 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.

Trends Noted

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

**Data Collection (Evidence)**
1. During the CEL/CUR 650 *Dimensions of Learning/Internship* candidates will be evaluated on their ability to plan instruction using Domain I: Planning and Preparation of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) for spring and fall 2011. The instrument is used statewide to

measure teacher candidates' abilities. The Cohort VI and Cohort VII candidates were trained on this instrument during their first semester in the program.

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

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

3. TaskStream reports provide descriptive statistical analyses.

**Results of Evaluation**
The M.A.T. candidates were evaluated by 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.

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

| 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 | 3 | 2 | 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 | 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 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

| 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 |
| 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 | 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. 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.

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

| 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 | 3 | 2 | 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 | 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 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

| 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 |
| 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 | 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 impact on student learning.

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

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

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

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

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

3. Descriptive statistics will be calculated using TaskStream.

**Results of Evaluation**
Since the beginning of the program, candidates in the M.A.T. Program were introduced to Teacher Work Sample (TWS) methodology during one of the first courses taken in the program, CEL/CUR 612 *Development, Assessment, and Evaluation*. During 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.

Trends Noted:
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.

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

| 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 |
| avgs | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

| 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 professional dispositions of an effective educator.

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

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

3. TaskStream reports provided descriptive statistical analyses.

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

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

Trends Noted
Trends over the last four years continue to show higher ratings during the Spring semester for all M.A.T. candidates. I believe it is a result of having a full semester of teaching in their 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-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**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%) |
| **Self Assessment ISLLC/ELCC1**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.0/4 (75.00%) |
| **Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC2**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%) |
| **Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC3**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00 |
| **Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC4**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%) |
| **Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC5**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Self Assessment ILSSC/ELCC6**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.00/4 (75.00%) |
| **Field Experiences**<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=3.25/4 (81.25%) |
| Situational Analysis<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=2.75/4 (68.75%) |
| Other Samples and Artifacts<br>**Folio Area:**Exit Portfolio: Exit Portfolio Rubric--Current<br>**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<br>**Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=2.0/3 (66.67%) |
| **The Beief That All Students Can Learn**<br>**Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=2.33/3 (76.6%) |
| **Professionalism**<br>**Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial | **Avg.**=2.0/3 (66.67%) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **DRF**<br>**Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | |
| **Resourcefulness**<br>**Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial<br>**DRF**<br>**Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=2.00/3 (66.67%) |
| Dependability<br>**Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial<br>**DRF**<br>**Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 | **Avg.**=2.00/3 (66.67%) |
| **Commitment to Inquiry**<br>**Folio Area:**Dispositions Rating Scale: DRS--Initial<br>**DRF**<br>**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** |
|---|
| **Number of Clinical Correlations**<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| Relation to Anchors & Standards<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| Educational Issues and Descriptions<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| Mechanics |

**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 1
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

**Average of 5 Criterion Average**

**Clinical Correlations 2**

**Rubric Criteria**

**Number of Clinical Correlations**
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

Relation to Anchors & Standards
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

Educational Issues and Descriptions
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

Mechanics
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 2
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

**Average of 5 Criterion Average**

**Clinical Correlations 3**

**Rubric Criteria**

**Number of Clinical Correlations**
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

Relation to Anchors & Standards
**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3
**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011

| |
|---|
| Educational Issues and Descriptions<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| Alternate Actions, Implications, and Reflections<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| Mechanics<br>**Folio Area:**Clinical Correlations: Clinical Correlations 3<br>**DRF Template:**Educational Leadership 2010-2011 |
| **Average of 5 Criterion Average** |

**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.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

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

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

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

**Results of Evaluation**
Spring 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.

Trends Noted
A previous concern with the candidates' ability to explicitly align all lessons with learning goals, integrate physical education and health into the unit lessons, effectively use technology, and foster higher thinking skills was addressed with the following: more explicit and specific online discussions regarding planning effective lessons; targeted course readings; and research assignments that focused on specific aspects of the TIAI indicators. Instructor feedback while planning the unit was also implemented. 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.

<u>Trends Noted</u>

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

**Data Collection (Evidence)**

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

2. Data are collected in TaskStream.

3. TaskStream reports provide means and score distributions.

**Results of Evaluation**

In 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.

Trends Noted
Candidates have consistently demonstrated their ability to accept and meet the needs of diverse learners during literacy instruction.
Using the Disposition Portfolio as a cross reference, candidates demonstrated consistent strengths with the belief that all students can learn. This indicates their understanding that education is interactive and reflective, as well as culturally contextualized and dynamic.

**Use of Evaluation Results**
1 & 2. The lesson 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-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:

| **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%) |

Scores by Question:

| **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 2014 & FALL 2014** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=8 (100%) |
| **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** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=5 (62.5%) | *n*=3 (37.5%) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2014 & FALL 2014** | | | |
| **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 2014 & FALL 2014** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=8 (100%) | *n*=0 (0%) |
| **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*=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%) |
| **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 2014 & FALL 2014 (*N*=8)** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=6 (75%) | *n*=2 (25%) |
| **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) (A), *N*=9 for the third evaluation (Summative) (B), *N*=8.<br><br>A=first rating (Formative), B=third rating (Summative)** | **Did Not Meet Expectations (0)** | **Partially Met Expectations (1)** | **Met Expectations (2)** | **Exceeded Expectations (3)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **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** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=1 (33.33%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=2 (66.67%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)** | | | | |
| **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) Combined (*N*=8)** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=3 (37.5%) | *n*=3 (37.5%) | *n*=2 (25%) |
| | **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)** | *n*=1 (11.11%) | *n*=3 (33.33%) | *n*=4 (44.44%) | *n*=1 (11.11%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Combined (*N*=9)** | | | | |
| **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 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*=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)** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=1 (11.11%) | *n*=6 (66.67%) | *n*=2 (22.22%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Combined (*N*=9)** | | | | |
| **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** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=3 (100%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **rating) (Summative) (*N*=3)** | | | | |
| **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 rating) (Formative (*N*=4)** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=3 (75%) | *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*=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** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=2 (25%) | *n*=6 (75%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(Summative) Combined (*N*=8)** | | | | |
| | **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*=4)** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=4 (100%) | *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*=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)** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=2 (25%) | *n*=4 (50%) | *n*=2 (25%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Combined (*N*=8)** | | | | |
| | **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) 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*=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*=0 (0%) | *n*=1 (33.33%) | *n*=1 (33.33%) | *n*=1 (33.33%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(*N*=3)** | | | | |
| **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*=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*=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) Combined (*N*=9)** | *n*=4 (44.44%) | *n*=4 (44.44%) | *n*=1 (11.11%) | *n*=0 (0%) |
| **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** | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=1 (25%) | *n*=3 (75%) | *n*=0 (0%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **rating) (Formative (*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*=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 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*=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** | *n*=1 (11.11%) | *n*=7 (77.78%) | *n*=1 (11.11%) | *n*=0 (%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(Formative) Combined (*N*=9)** | | | | |
| **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 (Formative) Combined (*N*=9)** | *n*=2 (22.22%) | *n*=2 (22.22%) | *n*=5 (55.56%) | *n*=0 (0%) |
| **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 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*=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)** | *n*=1 (11.11%) | *n*=2 (22.22%) | *n*=6 (66.67%) | *n*=0 (0%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Combined (*N*=9)** | | | | |
| **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*=0 (0%) | *n*=0 (0%) | *n*=5 (100%) | *n*=0 (0%) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(*N*=5)** | | | | |
| **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<br>2=Emerging<br>3=Developing<br>4=Achieving** | **Formal Assessment** | **Informal Assessment*** | **Assessment for Long-Term Planning** |
|---|---|---|---|
| ***Spring 2014** | | | |
| **Fall 2014** | 1=Adequate<br>*n*=0 (0%)<br>2=Emerging<br>*n*=2 (18.18%)<br>3=Developing<br>*n*=6 (54.55%)<br>4=Achieving<br>*n*=3<br>(27.27%)<br><br>(*N*=11) | 1=Adequate<br>*n*=0 (0%)<br>2=Emerging<br>*n*=2 (16.67%)<br>3=Developing<br>*n*=2 (16.67%)<br>4=Achieving<br>*n*=8 (66.67%)<br><br>(*N*=12) | 1=Adequate<br>*n*=0 (0%)<br>2=Emerging<br>*n*=0 (0%)<br>3=Developing<br>*n*=2 (40%)<br>4=Achieving<br>*n*=3 (60%)<br><br>(*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 content knowledge associated with the Council for Exceptional Children Standards as measured by the Education of Exceptional Children: Core Content Knowledge (0354), Cutoff score 142.

**Data Collection (Evidence)**
Candidates entering the program may be divided into three categories. One subgroup includes individuals who have completed an undergraduate degree in special education. These candidates have already met the Praxis Specialty Area requirement. The second subgroup includes individuals with undergraduate degrees in other areas of education. These individuals are advised to take the Praxis examination upon completion of 15-18 hours of coursework. In the last subgroup, members have undergraduate degrees in areas other than education. Some have already passed the special education Praxis examination due to requirements for alternate licensure in Mississippi. Others are full time students and are advised to take the Praxis examination upon completion of 15-18 hours of coursework. The Praxis examination must be passed in order to register for comprehensive examinations.

**Results of Evaluation**
Summary of Results:

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.<br>Did not meet standard: score is not in average range<br>Met standard: score is in average range<br>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<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1 | Did not meet standard *n*=1<br><br>Met standard *n*=3<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=2<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=2<br><br>Met standard *n*=1<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1 | Did not meet standard *n*=2<br><br>Met standard *n*=1<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1 | 153-180 (cutoff 142) |
| **Summer 2014 *N*=5*** | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=4<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=4<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=3<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1 | Did not meet standard *n*=1<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1 | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=3<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1 | 165-183 (cutoff 142) |
| **FALL 2014 *N*=3*** | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=1<br><br>Met standard *n*=1<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | Did not meet standard *n*=0<br><br>Met standard *n*=2<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0 | 153-171 (cutoff 152) |
| **Total 2014 *N*=12*** | Did not meet standard *n*=1 | Did not meet | Did not meet | Did not meet | Did not meet standard *n*=2 | 153-180 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Met standard *n*=8<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1<br><br>90% met or exceeded standard | standard *n*= 1<br><br>Met standard *n*=9<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=0<br><br>90% met or exceeded standard | standard *n*=3<br><br>Met standard *n*=5<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=1<br><br>60% met or exceeded standard | standard *n*=3<br><br>Met standard *n*=5<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=2<br><br>70% met or exceeded standard | Met standard *n*=6<br><br>Exceeded Standard *n*=2<br><br>80% 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.

## 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.

## Unit Goals

### 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**

*Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report*
*Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research*

## Section IV.a
## Brief Description
## Narrative

**Brief Description and/or Narrative of programmatic scope:**

Teacher Education Programs

- Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education - This degree provides initial licensure in grades Kindergarten through 6. Supplemental endorsements for middle level grades lead to licensure in grades 7-8. The program is available at the Cleveland campus, with a few courses offered at additional sites. In the Spring 2009 Semester a 2+2 Program with Hinds Community College was begun; most courses in the 2+2 Program are taught as hybrids with a few totally online. In 2013 an agreement was reached with Holmes Community College to implement a 2 + 2 program in the same area also.
- Master of Education Degree in Elementary Education – This program is available online. The purpose of the program is to prepare quality teachers who can teach at all levels of the elementary school.
- Educational Specialist Degree in Elementary Education – Beginning with the Spring 2009 Semester, this program has been totally online. The purpose of the program is to prepare quality elementary teachers who can function effectively and provide leadership for fellow teachers at both the primary and intermediate levels.
- Master of Education in Special Education – This program is intended for teachers with class A licensure in Special Education and is an online program. The program's mission is to advance the training of teachers to work with children and youth with mild/moderate disabilities. The program is structured to allow teachers who already hold initial licensure in Special Education and other areas to be awarded the M. Ed. Degree and help them earn a class AA license.
- Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) – The MAT is an alternate-route program designed for promising individuals with non-education degrees who want to become teachers. It leads to a class A license after the first summer's courses and then to a Master of Arts in Teaching Degree and Mississippi AA licensure.
  The program is online. The program offers an emphasis in Elementary Education (Grades 4 – 6), Special Education, Non-licensure and Secondary Education (Grades 7 - 12).
- Educational Leadership Programs - The following graduate degree programs are available for the preparation of educational administrators and supervisors: Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision – Public School Emphasis (full-time cohort program), Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision – Independent School Emphasis, and Educational Specialist in Educational Administration and Supervision (online).Each of these degree programs is designed to help develop effective school leaders at levels of public and private education.
- The Doctor of Education in Professional Studies Program has tracks in Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, Higher Education, and Counselor Education. These programs are designed to give students an in depth understanding of teaching and leadership as related to the concentration of the student's choice.

## Section IV.b
## Comparative data
Enrollment, CHP, majors, graduation rates, expenditures, trends, etc.
## Narrative

| CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer 2014 | | Fall 2014 | | Spring 2015 | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| AED | 0 | 417 | 0 | 411 | 0 | 480 |
| CAD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEL | 96 | 201 | 1299 | 300 | 1089 | 297 |
| CML | 102 | 0 | 87 | 9 | 51 | 21 |
| CRD | 84 | 57 | 258 | 0 | 162 | 57 |
| CSD | 0 | 39 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| CSP | 117 | 186 | 309 | 147 | 321 | 99 |
| CUR | 0 | 13631 | 392 | 269 | 261 | 210 |
| EDL | 0 | 54 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 84 |
| ELR | 0 | 327 | 0 | 430 | 0 | 333 |
| SUP | 0 | 93 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 45 |
| Total | 399 | 15005 | 2345 | 1740 | 1884 | 1626 |

| ENROLLMENT BY MAJOR | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer 2014 | | Fall 2014 | | Spring 2015 | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| Educ. Admin. and Supervision | 0 | 86 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 91 |
| Elementary Education | 87 | 86 | 219 | 92 | 189 | 87 |
| Professional Studies | 0 | 95 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 99 |
| Special Education | 0 | 35 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 21 |
| Teaching Alternate | 0 | 31 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 |
| Total | 87 | 333 | 219 | 325 | 189 | 306 |

** Note that there was 1 additional student enrolled in Elementary Education as a second major in Summer 2014.*

| 2014/15 Graduates | |
|---|---|
| Educ. Admin. And Supervision | |
| EdS | 22 |
| MED | 2 |
| Elementary Education | |
| BSE | 50 |
| EdS | 15 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **MED** | **32** |
| **Professional Studies** | |
| **EdD** | **7** |
| **Special Education** | |
| **MED** | **11** |
| **Teaching (Alternate Route)** | |
| **MAT** | **9** |

Elementary Education remains the majority of our undergraduate enrollment for the fall and spring semesters. We do have some enrollment in the secondary education courses and in the special education minor courses. The special education courses may grow with the correction of the error that deleted the minor from the catalog last year.

At the graduate level we have elementary education (MA and EdS), leadership (MA and EdS) and doctoral (EdD) programming that makes up the majority of our enrollment. The MAT program has started to implement the two new tracks (special education and non-licensure). This along with some different marketing strategies has led to a boom in admitted MAT students that will be reflected in the next data cycle.

We will be piloting the implementation of a university-wide enhanced advising and support system that will hopefully add to our already high level of advising with our students. This will be helpful with retention of students, and also with ease of connectivity for coordinators and advisors with the students in their programs.

See Appendices:
Secondary Education AY data
Secondary Education Trend data
Teacher Education AY data
Teacher Education Trend data

## Section IV.c
## Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress Narrative

**Diversity Compliance Initiatives and Progress:**

- A racial minority faculty member is the Coordinator of the graduate Elementary Education Programs and one is Director of the School Leadership Pipeline in Educational Administration and Supervision. All of our work study students and Graduate Assistants were racial minorities. Looking forward a finalist for one of the two positions currently open is also a racial minority.
- The Masters of Arts in Teaching, Special Education, M.Ed. in Educational Administration and Supervision, and Educational Specialist Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program have attracted "other race"* students from across the Delta region. The online Master's and Educational Specialist Degree Programs in Elementary Education have attracted "other race" students from across the Delta region, the State of Mississippi, and adjoining states.
- The Division had alternative course offerings during the past academic year through intersession courses, online courses, hybrids, and intense schedules in an effort to accommodate nontraditional students, working students, or those with other encumbrances that might make traditional course offerings difficult to access.
- *Since the majority of Delta State University's faculty, staff and students are classified as "White," the term "other race," as used above, is to be defined as including those individuals classified by

the U.S. Census Bureau as American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander.

## Section IV.d
## Economic Development Initiatives and Progress
## Narrative

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

The online Master of Elementary Education and Educational Specialist in Elementary Education Degree Programs continue to draw new students. Another group of candidates graduated from the Delta State University/Hinds Community College 2+2 in Elementary Education Degree Program graduated. The Ed.S. in Educational Administration and Supervision Degree Program and the Ed. D programs continued to grow through the provision of online and blended course offerings.

## Section IV.e
## Grants, Contracts, Partnerships, Other Accomplishments
## Narrative

**Grants, Contracts, Partnerships, Other Accomplishments:**

- The Literacy Across the Curriculum: Institute for Teachers in Grades 6 – 12 (LACI), funded by a $89,447 IHL grant, provided training for Delta area teachers in the incorporation of literacy skills in the content areas. Dr. Merideth Van Namen, a current faculty member, is the director of the Institute.
- The Delta State University/Tishomingo County School District Partnership received a grant from the Tri-State Educational Foundation to assist in funding tuition for Northeast Mississippi teachers to receive a Master of Education in Elementary Education Degree starting in August 2014. During the 2013 – 2014 academic year, the Ed. S. cohort programs in Elementary Education, Administration and Supervision, Ed. D. program in Professional Studies, and a Master of Education in Elementary Education sponsored by the Tri-State Foundation completed the cycle of courses. Tri-State also funded a part time cohort of 10 students to begin in Fall of 201. Additionally, the Ferguson Fellowship Program was completed with the support of the Tri-State Foundation to further the education of two practicing administrators each year. Dr. Corlis Snow coordinates the program in Elementary Education, Dr. Terry Harbin coordinated the program in Administration and Supervision and the Ferguson Fellowship Program, and Dr. Jacqueline Craven coordinates the doctoral program.
- The DSU/HCC Partnership Elementary Education Partnership is a 2+2 partnership between the Hinds Community College and the undergraduate Elementary Education Program. The program began in the Spring 2009 Semester and provides graduates of Hinds Community College and other residents of Hinds and surrounding counties the opportunity to complete a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Degree from Delta State University. Mrs. Terry Parrish coordinates this partnership. An additional 2+2 program in Elementary Education was also investigated with Holmes Community College.
- The College of Education and Human Sciences under the direction of Dean Leslie Griffin obtained a $1,000,000 grant from the United States Department of Education to be funded over a five year period to train school administrators in the Mississippi Delta.The director of this grant was Dr. Jennifer Wilson.

- Service Learning Data (list of projects, number of students involved, total service learning hours, accomplishments, etc.): Two undergraduate Elementary Education student organizations (Mississippi Early Childhood Association, Mississippi Association of Middle Level Educators) participated in various projects to help children in selected local schools.
- Ferguson Fellowship

## Section IV.f
## Service Learning Data

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

### Narrative

Various undergraduate elementary education courses conduct service learning experiences in the local classrooms. Among these projects are one-on-one reading interventions of students based on a prescribed, instructor-led, visits to the schools.

## Section IV.g
## Strategic Plan Data

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

### Narrative

**Strategic Plan Data:**

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

## Section IV.h
## Committees Reporting To Unit

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

### Narrative

**Committees Reporting To Unit:**

- The Division Chair is also chair of the Teacher Education Council (TEC) which is the policy-making body for all undergraduate Teacher Preparation Programs at Delta State University. Membership is made up of representatives from the Teacher Preparation Programs, P-12 teachers and administrators, community college faculty, community leaders and P- 12 parents, and undergraduate and graduate teacher education candidates. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE/CAEP shared drive. An equivalent organization, the Graduate Professional Education Council (GPEC), is the policy making body for all graduate programs in Teacher Education. The Teacher Education Advisory Committee was also established to ensure input from the community at large concerning ways to improve all aspects of our teacher education programs.
- The Division Curriculum Committee is made up of the division chair, who also chairs the committee; the Program Coordinators; undergraduate and graduate teacher and administrator candidates, and P-12 representatives. The committee reviews and approves all curriculum changes

made to courses in the Division. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE/CAEP shared drive.

- The Assessment Committee for the unit is currently chaired by Dr. Cheryl Cummins and Dr. Marilyn Feldman. This committee guides the development and refinement of candidate performance assessments and the Unit Assessment System used to collect, analyze, and disseminate data on candidate performance. Committee records are archived in the Division Office and on the College of Education NCATE/CAEP shared drive.
- The Ed.D. Program Coordinator, Dr. Jacqueline Craven, is chair of the Doctoral Admission and Curriculum Council, which is the policy-making council for the Ed.D. Program.Committee records are maintained in the Ed.D. Program Coordinator's Office and on the College of Education NCATE/CAEP shared drive.
- Dr. Tom Brady, interim chair of the Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, and Research serves as chair of the Teacher Education Advisory Committee.

## Section V.a
## Faculty (Accomplishments)

Noteworthy activities and accomplishments

## Narrative

**Faculty Accomplishments**

Publications

Kuykendall, M. (2014). *Diverse perspectives on culturally responsive teaching strategies.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Research Association, Knoxville, TN.

Presentations

Cabrera, J. (2014). "Using Evaluation to Enhance a New Principal Certification Program." Consortium for Research on Educational Assessment and Teaching Effectiveness Conference, Williamsburg, VA.

Wang, Y., Shuttlesworth, D., and Craven, J. (October 2014). On Beginning to Use the English Language Arts Standards of the Common Core State Standards: What Mississippi Delta Teachers Say. Presented at CREATE annual meeting.

Hartley, V. & Street, S. (2015). *I CARE; Special Education Teachers and Goodness of Fit.* Mississippi Council for Exceptional Children 2015 Conference, Biloxi, MS.

Hartley, V. & Street, S. (2014). *It's a Parade, Not a Circus: RTI and IEP...Oh, My*! Mississippi Council for Exceptional Children 2014 Conference, Biloxi, MS.

Kuykendall, M., Myers, A. M., Phillips, M., Rucker, T., & Swindol, W. (2014). *Teacher action research on cultural responsiveness, Spring 2014*. Presented at the 32st annual Delta State University. F.E. Woodall Spring Conference for Helping Professions, Cleveland, MS.

Powers, A., Van Namen, M., Watkins, T., Delta State University Teacher Education Candidates. (2014). *Brains at work: Building and organizing knowledge through virtual experiences and thinking maps.* Presentation at the Mississippi Reading Association Conference: Literacy Construction Zone: Building, Scaffolding, and Landscaping Knowledge. Biloxi, MS.

Van Namen, M., Powers, A., Watkins, T., et. al. (2014). *Brains at Work: Building and Organizing Knowledge through Virtual Experiences and Thinking Maps.* Presented at the Mississippi Reading Association annual conference. Biloxi, MS

Watkins, T. (2014). *Culturally responsive teaching in diverse classrooms.* Presentation given at the Mississippi Association for Middle Level Educators Annual Conference, Tupelo, MS.

Collaboration

Reviewer, AERA Annual Conference Submissions (Craven
Reviewer, Delta Journal of Education (Craven, Harbin, Watkins)
Reviewer, MSERA Annual Event Submissions (Craven)
Reviewer, National Field Experience Conference (Brady)
Reviewer, Radical Pedagogy Journal (Hartley)
Reviewer, Routledge Publications (Craven)
Reviewer, SAGE Publications (Harbin, Hartley)
A to Z Conference Planning Committee (Powers)
Praxis I & II Workshop Coordinator (Powers, Thomas, Van Namen)
Instructional Rounds Institute at Harvard Graduate School of Education Attendee (Cabrera, Harbin)
Reading Fair Judge (Powers)
Janie Allen-Bradley Literacy Event (Powers, Van Namen, Watkins)
DSU Hamilton-White Child Development Center Board Member (Van Namen)
Presentation on job interview success, Delta State University Student Interns (Harbin)
Created the Master of Arts in Teaching Special Education Track Proposal (Hartley)
Presentation of Special Education Process, Delta State University Administrative Cohort Students (Hartley)
Presentation on Multicultural Perspectives, Delta State University Student Interns (Kuykendall)
Presentation on Philosophy of Education and E-Folio, Delta State University Student Interns (Powers)
Presentation on Reading in the Classrooms, Delta State University Administrative Cohort Students (Van Namen)
Evaluator, Student Interns E-Folio Presentations (Powers)
Evaluator, Student Interns Educational Philosophies (Powers)
Evaluator, CEL 318 Students Teaching Unit (Powers)
MDE Regional Literacy Training on LETRS, Attendee (Powers)
Remediation Workshop on Phonemic Awareness, DSU Teacher Education Candidates (Powers)
Redesigned the M.Ed. in Elementary Education (Snow)
Observed and interviewed Teach for America Students (Snow)
West Bolivar Elementary School and Delta State University Partnership Coordinator (Watkins)
2+2 Elementary Education Seamless Transition Partnership with Holmes Community College Coordinator (Watkins)

Technical Assistance/Professional Development Services to Area Schools and Communities
Powers, A., Van Namen, M. (2014). *Classroom management.* Professional Development Workshop presented to the teachers at West Bolivar Elementary School.
Watkins, T. (2014). *Student engagement*. Staff Development given at West Bolivar Elementary School, Rosedale, MS
Watkins, T. (2014). *High Yield Strategies/Higher Order Thinking Skills*. Staff Development at West Bolivar Elementary School, Rosedale, MS
Watkins, T. (2014). *The Principal's Role in the Implementation of the Common Core State Standards (Part 1-3)*. Presentation given for DAAIS and DSU Leadership Cohort, Cleveland, MS.
Watkins, T. (2014). *Time on Task.* Staff Development given at West Bolivar Elementary School, Rosedale, MS.

Training for teachers of Red Cloud Indian School, South Dakota (Brady)
Training for Shannon Middle School on Instructional Rounds (Harbin)
Led student study group for ISLLC Standards Assessment (Harbin)
Families Together Forum, Delta State University (Hartley, Kuykendall)
Guest Speaker, Northwest MS Community College Future Educators Association (Powers)

***Delta State University FY2015 Unit Level Report***
***Department: Teacher Education, Leadership and Research***

Awards

2014 Connected Educator Award (Harbin, Hartley, Snow)

Eloise Walker Faculty Professional Development Scholarship (Powers)

Advisors to Student Organizations

Early Childhood Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Powers)
Mississippi Early Childhood Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Powers)
Future Educators Association – DSU Chapter Advisor (Van Namen, Powers)
Student Association of Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education Advisors (Watkins)
Phi Mu Sorority Advisor (Powers)
Kappa Delta Pi (Snow)
Student Advisory Committee Advisor (Van Namen)

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

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

AERA
Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association for School Curriculum and Development
Collaborative for Effective Education, Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) Leadership Team
Consortium for Research on Educational Assessment and Teacher Effectiveness
Delta Reading Council
Future Educations Association
International Reading Association
Kappa Delta Pi
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Mississippi Early Childhood Association
Mississippi Geography Association
Mississippi Professional Educators
Mississippi Reading Association
Mississippi Special Education Advisory Panel
Mississippi Special Education Task Force
Mixed-Methods International Research Association
Omicron Delta Kappa

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

<u>University</u>

Academic Grievance Committee
Courtesy Committee
College of Education & Human Sciences Curriculum Committee
Diversity Advisory Committee, Secretary
Distance Education Committee
Distance Education Policy Review Committee
DSU Student Publications Committee
DSU Student Organizations Committee
DSU Tenure and Promotion Committee
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Faculty Senate Senator
Faculty Senate Proxy
First Year Experience Steering Committee
Graduate Appeals Committee
Graduate Council
Health and Wellness Committee
IRB
Library Committee
Merit Pay Appeals Committee
Online Teaching and Learning Advisory Group
Safety and Environment Committee
STEM Camp Steering Committee
Student Success Task Force
University Benefits Committee
University Faculty Grievance Committee
Winning the Race Conference, Logistics Committee
Winning the Race Conference, Student Engagement Committee

College
Assessment Committee; Co-Chair, Member
CAEP Assessment Committee, Member
College of Education Enhancement Fund Committee
Doctoral Admission Curriculum Council; Chair, Member
Dissertation Committee; Chair, Member
Graduate Education Program Council
Standard 3 Committee
Various NCATE Committees, Members
Teacher Education Council; Chair, Member
Teacher Education Curriculum Committee

Division
Tenure and Promotion Committee; Chair, Member
Teacher Education Hiring Committees
Teacher Education Curriculum Committee
Teacher Education Council Member
Coordinator's Council: Division of Teacher Education
Special Education Curriculum Committee

## Section V.b
## Staff (Accomplishments)
## Narrative

Staff members attended the following trainings:
Respondus LockDown Browser training
Banner & Argos Training
Electronic Personnel Action Form (EPAF) Training
Degree Audit Training
Statesmen Connect Training
Banner Finance Self-Service Training

Staff members participated in the following development activities:
Reader, Advanced Placement World History Examination (Becker)

Jennifer Wilson- attended data wise and instructional rounds trainings at Harvard during the school year. She, along with a couple of our faculty members, held training with local districts surrounding this topic. Our incoming director of the Pipeline grant will continue this collaboration.

Franco Zengaro- took part in various committee work surrounding the topic of online learning. He led and took part in several small group meetings about how to better implement technology, and performed evaluations of Canvas shells of division courses and made recommendations for better use.

## Section V.c
## Administrators (accomplishments)
## Narrative
**Administrator Accomplishments**
Presentations

Brady, T. (2015). Developing Digital Literacy in Teachers and Teacher Candidates. Presented at Harvard University's 21st Century Learning Forum, Cambridge, MA.

## Section V.d
## Position(s) requested/replaced with justification
## Narrative
**Position(s) Requested/Replaces with Justification**
Dr. Carolyn Casale was hired to replace Tom Brady when he took over as interim chair of the division.
Dr. Janet Parker was hired to replace Dianne Thomas as Assistant Professor of TELR after we failed to fill this position last year.

## Section V.e
## Recommended Change(s) of Status
## Narrative
**Recommended Change(s) of Status**
Dr. Jennifer Wilson resigned effective July 2015 to take the Director of DAAIS position.
Dr. James Harbin resigned effective July 2015.
Dr. Cindy Casebeer's contract was not renewed effective May 2015.

## Section VI.a
## Changes Made in the Past Year
## Narrative
**Changes Made in the Past Year**
Two additional tracks in the MAT were implemented, Special Education and Non-Licensure.
The name of a track in the Ed.D was changed to better fit the needs of students, Curriculum and Instruction.

## Section VI.b
## Recommended Changes for the Coming Year
## Narrative
**Recommended Changes for the Coming Year**
Look at course rotations to optimize availability and enrollment per section.

# Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument

**Teacher Candidate/Intern _____ Semester/Year _____**

**Evaluator _____ Circle One: University/College Supervisor Cooperating Teacher**

## I. PLANNING AND PREPARATION

***Items 1-9 should be assessed from written plans.**

**1. Selects developmentally appropriate objectives for lessons based on state frameworks and best practices. (1, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Objectives based on state frameworks and best practices are not present OR are not stated as performance outcomes and/OR inappropriate for student learning. | Objectives based on state frameworks and best practices are stated as performance outcomes and are appropriate for student learning. | Objectives, based on state frameworks and best practices, are stated as performance outcomes and are planned for different instructional levels and individual needs (DOK Levels, Bloom's, Understanding by Design, etc.). | In addition to **acceptable**, objectives, which are appropriate for student learning, are aligned with assessments. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**2. Plans appropriate teaching procedures. (2, 4, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| No procedures are included, OR procedures are not referenced to objectives. | Procedures are referenced to objectives and are appropriate for students. | Procedures are sequential, clearly referenced to objectives, and appropriate for students. | In addition to **acceptable**, procedures are both learner-centered and teacher-centered. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**3. Selects a variety of appropriate materials and technology for lessons. (1, 2, 6, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Materials and technology are not specified OR are limited to textbooks and worksheets. | Materials and technology other than textbooks and worksheets are specified and related to procedures. | Various types of materials and technology are appropriately integrated and are used effectively to enhance lessons. | In addition to **acceptable**, materials and technology show initiative and creativity in original development. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**4. Prepares appropriate assessment procedures and materials to evaluate learner progress. (7, 8)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Assessment procedures and materials are not specified in the plans OR are inappropriate for students OR are not matched to objectives. | Assessment procedures and materials in plans are related to objectives and appropriate for students. | Multiple assessment procedures and materials are included in plans where needed and assessments directly correlate to objectives and are appropriate for students. | In addition to **acceptable**, informal (performance) and formal assessments and materials are planned including rubrics/checklists. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**5. Uses assessment information (ex. – pretests, quizzes, unit tests, remediation, and enrichment activities) to plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (2, 3, 4, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of students. | Uses assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **some** students. | Uses assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **most** students. | Uses assessment information to plan instruction accommodating differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **all** students. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**6. Uses knowledge of students' backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge (e.g., pretests, learning styles inventories, interest inventories, multiple intelligences surveys, and KWLs) to make instruction relevant and meaningful. (1, 2, 3, 5, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use knowledge of students' backgrounds, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge to make instruction relevant and meaningful. | Demonstrates some understanding of students' background, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge, but does not effectively use the information in developing learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful. | Demonstrates understanding of students' background, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge and effectively uses this knowledge in developing learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful. | Demonstrates a **thorough** understanding of students' background, interests, experiences, and prior knowledge and **effectively and consistently** uses this knowledge in developing learning experiences that are relevant and meaningful. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**7. Integrates knowledge from several subject areas in lessons. (1, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provides instruction that relates to only one subject and focuses on specific skills. | Instruction includes integration of content areas but lessons maintain a discipline centered focus and offer limited assistance in helping students make connections across disciplines. | Instruction includes effective integration of content areas clearly establishing connections across disciplines. | In addition to **acceptable**, creates **innovative** lessons which include activities that assist students in making connections across multiple disciplines. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**8. Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. (3)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not incorporate diversity or multicultural perspectives into lessons. | Ineffectively incorporates diversity into lessons. | Incorporates diversity, including multicultural perspectives, into lessons. | Uses aspects of the world as well as the class make-up to purposefully and effectively incorporate diversity, including multiculturalism, into lesson. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**9. Uses a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons. (1, 6)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| No introductions and/or closures to lessons. | Inconsistently or inappropriately uses introductions and/or closures to lessons. | Consistently and appropriately uses a variety of strategies to introduce and close lessons. Strategies to introduce lessons motivate students and closures accurately summarize the lessons. | In addition to **acceptable**, introductions and closures are creative and innovative. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

## II. COMMUNICATION AND INTERACTION

**10. Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication. (6)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use standard written, oral, and non-verbal communication. | Uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication with multiple errors. | Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication with minimal errors. | Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication proficiently. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**11. Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities. (4)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| No written and/or oral directions for instructional activities are provided. | Provides written and/or oral directions for instructional activities that are vague and/or confusing. | Provides clear, complete written and/or oral directions for instructional activities. | In addition to **acceptable**, uses concrete examples to model and clarify tasks and concepts. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**12. Communicates high expectations for learning to all students. (3)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not communicate high expectations for learning to **all** students. | Inconsistent in communicating to **all** students that they are capable of meeting learning expectations. | Consistent in communicating to **all** students that they are capable of meeting learning expectations. | In addition to **acceptable**, provides a supportive, risk free environment. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**13. Conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning. (1, 5)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not convey enthusiasm for the content being taught. | Conveys limited interest and enthusiasm for the content being taught. | Motivates students by conveying enthusiasm and interest for the content being taught. | In addition to **acceptable**, the motivation, enthusiasm, and interest in the content are evident through students' attitudes, questions, and ability to stay focused on tasks and activities. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**14. Provides opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. (2, 5, 6)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not provide opportunities for the students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning. | Involves the students in interactive learning activities. | Involves students in teacher-planned cooperative group activities in which students are working toward a common goal. | In addition to **acceptable**, frequently plans instruction to include situations for students to work cooperatively on projects/activities of their choice. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**15. Establishes opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians (newsletters, positive notes, extracurricular activities, etc.). (10)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not establish opportunities for communication with parents and/or guardians. | Initiates communication with parents and/or guardians through an introduction. | In addition to **emerging**, maintains communication with parents and/or guardians. | In addition to **acceptable**, consistently communicates with parents and/or guardians for a variety of purposes and in a variety of ways. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

## III. TEACHING FOR LEARNING

**16. Demonstrates knowledge of the subject(s) taught. (1)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not demonstrate basic knowledge of the subject(s) taught. | Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject(s) being taught. | Evidence of thorough subject(s) knowledge is exhibited through minimal reliance on written notes and ability to lead effective class discussions. | In addition to **acceptable**, challenging questions and/or activities relating to subject(s) are included in lessons that demonstrate depth of understanding and knowledge of subject(s). |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**17. Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies (e.g., cooperative learning, discovery learning, demonstration, discussion, inquiry, simulation, etc.) (4)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use a variety of teaching strategies. | Ineffectively uses a variety of teaching strategies. | Effectively uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies. | In addition to **acceptable**, teaching strategies are both teacher-centered and learner-centered. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment** | |

**18. Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e., learning styles, multiple intelligences and enrichment/remedial needs). (2, 3, 4)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not provide learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners. | Inconsistently provides learning experiences that accommodate the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners. | Consistently provides learning experiences that accommodate the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners. | Consistently and **effectively** provides learning experiences that accommodate the developmental and individual needs of diverse learners. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**19. Provides opportunities for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. (4, 6)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| No opportunities are provided for students to apply concepts in problem solving and critical thinking. | Provides opportunities for students to recognize and identify problems. | In addition to **emerging**, provides opportunities for students to propose and test solutions. | In addition to **acceptable**, provides opportunities for students to analyze and evaluate their solutions and to present findings. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**20. Responds to and elicits student input during instruction. (6)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not respond to or elicit student input during instruction AND/OR uses negative words or actions to discourage students from giving responses and asking questions. | Inconsistently responds to and/or elicits student input during instruction. | Consistently and appropriately responds to and elicits student input during instruction. | In addition to **acceptable**, provides appropriate prompts to elicit expanded student responses. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**21. Allows sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses. (2, 4)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not allow sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses. | Inconsistently allows sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses. | Allows sufficient and equitable wait time to encourage students to expand and support their responses. | In addition to **acceptable**, probes and encourages students to expand and support their responses. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**22. Uses higher-order questions to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking. (1, 4, 6)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use questioning to engage students. | Asks questions at the lowest level, gathering and recalling information (knowledge and comprehension). | Asks questions which are designed to apply knowledge, analyze, compare/contrast, or classify data (application, analysis). | In addition to **acceptable**, asks questions which encourage students to think intuitively, creatively, and hypothetically, to use their imaginations, to identify a value system; or to evaluate judgments (synthesis and evaluation). |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**23. Uses family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to enhance student learning. (10)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use family or community resources in lessons. | Limited use of family or community resources in lessons to enhance student learning. | Effectively uses family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning. | In addition to **acceptable**, encourages the students' effective use of family and community resources in lessons to enhance student learning. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

## IV. MANAGEMENT OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

**24. Monitors and adjusts the classroom environment to enhance social relationships, motivation, and learning. (5)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not monitor or adjust the classroom environment. | Demonstrates an awareness of the social relationships and motivational strategies within the classroom, but does not always make adjustments to enhance learning. | Monitors and makes adjustments that are effective in enhancing social relationships, motivation, and learning. | In addition to **acceptable**, monitors students' participation and interpersonal interactions in learning activities and encourages students to develop self-monitoring skills. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**25. Adjusts lessons according to individual student cues, professional reflections, and group responses. (2, 4)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not adjust lessons. | Ineffectively or inconsistently adjusts lessons according to individual student cues, personal reflections, and group responses. | Effectively adjusts lessons according to individual student cues, personal reflections, and group responses. | In addition to **acceptable**, takes advantage of teachable moments to enhance lessons. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**26. Attends to or delegates routine tasks. (5)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not attend to or delegates routine tasks. | Seldom attends to and delegates routine tasks. | Attends to and delegates routine tasks. | In addition to **acceptable,** has a set plan which includes delegating appropriate responsibilities to students who complete these tasks efficiently. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**27. Uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. (5)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not attend to inappropriate student behavior. | Inconsistently uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. | Consistently uses a variety of strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs. | In addition to **acceptable**, uses a variety of strategies that promote cooperation and learning. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**28. Demonstrates fairness and supportiveness in order to achieve a positive, interactive learning environment. (5)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not demonstrate fairness and supportiveness in order to achieve a positive, interactive learning environment. | Inconsistently demonstrates fairness and supportiveness in order to achieve a positive, interactive learning environment. | Consistently demonstrates fairness and supportiveness in the treatment of students and actively encourages fairness among students. | In addition to **acceptable**, creates a positive, interactive learning environment. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**29. Uses instructional time effectively.(5)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use instructional time effectively - Substantial instructional time is spent in non-instructional activities and/or time is wasted during transitions. | Overall pacing and transitions are smooth; however, there are minor problems with effective use of instructional time. | Pacing is appropriate, transitions are smooth, and there are no unnecessary delays or undesirable digressions. | In addition to **acceptable**, students are on-task and engaged in meaningful learning activities. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

## V. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

**30. Communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. (8)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not communicate assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. | Ineffectively communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. | Effectively communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students. | In addition to **acceptable**, various strategies are used to communicate assessment criteria AND/OR student input is sought in developing assessment criteria. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**31. Develops and uses a variety of informal assessments (ex. – pretests, quizzes, checklists, rating scales, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (2, 3, 4, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use a variety of informal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of students. | Occasionally uses informal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **some** of the students. | Uses a variety of informal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **most** students. | Consistently plans and uses informal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **all** students. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**32. Develops and uses a variety of formal assessments (ex. – pretests, quizzes, unit tests, rubrics, remediation, and enrichment activities) to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs. (2, 3, 4, 7)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not use a variety of formal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of students. | Occasionally uses formal assessments to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **some** of the students. | Uses a variety of formal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **most** students. | Consistently plans and uses formal assessment information to accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs of **all** students. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**33. Provides timely feedback on students' academic performance and discusses corrective procedures to be taken. (8)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not provide feedback. | Provides timely feedback on students' academic performance and occasionally discusses corrective procedures. | Consistently provides timely feedback on students' academic performance, discusses corrective procedures, and purposefully uses reinforcement and praise. | In addition to **acceptable**, encourages student conferences and reflections for self-evaluation. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**34. Maintains records of student work and performance and appropriately communicates student progress. (10)**

| Unacceptable (0) | Emerging (1) | Acceptable (2) | Target (3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Does not maintain records of student work or performance. | Maintains limited records of student work and performance and attempts to communicate student progress. | Maintains adequate records of student work and performance and communicates student progress in a timely manner. | Maintains detailed records of student work and performance, communicates student progress and helps students develop self-evaluation processes. |
| **First Assessment →** | **Score:** | **Second Assessment →** | **Score:** |
| **Comments on Effectiveness** | | | |
| **First Assessment:** | | **Second Assessment:** | |

**Contextual Factors Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard***: The teacher uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals, plan instruction and assess learning.*

| **Rating →**<br>**Indicator ↓** | **1**<br>**Indicator Not Met** | **2**<br>**Indicator Partially Met** | **3**<br>**Indicator Met** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors** | Teacher displays minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom. | Teacher displays some knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning. | Teacher displays a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning. | |
| **Knowledge of Characteristics of Students** | Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/ disabilities). | Teacher displays general knowledge of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/ disabilities) that may affect learning. | Teacher displays general & specific understanding of student differences (e.g., development, interests, culture, abilities/ disabilities) that may affect learning. | |
| **Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning** | Teacher displays minimal, stereotypical, or irrelevant knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities). | Teacher displays general knowledge about the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities). | Teacher displays general & specific understanding of the different ways students learn (e.g., learning styles, learning modalities) that may affect learning. | |
| **Knowledge of Students' Skills And Prior Learning** | Teacher displays little or irrelevant knowledge of students' skills and prior learning. | Teacher displays general knowledge of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning. | Teacher displays general & specific understanding of students' skills and prior learning that may affect learning. | |
| **Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment** | Teacher does not provide implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics OR provides inappropriate implications. | Teacher provides general implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics. | Teacher provides specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics. | |

**Learning Goals Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard***: The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals.*

| **Rating →**<br>**Indicator ↓** | **1**<br>**Indicator Not Met** | **2**<br>**Indicator Partially Met** | **3**<br>**Indicator Met** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Significance, Challenge and Variety** | Goals reflect only one type or level of learning. | Goals reflect several types or levels of learning but lack significance or challenge. | Goals reflect several types or levels of learning and are significant and challenging. | |
| **Clarity** | Goals are not stated clearly and are activities rather than learning outcomes. | Some of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes. | Most of the goals are clearly stated as learning outcomes. | |
| **Appropriate-ness for Students** | Goals are not appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; or other student needs. | Some goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs | Most goals are appropriate for the development; pre-requisite knowledge, skills, experiences; and other student needs. | |
| **Alignment with National, State or Local Standards** | Goals are not aligned with national, state or local standards. | Some goals are aligned with national, state or local standards. | Most of the goals are explicitly aligned with national, state or local standards. | |

**Assessment Plan Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard*****: The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.***

| **Rating →**<br>**Indicator ↓** | **1**<br>**Indicator Not Met** | **2**<br>**Indicator Partially Met** | **3**<br>**Indicator Met** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alignment with Learning Goals and Instruction** | Content and methods of assessment lack congruence with learning goals or lack cognitive complexity. | Some of the learning goals are assessed through the assessment plan, but many are not congruent with learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. | Each of the learning goals is assessed through the assessment plan; assessments are congruent with the learning goals in content and cognitive complexity. | |
| **Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Performance** | The assessments contain no clear criteria for measuring student performance relative to the learning goals. | Assessment criteria have been developed, but they are not clear or are not explicitly linked to the learning goals. | Assessment criteria are clear and are explicitly linked to the learning goals. | |
| **Multiple Modes and Approaches** | The assessment plan includes only one assessment mode and does not assess students before, during, and after instruction. | The assessment plan includes multiple modes but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability. | The assessment plan includes multiple assessment modes (including performance assessments, lab reports, research projects, etc.) and assesses student performance throughout the instructional sequence. | |
| **Technical Soundness** | Assessments are not valid; scoring procedures are absent or inaccurate; items or prompts are poorly written; directions and procedures are confusing to students. | Assessments appear to have some validity. Some scoring procedures are explained; some items or prompts are clearly written; some directions and procedures are clear to students. | Assessments appear to be valid; scoring procedures are explained; most items or prompts are clearly written; directions and procedures are clear to students. | |
| **Adaptations Based on the Individual Needs of Students** | Teacher does not adapt assessments to meet the individual needs of students or these assessments are inappropriate. | Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of some students. | Teacher makes adaptations to assessments that are appropriate to meet the individual needs of most students. | |

**Design for Instruction Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard*: The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.***

| Rating → Indicator↓ | 1 Indicator Not Met | 2 Indicator Partially Met | 3 Indicator Met | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alignment with Learning Goals** | Few lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Few learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Not all learning goals are covered in the design. | Most lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. Most learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. Most learning goals are covered in the design. | All lessons are explicitly linked to learning goals. All learning activities, assignments and resources are aligned with learning goals. All learning goals are covered in the design. | |
| **Accurate Representation of Content** | Teacher's use of content appears to contain numerous inaccuracies. Content seems to be viewed more as isolated skills and facts rather than as part of a larger conceptual structure. | Teacher's use of content appears to be mostly accurate. Shows some awareness of the big ideas or structure of the discipline. | Teacher's use of content appears to be accurate. Focus of the content is congruent with the big ideas or structure of the discipline. | |
| **Lesson and Unit Structure** | The lessons within the unit are not logically organized organization (e.g., sequenced). | The lessons within the unit have some logical organization and appear to be somewhat useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. | All lessons within the unit are logically organized and appear to be useful in moving students toward achieving the learning goals. | |
| **Use of a Variety of Instruction, Activities, Assignments and Resources** | Little variety of instruction, activities, assignments, and resources. Heavy reliance on textbook or single resource (e.g., work sheets). | Some variety in instruction, activities, assignments, or resources but with limited contribution to learning. | Significant variety across instruction, activities, assignments, and/or resources. This variety makes a clear contribution to learning. | |
| **Use of Contextual Information and Data to Select Appropriate and Relevant Activities, Assignments and Resources** | Instruction has not been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Activities and assignments do not appear productive and appropriate for each student. | Some instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Some activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student. | Most instruction has been designed with reference to contextual factors and pre-assessment data. Most activities and assignments appear productive and appropriate for each student. | |
| **Use of Technology** | Technology is inappropriately used OR teacher does not use technology | Teacher uses technology but it does not make a significant contribution to teaching and learning | Teacher integrates appropriate technology that makes a significant contribution to teaching and learning | |

**Instructional Decision-Making Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard:** ***The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.***

| **Rating →**<br>**Indicator ↓** | **1**<br>**Indicator Not Met** | **2**<br>**Indicator Partially Met** | **3**<br>**Indicator Met** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sound Professional Practice** | Many instructional decisions are inappropriate and not pedagogically sound. | Instructional decisions are mostly appropriate, but some decisions are not pedagogically sound. | Most instructional decisions are pedagogically sound (i.e., they are likely to lead to student learning). | |
| **Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning** | Teacher treats class as "one plan fits all" with no modifications. | Some modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs, but these are not based on the analysis of student learning, best practice, or contextual factors. | Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address individual student needs. These modifications are informed by the analysis of student learning/performance, best practice, or contextual factors. Include explanation of why the modifications would improve student progress. | |
| **Congruence Between Modifications and Learning Goals** | Modifications in instruction lack congruence with learning goals. | Modifications in instruction are somewhat congruent with learning goals. | Modifications in instruction are congruent with learning goals. | |

**Analysis of Student Learning Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard:** ***The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.***

| **Rating →**<br>**Indicator ↓** | **1**<br>**Indicator Not Met** | **2**<br>**Indicator Partially Met** | **3**<br>**Indicator Met** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Clarity and Accuracy of Presentation** | Presentation is not clear and accurate; it does not accurately reflect the data. | Presentation is understandable and contains few errors. | Presentation is easy to understand and contains no errors of representation. | |
| **Alignment with Learning Goals** | Analysis of student learning is not aligned with learning goals. | Analysis of student learning is partially aligned with learning goals and/or fails to provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to the goals for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals. | Analysis is fully aligned with learning goals and provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for the whole class, subgroups, and two individuals. | |
| **Interpretation of Data** | Interpretation is inaccurate, and conclusions are missing or unsupported by data. | Interpretation is technically accurate, but conclusions are missing or not fully supported by data. | Interpretation is meaningful, and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data. | |
| **Evidence of Impact on Student Learning** | Analysis of student learning fails to include evidence of impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals. | Analysis of student learning includes incomplete evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of numbers of students who achieved and made progress toward learning goals. | Analysis of student learning includes evidence of the impact on student learning in terms of number of students who achieved and made progress toward each learning goal. | |

**Reflection and Self-Evaluation Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard*****: The teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.***

| **Rating →**<br>**Indicator ↓** | **1**<br>**Indicator Not Met** | **2**<br>**Indicator Partially Met** | **3**<br>**Indicator Met** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Interpretation of Student Learning** | No evidence or reasons provided to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. | Provides evidence but no (or simplistic, superficial) reasons or hypotheses to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. | Uses evidence to support conclusions drawn in "Analysis of Student Learning" section. Explores multiple hypotheses for why some students did not meet earning goals. l | |
| **Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment** | Provides no rationale for why some activities or assessments were more successful than others. | Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities or assessments and superficially explores reasons for their success or lack thereof (no use of theory or research). | Identifies successful and unsuccessful activities and assessments and provides plausible reasons (based on theory or research) for their success or lack thereof. | |
| **Alignment Among Goals, Instruction and Assessment** | Does not connect learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction and/or the connections are irrelevant or inaccurate. | Connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction, but misunderstandings or conceptual gaps are present. | Logically connects learning goals, instruction, and assessment results in the discussion of student learning and effective instruction. | |
| **Implications for Future Teaching** | Provides no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment. | Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment but offers no rationale for why these changes would improve student learning. | Provides ideas for redesigning learning goals, instruction, and assessment and explains why these modifications would improve student learning. | |
| **Implications for Professional Development** | Provides no professional learning goals or goals that are not related to the insights and experiences described in this section. | Presents professional learning goals that are not strongly related to the insights and experiences described in this section and/or provides a vague plan for meeting the goals. | Presents a small number of professional learning goals that clearly emerge from the insights and experiences described in this section. Describes specific steps to meet these goals. | |

**Design for Instruction in Elementary Education Rubric**

**Teacher Work Sample Standard:** ***The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts in elementary education.***

| Rating Indicator | 1<br>Indicator Not Met | 2<br>Indicator Partially Met | 3<br>Indicator Met | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alignment with Mississippi Curricular Standards** | Few lessons are explicitly linked to the Mississippi Curricular Standards. | Most lessons are explicitly linked to the Mississippi Curricular Standards. | All lessons are explicitly linked to the Mississippi Curricular Standards. | |
| **Selection and Integration of Content** | The plans for the unit are generic to the grade level, with little or no connection between the various content areas. Goals for IEPS are absent from the plans. | The plans for the unit are generic to the grade level, with partial integration of language arts/reading, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, and physical education. Goals from IEPs are minimal or absent from the plans. | The teacher creates plans where all children can learn, integrating the content areas of elementary education (language arts/reading, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, physical education) and goals from IEPs into daily activities and routines. | |
| **Language Arts and Reading** | The language arts and reading lesson are separate from the other subjects and isolated from other learning experiences. | The lessons provide a limited focus on the various types of language arts and reading purposes and activities. | The lessons provide specific activities that help students identify the various purposes of reading and writing (narrative, expository, technical, and persuasive) and speaking, listening, and viewing. | |
| **Mathematics and Science** | Math and science are taught at the knowledge level with primary focus on memorization of facts. | Memorization of facts is supplemented with isolated problems and application of knowledge. | Describe the use of inquiry in mathematics and science lessons, connecting both to real life situations allowing for discover and application of knowledge. | |
| **Social Science** | The social sciences are taught incidentally or add on to the classroom activities. | The social sciences are taught as separate aspects of culture with the use of single sources to | Describe how the social sciences connect various elements of culture and the use of | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | study relevant events, processes, people, and regions. | resources, data, sources, and tools are used to interpret information. | |
| **The Arts** | The arts activities are left to the special area teacher. | The arts activities seem contrived and an add-on to the regular classroom. | The teacher describes the strategies that actively engage students in creating, performing and responding to the arts. | |
| **Physical Education** | The P.E. and movement activities are left to the special area teacher. | The teacher provides for outdoor play and P.E., but doesn't incorporate information about a healthy lifestyle. | The teacher describes the activities and strategies for healthy lifestyles that include play and physical activity. | |
| **Health** | Health integration is left to the special area teacher. | The lessons provide a limited focus on health integration into the daily routine. | The teacher describes the activities and strategies for healthy lifestyles. | |
| **Selection of Instructional Materials** | Little or no information is provided on how and why reading and curriculum materials were selected. | The teacher describes how they evaluated or why they selected the reading and curriculum materials used in the lesson. | The teacher describes the evaluation procedure and selected the appropriateness of the reading and curriculum materials used in the lessons. | |

**Scoring Guide/Description for CRD 326, *Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties, Reading Case Study***

**Part I- *Reading Case Study (RCS)* Components/Requirements**

**I. Student Data**

Provide the following information on the child: name, age, gender, grade, teacher, school, town, state, examiner's name, and dates of testing.

**_____ (5 points)**

**II. Background Information**

Provide a description of the family situation (e.g., number of brothers and sisters, parents, others residing in the home). Give a brief social history to include interests of the child both in and out of school. **[ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 5.4]**

**_____ (10 points)**

**III. General Observations**

Describe the testing circumstances, including the number of sittings and the child's attitude, behavior, and appearance during testing. Describe the child's general attitude toward reading, school, and self. **[ACEI 1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 4]**

**_____ (5 points)**

**IV. Tests Administered and Results**

Identify tests you have administered as part of this diagnosis. List all the tests you actually gave and report results as appropriate to each section. **[ACEI 4]**

**_____ (10 points)**

**V. Analysis**

Interpret the student's performance in each of the areas evaluated. Present this information by describing the student's strengths and weaknesses and providing a summary in outline form. Rather than reporting each error, provide specific examples to support identified strengths and weaknesses appropriately. **[ACEI 4, 5.1, 5.2]**

**_____ (10 points)**

**VI. Field Experiences (Teaching)**

Complete the development of four lesson plans for implementation through tutorial sessions. A scoring guide is attached for reference both during the planning of the lessons and their implementation during supervised tutorial sessions.* **[ACEI 1, 2.1, 3.1-3.5, 4, 5.2] (50 points)**

**VII. Summary and Recommendations**

State the reading strengths and weakness of the student, listing them sequentially in order of the areas evaluated. Provide a list of recommendations for areas of remediation. The list of recommendations should be presented in priority order, with the most important areas listed first. **[ACEI 4, 5.1, 5.2]**

**_____ (10 points)**

**_____ (100 points) Total Points Earned**

DISPOSITIONS RATING SCALE
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Student Name _____

Rater _____ Date _____

Circle Program: Art Elementary English Mathematics Music P. E. Science Social Science

Directions: Use the Appraisal Scale to rate each of the five Dispositions. The Indicators (e.g., 1.1, 1.2) provide clarification. Provide evidence in the last column for ratings of 0, 1, or 3.

Appraisal Scale:

0 – Does not meet expectations 1 – Meets a few expectations but not sufficient

2 – Meets expectations 3 – Exceeds expectations

| Characteristic (Disposition) | Rating of Disposition | Evidence for 0, 1, or 3 Rating |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Fairness<br>1.1 Strives to meet the educational needs of all students in a caring, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner<br>(IN 2, 3, 5)<br>1.2 Treats students, families, community members, and colleagues with dignity and respect, regardless of background, ethnicity/race, capabilities, or beliefs<br>(IN 10) | 1. Fairness_____ | |
| 2. The Belief That All Students Can Learn<br>2.1 Establishes a classroom climate that supports the learning, development, emotional well-being, and physical well-being of a diverse student population<br>(IN 2, 3, 5)<br>2.2 Effectively plans and implements teaching and assessment strategies that address the experiences; academic, emotional, and physical needs; developmental levels; and interests of a diverse student population | 2. The Belief That All Students Can Learn _____ | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (IN 4, 8) | | |
| 3. Professionalism<br>3.1 Engages in ongoing self-reflection and participates in professional development opportunities<br>(IN 9, 10)<br>3.2 Displays professional appearance and actions, including effective oral and written communication<br>(IN 6)<br>3.3 Collaborates with professors, students, colleagues, families, and/or community members<br>(IN 10) | 3. Professionalism _____ | |
| 4. Resourcefulness<br>4.1 Motivates self and others to perform well<br>(IN 5)<br>4.2 Anticipates what a situation calls for and responds appropriately<br>(IN 6)<br>4.3 Uses personal talents to enhance professional functioning<br>(IN 6)<br>4.4 Adapts willingly to change<br>(IN 5) | 4. Resourcefulness _____ | |
| 5. Dependability<br>5.1 Attends all expected classes and meetings, and arrives on time<br>(IN 10)<br>5.2 Participates meaningfully in classes and meetings<br>(IN 10)<br>5.3 Fulfills responsibilities in the college classroom and in P-12 settings | 5. Dependability _____ | |

| Philosophy of Education Scoring Guide | **0 - Unacceptable** | **1 - Emerging** | **2 - Acceptable** | **3 - Target** | **Score** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching Rationale | Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples | Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak | Clear explanation with rational example | Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples | |
| Appropriate Teaching/Learning Climate | Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples | Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak | Clear explanation with rational example | Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples | |
| Content | Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples | Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak | Clear explanation with rational example | Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples | |
| Professionalism | Explanation is unclear or inappropriate, and lacks appropriate examples | Explanation is basic in nature; lacks cohesiveness, clarity and/or example(s) are weak | Clear explanation with rational example | Detailed and honed explanation with superior examples | |
| Composition/ Mechanics | Excessive deficiencies noted related to indicators | Deficiencies related to indicators are distracting, though not at an unacceptable level | Deficiency is noted for one or more indicators, but meaning is intact | All indicators met at a high level of proficiency | |

DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Institutional Research & Planning
Kent Wyatt Hall 161
(662) 846-4052

To: Mr. Allan Mitchell, Chair; Division of Languages & Literatures
Mr. Ron Koehler, Chair; Department of Art
Dr. Paulette Meikle, Chair; Division of Social Sciences & History

Cc: Dr. Dave Breaux, Dean; College of Arts & Sciences

From: Office Institutional Research & Planning

Date: July 24, 2015

**Subject: Academic Year Report Information for the MED in Secondary Education**

The following information contains Summer 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015 credit hours produced, enrollment, and graduates for academic year 2014/15. If you need additional information, or have any questions regarding this information, please contact IRP at x4052.

| MED ENROLLMENT BY CONCENTRATION | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer 2014 | | | Fall 2014 | | | Spring 2015 | |
| | UG | GR | | UG | GR | | UG | GR |
| English Education | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 |
| Fine Arts Education | 0 | 2 | | 0 | 7 | | 0 | 4 |
| History Education | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Social Science Education | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 5 | | 0 | 4 |
| Total | 0 | 3 | | 0 | 12 | | 0 | 9 |

| 2014/15 Graduates | |
|---|---|
| Secondary Education | |
| MED, English Education | 2 |
| MED, Fine Arts Education | 3 |
| MED, History Education | 0 |
| MED, Social Science Education | 0 |

| Enrollment by Concentration | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer | | Fall | | Spring | | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR | Total |
| **English Education** | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 47 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 47 |
| **Fine Arts Education** | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 27 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 27 |
| AY 2010 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 21 |
| **History Education** | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| **Social Science Education** | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 37 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 37 |
| **AY Totals** | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 24 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 44 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 16 | 59 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 46 | 128 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 46 | 128 |

| Graduates | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eng Ed | Fine Arts | History | Soc Sci | |
| | MED | MED | MED | MED | Total |
| AY 2015 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| AY 2013 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 16 |
| AY 2012 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| AY 2011 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 14 |

DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY

Institutional Research & Planning
Kent Wyatt Hall 161
(662) 846-4052

To: Dr. Tom Brady, Interim Chair; Division of Teacher Education, Leadership, & Research

From: Office Institutional Research & Planning

Date: July 24, 2015

**Subject: Academic Year Report Information for the Division of Teacher Education**

The following information contains Summer 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015 credit hours produced, enrollment, and graduates for academic year 2014/15. If you need additional information, or have any questions regarding this information, please contact IRP at x4052.

| CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION* | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer 2014 | | Fall 2014 | | Spring 2015 | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| AED | 0 | 417 | 0 | 411 | 0 | 480 |
| CAD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CEL | 96 | 204 | 1308 | 300 | 1101 | 297 |
| CML | 102 | 0 | 87 | 9 | 51 | 21 |
| CRD | 84 | 57 | 261 | 0 | 162 | 57 |
| CSD | 0 | 39 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| CSP | 117 | 186 | 315 | 144 | 327 | 93 |
| CUR | 0 | 13631 | 404 | 269 | 261 | 216 |
| EDL | 0 | 54 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 84 |
| ELR | 0 | 330 | 0 | 433 | 0 | 336 |
| SUP | 0 | 93 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 45 |
| Total | 399 | 15011 | 2375 | 1740 | 1902 | 1629 |

*Note CUR had 12 additional continuing education "credit hours"

| ENROLLMENT BY MAJOR** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer 2014 | | Fall 2014 | | Spring 2015 | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| Educ. Admin. and Supervision | 0 | 60 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 91 |
| Elementary Education | 65 | 55 | 219 | 92 | 189 | 87 |
| Professional Studies | 0 | 63 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 99 |
| Special Education | 0 | 21 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 21 |
| Teaching Alternate | 0 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 |
| Total | 65 | 218 | 219 | 325 | 189 | 306 |

** *Note that there was 1 additional student enrolled in Elementary Education as a second major in Summer 2014.*

| 2014/15 Graduates | |
|---|---|
| **Educ. Admin. And Supervision** | |
| **EdS** | **22** |
| **MED** | **2** |
| **Elementary Education** | |
| **BSE** | **50** |
| **EdS** | **15** |
| **MED** | **32** |
| **Professional Studies** | |
| **EdD** | **7** |
| **Special Education** | |
| **MED** | **11** |
| **Teaching (Alternate Route)** | |
| **MAT** | **9** |

| Credit Hour Production | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer | | Fall | | Spring | | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR | Total |
| AED | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 417 | 0 | 411 | 0 | 480 | 1308 |
| AY 2014 | 3 | 432 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 393 | 1,137 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 498 | 0 | 324 | 1,023 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 285 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 273 | 867 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 333 | 0 | 168 | 717 |
| CAD | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| CEL | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 96 | 204 | 1308 | 300 | 1101 | 297 | 3306 |
| AY 2014 | 114 | 519 | 1293 | 519 | 1398 | 363 | 4,206 |
| AY 2013 | 126 | 582 | 1,539 | 582 | 1,323 | 621 | 4,773 |
| AY 2012 | 126 | 684 | 1,593 | 576 | 1,611 | 618 | 5,208 |
| AY 2011 | 195 | 738 | 1,395 | 675 | 1,485 | 588 | 5,076 |
| CML | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 102 | 0 | 87 | 9 | 51 | 21 | 270 |
| AY 2014 | 117 | 0 | 66 | 12 | 54 | 18 | 267 |
| AY 2013 | 120 | 0 | 81 | 18 | 69 | 33 | 321 |
| AY 2012 | 120 | 0 | 69 | 24 | 72 | 45 | 330 |
| AY 2011 | 78 | 0 | 81 | 27 | 84 | 45 | 315 |
| CRD | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 84 | 57 | 261 | 0 | 162 | 57 | 621 |
| AY 2014 | 105 | 102 | 273 | 0 | 255 | 147 | 882 |
| AY 2013 | 138 | 183 | 360 | 0 | 180 | 87 | 948 |
| AY 2012 | 129 | 186 | 342 | 3 | 255 | 180 | 1095 |
| AY 2011 | 129 | 183 | 363 | 3 | 276 | 165 | 1119 |
| CSD | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| CSP | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 117 | 186 | 315 | 144 | 327 | 93 | 1182 |
| AY 2014 | 189 | 264 | 408 | 270 | 396 | 180 | 1,707 |
| AY 2013 | 222 | 264 | 327 | 297 | 468 | 252 | 1,830 |
| AY 2012 | 267 | 321 | 504 | 312 | 573 | 252 | 2,229 |
| AY 2011 | 183 | 270 | 414 | 270 | 501 | 303 | 1,941 |
| CUR | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 13631 | 404 | 269 | 261 | 216 | 14781 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 4638 | 434 | 11007 | 241 | 192 | 16,512 |
| AY 2013 | 6 | 405 | 550 | 9,993 | 259 | 276 | 11,489 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 510 | 526 | 8,370 | 458 | 273 | 10,137 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 645 | 605 | 3,894 | 436 | 297 | 5,877 |
| EDL | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 84 | 201 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 48 | 135 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 60 | 207 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 112 | 339 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 154 | 465 |
| ELR | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 330 | 0 | 433 | 0 | 336 | 1099 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 273 | 0 | 483 | 0 | 540 | 1,296 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 306 | 0 | 423 | 0 | 384 | 1,113 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 288 | 0 | 360 | 0 | 228 | 876 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 366 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 273 | 915 |
| SUP | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 45 | 228 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 114 | 300 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 105 | 144 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 156 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 213 |
| AY Totals | | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 399 | 15011 | 2375 | 1740 | 1902 | 1629 | 23056 |
| AY 2014 | 528 | 6444 | 2474 | 12708 | 2344 | 1995 | 26493 |
| AY 2013 | 612 | 2103 | 2857 | 11895 | 2299 | 2142 | 21908 |
| AY 2012 | 642 | 2445 | 3034 | 10106 | 2969 | 2137 | 21333 |
| AY 2011 | 585 | 2694 | 2858 | 5648 | 2782 | 2167 | 16734 |

| Enrollment by Major | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Summer | | Fall | | Spring | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| Education Administration and Supervision | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 91 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 87 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 81 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 87 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 80 |
| Elementary Education | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 65 | 55 | 219 | 92 | 189 | 87 |
| AY 2014 | 74 | 127 | 226 | 127 | 197 | 116 |
| AY 2013 | 107 | 135 | 252 | 158 | 224 | 161 |
| AY 2012 | 114 | 146 | 291 | 165 | 264 | 153 |
| AY 2011 | 125 | 161 | 262 | 177 | 243 | 171 |
| Professional Studies | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 99 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 112 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 66 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 55 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 55 |
| Special Education | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 21 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 40 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 63 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 57 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 63 |
| Teaching Alternate | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 |
| AY 2014 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 10 |
| AY 2013 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 10 |
| AY 2012 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 16 |
| AY 2011 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 14 |
| AY Totals | | | | | | |
| AY 2015 | 65 | 218 | 219 | 325 | 189 | 306 |
| AY 2014 | 74 | 303 | 226 | 372 | 197 | 365 |
| AY 2013 | 107 | 311 | 252 | 397 | 224 | 381 |
| AY 2012 | 114 | 318 | 291 | 392 | 264 | 368 |
| AY 2011 | 125 | 326 | 262 | 399 | 243 | 383 |

| Graduates | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ed Ad & Supervision | | Elementary Education | | | Prof Stud | Spec Ed | Tch Alt Rt | |
| | EdS | MED | BSE | EdS | MED | EdD | MED | MAT | Total |
| AY 2015 | 22 | 2 | 50 | 15 | 32 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 148 |
| AY 2014 | 37 | 7 | 49 | 14 | 68 | 6 | 13 | 10 | 204 |
| AY 2013 | 27 | 11 | 60 | 22 | 68 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 213 |
| AY 2012 | 20 | 12 | 39 | 13 | 73 | 2 | 20 | 15 | 194 |
| AY 2011 | 32 | 7 | 50 | 10 | 73 | 1 | 16 | 7 | 196 |