VIII. Unit Title: Field Experiences

School/College or University Division: College of Education

Unit Administrator: Dr. Cheryl Cummins

II. Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan (*Academics*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A. Learning Outcome</strong></th>
<th><strong>B. Data Collection &amp; Analysis</strong></th>
<th><strong>C. Results of Evaluation</strong></th>
<th><strong>D. Use of Evaluation Results</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>What should a graduate in the (fill in major here) major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</em></td>
<td>1. What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? 2. Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be/ have been collected. 3. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</td>
<td><em>What were the findings of the analysis?</em></td>
<td>1. List any specific recommendations. 2. Describe changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures that are proposed or were made/are being made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner outcomes for students who participate in field experiences are referenced by divisions.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Goals

-- For the Current Year

A. Goal #1: To more closely couple the curricula of educator preparation programs with field experiences through increased collaboration with P-12 school partners and school-site delivery of courses with clinical faculty input and modeling.

1. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1, 4, 5 or QEP Goal # 1, 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Agendas and minutes from meetings (faculty and partner school meetings, Teacher Education Council, others); review of log noting number and types of field experiences; student, faculty, and clinical faculty feedback/informal evaluations; note syllabi revisions; course evaluations.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation: At the beginning of the school year, a meeting was held with leaders from the Cleveland School District and leaders from the COE. The goal of the meeting was to establish cooperation between DSU COE and the Cleveland School District. We looked at the number of student teachers placed in the district as well as discussed different ways to have the DSU students out in the elementary and secondary schools for quality field experiences. At the beginning of both the fall and spring semesters, I sent a letter to all principals in schools where our student teachers were placed. In this letter, I talked about the expectations for our student teachers and the importance of having the cooperating teachers to attend training so we would have optimal communication during the semester between the cooperating teacher and DSU. I conducted cooperating teacher trainings both semesters and had about 90% of the cooperating teachers to attend. I taught an elementary reading class on site at a local elementary school and have had conversations with another principal regarding teaching an additional reading class on site in the fall.

4. Use of Evaluation Results: Due to the success with meeting with the central office personnel in Cleveland School District, I plan to include principals in a meeting in late summer in order to get their input regarding our students being placed in the district for field experiences. Teacher Education Council will be involved in decisions regarding more and better field experiences beginning with the fall semester after noting the small number of field experiences in some of our programs.

B. Goal #2: To foster improved collaboration and cohesiveness between elementary and secondary education programs, ensuring that all candidates in educator preparation programs have optimum experiences and training infused throughout their programs.
1. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1, 2, 5 or QEP Goal # 1, 3

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Agendas and minutes (faculty, Teacher Education Council, partner schools, others); surveys of Candidates; protocols for seminars and faculty and student feedback from same; course evaluations.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation: In the spring semester of this year, I had two general meetings with secondary education candidates concerning a variety of issues. Topics discussed in these meetings were student advisement, teacher education program requirements, student teaching requirements, and Praxis scores and requirements. I had high attendance from both secondary education majors and secondary education faculty. In the spring semester, I also conducted three Teacher Work Sample trainings for secondary majors and methods course instructors.

4. Use of Evaluation Results: More seminars on Praxis, TWS, and other topics will be implemented in the following academic year due to success of initial meetings and due to feedback from students and faculty.

C. Goal #3: To identify model programs for study in order to design and implement more effective university/school partnerships

1. Institutional Goal which was supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1, 5 or QEP Goal # 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Notes from research findings; minutes from debriefing meetings with stakeholders; notes from meetings and conversations with contact individuals identified in model programs; itineraries and notes from site visits to observe model programs; program planning notes and resulting plans.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation: I looked at research regarding different universities and programs. However, my best information has come from meetings I have had with the other field directors in the state of MS. I initiated the first meeting of all the directors in February, 2008. Since that time, we have had two other meetings. I have learned of good practices that some of the other universities are doing regarding more effective university/school partnerships. I also attended a Professional Development Schools Conference and learned more about effective partnerships.

4. Use of Evaluation Results: Discussion will begin on changes that need to be made within programs to ensure quality and preparedness for teaching based on model programs observed and researched.
A. Goal #1: To increase collaboration with P-12 school partners and school-site delivery of courses with clinical faculty input by meeting with representatives from at least five districts to establish rapport and plan ways to increase partnerships between DSU COE and P-12 districts.

1. Institutional Goal(s) supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1, 4, 5  QEP Goal # 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Agendas and minutes from partner school meetings, faculty meetings, and Teacher Education Council. Review field experience request forms, and student, faculty, and clinical faculty formal and informal evaluations, including course evaluations.

3. Expected Results: Methods course syllabi will reflect a variety of partnerships between the COE and P-12 districts. At least one additional class will be taught on-site in a local elementary school for both the fall and spring semesters.

4. Anticipated/Intended Uses of Evaluation Results: Evaluation results will be used to refine/revise teacher education programs in both elementary and secondary education as needed.

B. Goal #2: To improve collaboration and cohesiveness between elementary and secondary education programs by providing general information seminars, TWS trainings, and Praxis workshops each semester.

1. Institutional Goal(s) supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1, 3  QEP Goal # 1, 3, 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Review feedback forms given after all seminars, workshops, and training sessions as well as informal feedback from students and faculty. Review student teaching evaluation forms. Also review agendas and minutes from faculty meetings from elementary and secondary programs.

3. Expected Results: (i.e. improvement percentages, increase/decrease in numbers, measurable data.) Elementary and secondary education program candidates will be better prepared for all field experiences, student teaching, and the real world of teaching.

4. Anticipated/Intended Uses of Evaluation Results: Students will be more aware of program requirements and the number of students
failing to meet program requirements will decrease.

C. Goal #3: To ensure that all candidates in educator preparation programs have optimum experiences and training infused throughout their programs by increasing the type and amounts of field experiences offered in all of our teacher preparatory programs.

1. Institutional Goal(s) supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1,4,5 QEP Goal # 1, 2

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Agendas and minutes from field directors’ meetings, TEC meetings, and faculty meetings. Examine field experience request forms, poll students and faculty regarding field experiences, and examine course syllabi noting increases/changes in field experiences from previous semesters.

3. Expected Results: Course syllabi and evaluations will indicate that field experiences have increased in both type and amount for both secondary and elementary education programs.

4. Anticipated/Intended Uses of Evaluation Results: Make improvements to syllabi and coursework and plan for increased field experience hours in all methods courses.

D. Goal # 4: To visit model programs in order to design and implement more effective university/school partnerships (goal continued from previous year).

1. Institutional Goal(s) supported by this goal:
   SP Goal # 1, 5 QEP Goal # 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s): Notes from research findings; agendas and minutes from field directors’ meetings; minutes from meetings with stakeholders; notes from meetings and conversations with contact individuals identified in model programs; itineraries and notes from site visits to observe model programs; program planning notes and resulting plans.

3. Expected Results: A plan will be developed for at least one professional development school in the area as well as changes being implemented within programs to move to a model with a block semester with increased field experiences in the semester before student teaching.

4. Anticipated/Intended Uses of Evaluation Results: Begin implementation of the new model within the 2009-2010 school year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Institutional Goal</th>
<th>Baseline (AY 2007-08)</th>
<th>Year 1 (08-09)</th>
<th>Year 2 (09-10)</th>
<th>Year 3 (10-11)</th>
<th>Year 4 (11-12)</th>
<th>Year 5 (12-13)</th>
<th>Year 6 (13-14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Increase field experiences in all elementary and secondary programs by 30% in the next 6 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Data and information for department:

Brief Description and/or Narrative of programmatic scope:

The Office of Field Experiences has the following responsibilities:

1. Screen and approve all candidates who request admission to Teacher Education;
2. Screen and approve all candidates who request admission to student teaching;
3. Coordinate with P-12 schools in the DAAIS consortium for the placement of teacher education candidates, interns in the School Counseling program, graduate students doing practicum field experiences, student interns in the FCS Nutrition program, student interns in Child Development, interns in Athletic Training, and for placements for all school visits and observations prior to the capstone student teaching experience;
4. Provide training for cooperating teachers on expectations/responsibilities, including technology expectations associated with Task Stream to clinical faculty;
5. Provide training on Teacher Work Sample construction to teacher education majors and faculty;
6. Serve as a liaison between the College of Education and educational partners;
7. Maintain all records associated with field experiences and candidates in the teacher education program;
8. Maintain records with varied assessment data for teacher education candidates;
9. Provide licensure advisory for all candidates prior to admission to Teacher Education;
10. Provide licensure verification for current candidates and alumni of Delta State University;
11. Serve as Certification Officer for Delta State University;
12. Provide resources and workshops for Praxis examinations.
Comparative Data (enrollment, CHP, majors, graduation rates, etc):

### Office of Field Experiences Yearly Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Division</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Experience Prior to Student Teaching</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Internships</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics and Nutrition Practicum Experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Internships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Psychology Internships</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training Internships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Placements Each Semester</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Placements for 2007-2008 = 1119**

### V. Personnel:

Cheryl J. Cummins, Ed. D.  
Director of Field Experiences  
Patti Boswell  
Senior Secretary

Noteworthy activities and accomplishments:

1. Revised the Teacher Education Handbook for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 to provide candidates, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and faculty with written protocol for all forms, paperwork, procedures, etc. vital to the success of field experiences.
2. Updated the student teaching CD to include all forms, paperwork, etc. in a digital format for student teaching candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers.

3. Conducted cooperating teacher trainings, both on campus and at partnership schools, for teachers from districts accepting DSU student teachers during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008.


5. Conducted general information meetings for teacher education candidates, both elementary and secondary, keeping them informed of updates, deadlines, licensure advisory, program advisement, Praxis exams, requirements for admission to teacher education and to student teaching, and other important information from MDE and the Office of Field Experiences.

6. Provided workshops and shared resources with students for three different Praxis exams (Praxis I, PLT, and Praxis II for elementary content).


8. Continued a partnership with my reading class and Bell Elementary School as the course is taught on-site.

9. Participated in and helped organize a new partnership called the “Delta Connection” with Blue Mountain College and DSU elementary candidates in which students from DSU team taught a lesson with Blue Mountain students at New Albany Elementary School and at Bell Elementary School.

10. Initiated a meeting of all the field directors in the state and hosted the first meeting at DSU; this, in turn, prompted other universities to host meetings as well. Three meetings have been held to date, and another is scheduled for the summer.

11. Provided six professional development sessions at a local elementary school on a variety of reading/literacy topics.

12. Served as Certification Officer for the College of Education.

13. Attended many professional meetings and conferences relevant to the Office of Field Experiences and Teacher Education.

15. Served on and am currently serving on two other dissertations committees.


17. Served on the College of Education’s Administrative Council.

18. Served as the DSU liaison for the state of MS High School Feedback report.

19. Served as a member of the Teacher Education Council.

20. Served as the COE representative for the college fair in DeSoto County.

21. Scholarly activities as in presentations/publications:

    Griffin, L., & Cummins, C. (2007). *Longitudinal faculty Study Groups: A Model for Developing Comprehensive Teacher Preparation Programs*. Manuscript has been accepted for publication in the *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*.


    Cummins, C., Pedersen, S., & Thomas, D. (2008). *Comparison between informal graded word list instructional levels and classroom teachers’ perceived instructional reading levels of second and third graders*. Action research presented at the 3rd Annual Faculty Research and Scholarship Symposium at Delta State University.

22. Professional service to the university and/or community included the following:

- Certification officer for Delta State University
- College of Education Administrative Council
- Teacher Education Council
- COE Unit Assessment committee
- Teacher Retention Initiative coordinator
- High School Feedback Liaison for DSU
- College fair representative for COE
- Chair of successful Doctoral Candidate graduate
- Delta Kappa Gamma secretary
- Chair of NCATE Standard One committee
- Serve on NCATE Standard Three committee
- Dissertation chair for one doctoral candidates
- Advisor to pre-dissertation candidate
- Report to faculty after Commission meetings
- LACI guest speaker
- Academic Success Workshop speaker
- DAAIS District Reading Fair Judge
- Presbyterian Day School Literacy Consultant
- St. Luke Methodist Church Children’s Ministries Coordinator
- Presbyterian Day School Parent Teacher Organization

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

Changes made in the past year:

Conducted Teacher Work Sample trainings for secondary education students and faculty.

Held general information meetings with secondary education students and advisors to open lines of communication between the COE and Arts and Sciences faculty and students.
Conducted and/or assisted with workshops geared toward increasing percentages of student success on Praxis exams.

Contacted principals by letter at the beginning of each semester to encourage attendance by cooperating teachers at trainings, and attendance did increase from previous years.

Held cooperating teacher trainings much earlier in the semester to explain expectations/responsibilities of cooperating teachers and training was offered on two different days so teachers could choose a morning session or an afternoon session to better accommodate schedules.

Recommended changes for the coming year(s):

Require all students to complete CUR 300 with a C or above. This is inconsistent throughout programs.

Require student athletes to complete their student teaching in a semester in which their sport is not played.
IX. Unit Title: Unit Assessment System

School/College or University Division: College of Education

Unit Administrator: Jenetta Waddell

II. Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

Note: Scoring guides and rubrics for the assessments referenced in this plan may be accessed in the appendices of the Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plans for the Divisions of Teacher Education; Counseling and Psychology; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and Leadership and Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Learning Outcome</th>
<th>B. Data Collection &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>C. Results of Evaluation</th>
<th>D. Use of Evaluation Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge and skills associated with both the content and pedagogy of Teacher Education, School Counseling, and Educational</td>
<td>1. The licensure examinations (Praxis I, Praxis II Subject Area Tests, and the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching), the Student Teacher Assessment Instrument (STAI) Content Assessment, and the</td>
<td>Praxis Examination:</td>
<td>1. Continue to monitor “Professional Growth and Reflection” ratings on the Philosophy of Education. (Note possible link to “Collaboration” on Dispositions Rating Scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Praxis I – weaknesses identified in Reading (pass rates ranges were 37% - 69%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Praxis II PLT – pass rate ranged were 85% and above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Praxis I – weaknesses identified in Reading (pass rates ranges were 37% - 69%)
- Praxis II PLT – pass rate ranged were 85% and above
| Administration. | **Philosophy of Education** will be used.  
2. The Praxis examinations are nationally-normed assessments administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The data for the **STAI Content Assessment** and the **Philosophy of Education** will be collected in TaskStream.  
3. For the Praxis examinations, pass rates were provided to the COE by the ETS. Data from the **STAI Content Assessment** and the **Philosophy of Education** will be analyzed using mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions. | for K-6 and 7 – 12 assessments  
- Praxis II Subject Area Tests – Pass rates for Special Education, Physical Education, and Elementary Education were 90% and above. Lowest pass rates were identified for alternate route applicants (e.g., Elementary 4 – 22%, Biology 30%)  
**STAI Content Assessment**—Median ratings on all indicators were at the outstanding level.  
**Philosophy of Education** – The large majority of indicator ratings for students in introductory courses and student teachers were at the acceptable and outstanding levels. A relative weakness was found in “Professional Growth and Reflection” for students in introductory courses and for student teachers. | “Implications for Professional Development” on **Teacher Work Sample**. Also note that this area was not identified as a weakness on the Follow-Up Surveys.)  
2. Software is available in The Learning Curve to address Praxis I weaknesses. Individual candidates are referred by instructors and advisors.  
Note: Alternate route candidates must pass the Praxis II Subject Area Tests before they are accepted into the program. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GE I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Graduate Programs**  
1. The admission Tests of Verbal Ability and the results of the comprehensive assessments for K-6 and 7 – 12 assessments  
- Praxis II Subject Area Tests – Pass rates for Special Education, Physical Education, and Elementary Education were 90% and above. Lowest pass rates were identified for alternate route applicants (e.g., Elementary 4 – 22%, Biology 30%)  
**STAI Content Assessment**—Median ratings on all indicators were at the outstanding level.  
**Philosophy of Education** – The large majority of indicator ratings for students in introductory courses and student teachers were at the acceptable and outstanding levels. A relative weakness was found in “Professional Growth and Reflection” for students in introductory courses and for student teachers. | | |
| **Graduate Programs**  
For the Tests of Verbal Ability, the majority of prospective candidates submitted acceptable “Implications for Professional Development” on **Teacher Work Sample**. Also note that this area was not identified as a weakness on the Follow-Up Surveys.)  
2. Software is available in The Learning Curve to address Praxis I weaknesses. Individual candidates are referred by instructors and advisors.  
Note: Alternate route candidates must pass the Praxis II Subject Area Tests before they are accepted into the program. | | |
| **Graduate Programs**  
1. A comprehensive examination will be implemented in the MAT | | | |
examinations will be used, with the exception of the MAT program. For the MAT program, content will be assessed through the STAI Content Assessment and a Philosophy of Education.

2. The Tests of Verbal Ability are nationally-normed assessments; scores were provided to the COE by the testing companies that administered the tests. Program coordinators will use spreadsheets to collect the data from the comprehensive examinations. The MAT data for the STAI Content Assessment and the Philosophy of Education will be collected in TaskStream.

3. Standard scores were provided for the Tests of Verbal Ability. For comprehensive examinations, pass rates will be reported. Data from the MAT STAI Content Assessment and the Philosophy of Education will be analyzed using mean, median, standard deviation, and scores. The Educational Leadership program noted an increase in scores. A possible link was identified between the increase and the program emphasis on writing in all coursework over the past several semesters. (Note: Most candidates are accepted provisionally and complete some coursework before taking the admission Test of Verbal Ability.)

High pass rates were reported for comprehensive examinations, with the exception of Elementary Education, which reported a 50% pass rate in Fall 2007.

For the MAT STAI Content Assessment and Philosophy of Education, the majority of candidates received acceptable and outstanding scores.

2. In the Educational Leadership program, feedback from the ELPPQ (follow up survey) results and School Leadership Council (SLC) advisory council indicated the need to improve the candidates’ formal writing skills. A common writing assignment was implemented in all courses in the program in Summer 2006.
#2 Ability to Plan  
Demonstrate mastery of the ability to plan instruction for P-12 students, and the ability to plan school and student counseling programs and school and district administrative and academic programs.

**GE 1, 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** The *STAI* Domain I (Planning and Preparation) will be used in Spring and Fall 2007 for student teachers; the instrument will be implemented in methods courses in Fall 2007.  
2. Data will be collected in *TaskStream*.  
3. Mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated. | **1.** Program-specific assessments will be completed in field experiences and in practica/internships.  
2. Program coordinators will use spreadsheets for data collection.  
3. Descriptive statistics will be calculated. | **1.** For student teachers, the median scores on all indicators in Spring and Fall 2007 were in the outstanding range. For candidates in methods courses (collected only in Fall 2007), the majority of the indicator median scores were in the acceptable range, with the rest in the outstanding range. | **1.** None at this time.  
2. As of Fall 2007, data are gathered in methods courses, as well as during student teaching, so that changes over time may be identified. |

---

Undergraduate Programs  
**1.** None at this time.  
2. As of Fall 2007, data are gathered in methods courses, as well as during student teaching, so that changes over time may be identified.

Graduate Programs  
**1.** None at this time.  
2. Disaggregated data from the Special Education and Physical Education Programs identified difficulties for candidates without undergraduate degrees in these fields. Both programs have added a required course to address this concern.
and outstanding scores: MAT, Counseling, Educational Leadership (all degree programs), and Elementary Ed.S. In the Special Education Program, 10 of 11 candidates passed at the minimal level. In the Elementary Education M.Ed. program, concerns were noted in the use of technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3 – Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- During internships and practica, demonstrate the ability to plan, implement, and assess instruction for teacher education and school counseling programs, and the ability to administer and supervise school and district programs for educational administration programs.</td>
<td>1. Indicators 9 – 42 of the STAI will be used to assess student teaching.</td>
<td>For Spring 2007, median scores on all indicators were in the outstanding range. For Fall 2007, median scores were outstanding on all indicators, except for acceptable ratings from DSU supervisors on relationships with parents/guardians, using higher-order questions, and using community resources.</td>
<td>1. Continue to monitor ratings on dealing with relationships with parent/guardian, using higher-order questions, using community resources to determine if changes are warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The data will be collected in TaskStream.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. None at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GE 1, 9, 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue to monitor ratings on dealing with relationships with parent/guardian, using higher-order questions, using community resources to determine if changes are warranted.</td>
<td>1. Program-specific assessments will be completed in practica and internships.</td>
<td>For Spring 2007, the majority of candidates in all programs received acceptable and outstanding scores; the Special Education Program identified assessment of student learning and instructional planning as</td>
<td>1. None at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program coordinators will use spreadsheets to collect data.</td>
<td>2. The Special Education Program added a modified Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assessment to be used along with the STAI. The TWS will</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. None at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| #4 – Impact on Student Learning – Demonstrate mastery of the ability to measure the impact of instruction on student learning for the individual student and the classroom in teacher education programs, for the school in school counseling and educational administration programs, and for the district in educational administration programs. | Undergraduate Program  
1. For Spring 2007, the *STAI* Impact on Student Learning Assessment will be used with student teachers. For Fall 2007, the Analysis of Student Learning and the Reflection and Evaluation components of the *TWS* will be used with candidates in methods courses and with student teachers.  
2. Data will be collected in *TaskStream.*  
3. Mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated. | Undergraduate Program  
For Spring 2007, median scores on the STAI were in the outstanding range on all indicators.  
For Fall 2007, median scores on the *TWS* for Analysis of Student Learning were at the acceptable level for methods course candidates and student teachers, although mean scores were higher for student teachers than for methods course candidates. On the Reflection and Evaluation component of the *TWS*, median scores for methods course candidates and for student teachers were at the acceptable level, with the exception of a weakness noted for methods course candidates in “Implications for Professional Development.” | Undergraduate Program  
1. Continue to monitor scores on “Implications for Professional Development” (Note possible link to “Professional Growth and Reflection” in the Content and Pedagogical Content Knowledge section above and “Collaboration” on the Dispositions Rating Scale. Also note that this area was not identified as a weakness on the Follow-Up Surveys.)  
2. Faculty concerns with over-reliance on the *STAI* and the desire to identify a more comprehensive measure of Impact on Student Learning led to the adoption of the two components of the *TWS* for all methods courses, as well as... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Professional Development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program-specific assessments will be completed in field experiences and practica/internships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program coordinators will use spreadsheets to collect data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Descriptive statistics will be calculated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Spring 2007, median scores in all programs, with the exception of MAT and Special Education, were in the acceptable and outstanding range. In Special Education, 11 of 14 candidates scored at 80% or above on the STAI Impact on Student Learning Assessment, which was identified as a weakness by the Special Education Faculty. In the MAT Program, the TWS was used; weaknesses included interpretation of data, evidence of impact on student learning, implications for future teaching, and alignment with learning goals. In Summer and Fall 2007, median scores in all programs, with the exception of MAT and Elementary Education M.Ed., were in the acceptable and outstanding range. In the MAT Program, the student teaching for the Fall 2007 semester. The TWS had been successfully piloted in the Elementary Education Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue to review the weaknesses identified in the MAT Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In Fall 2007, the Special Education Program changed from use of STAI to a modified TWS. Faculty were concerned that the STAI assessment did not correlate with Impact on Student Learning as closely as did components of the TWS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Dispositions - Display the values, commitments, and professional ethics associated with effective teaching, counseling, and administration.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE 10</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs 1. The <em>Dispositions Rating Scale</em> will be used. 2. Data will be collected in <em>TaskStream</em>. 3. Mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs 1. The <em>Dispositions Rating Scale</em> will be used.</td>
<td>Graduate Programs For Spring 2007, all ratings were in the acceptable and outstanding range. For Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 – Diversity</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Programs 1. The STAI Diversity Assessment for student teachers and the Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey (ODCS), administered in EPY 341, will be used for Spring, Summer, and Fall 2007. For Fall 2007, the ratings on the “Sensitivity” dispositional characteristic of the Dispositions Rating Scale will be used for candidates in introductory courses and student teaching. 2. For the STAI, data will be</td>
<td>Undergraduate Programs 1. None at this time. 2. None at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Undergraduate Programs 1. None at this time. 2. None at this time. | - Mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated. - Data will be collected in Excel spreadsheets. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The ODCS, administered in <strong>EPY 601</strong> (for M.Ed.) and in <strong>CUR 701</strong> (for Ed.S.), <strong>SUP 831</strong> (for Ed.D.), and <strong>CUR/CEL 650</strong> (for MAT) will be used. For Summer and Fall 2007, the ratings on the “Sensitivity” dispositional characteristic of the <em>Dispositions Rating Scale</em> will be used for candidates in <strong>ELR 605</strong> and <strong>CUR 702</strong>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Data will be collected in Excel spreadsheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Spring 2007, the following scores were obtained on the <strong>ODCS</strong>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPY 601</strong> – Median scores on all survey items were at the agree level, with the exception of “I enjoy talking with people whose values are different from mine” and “Learning about people from different cultures is a very important part of my college education,” on which the median scores were strongly agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUR 701</strong> – Median scores for all survey items were at the strongly agree level, with the exception of “Learning about people from different cultures is a very important part of my college education,” which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. None at this time.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**406**
- SUP 831 – Median scores on all survey items were at the Strongly Agree level.

For Summer and Fall 2007, the scores on the ODCS were as follows:
- EPY 601 – Median scores for all survey items were at the agree level, with the exception of “I enjoy having discussions with people whose ideas and values are different from my own,” “Learning about people from different cultures is a very important part of my college education,” and “I enjoy courses that are intellectually challenging,” on which the median scores were strongly agree.
- MAT – The median scores on all indicators were at the agree level, with the exception of “I enjoy courses that are intellectually stimulating,” on which the median score was strongly agree.

The majority of scores on the “Diversity” dispositional characteristic from the
Dispositions Rating Scale for Master’s candidates were in the acceptable and outstanding ranges, while those for Ed.S. candidates were in the acceptable range.

#7 – Follow-Up Surveys are completed by graduates and their employers, and student teachers in order to evaluate the quality of COE programs. The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) also conducted a survey of first-year traditionally prepared teachers and their principals.
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1. The COE surveys will be completed by student teachers during the Fall 2007 semester, and graduates and their employers during early Spring 2008. The MDE survey results were mailed to the COE dean.

2. For the COE surveys, data will be collected in Excel spreadsheets. There was no information provided on how data were collected for the MDE survey.

3. For the COE teacher preparation surveys, mean, median, standard deviation, and score distributions will be calculated. For the COE educational leadership survey, score distributions will be calculated. The number of “Disagree” responses was provided for the MDE survey.

On the COE student teacher survey from Fall 2007, median scores of strong preparation were obtained on all survey items, with the exception of “working with special needs students,” on which the median score was neutral and on “managing student behavior,” on which the median score was adequate preparation.

On the COE survey of teacher preparation graduates (undergraduates and graduates), median scores on the majority of indicators showed strong preparation. Median scores on these indicators fell in the adequate preparation range: “accommodating instructional needs of most students,” “working with special needs students,” “integrating technology into teaching and learning,” “success in student

1. For undergraduate programs, recent changes in candidate performance assessments and in field experiences will be implemented in the Spring 2008 semester to address the concerns noted on the student teacher and the MDE surveys. Two days of field experiences will be added to CUR/CEL 393, Classroom Management. The full eight components of the TWS will be added to methods courses and student teaching to provide a more in-depth assessment of impact on student learning.

2. At the undergraduate level, the Special Education Program faculty provided seminars for student teachers on the special education process and on differentiating instruction.
motivation,” and “managing student behavior.”

On the COE survey of employers of teacher preparation graduates (undergraduates and graduates), the median rating on a majority of indicators was strong preparation. The median ratings on the rest of the indicators were adequate preparation.

On the COE survey of educational leadership programs, graduates and their employers completed the survey, but the data were not disaggregated. For the Master’s program, the majority of indicators were rated at above expected level. All other ratings were at the average level, with the exception of one respondent rating “Experiences are designed to accommodate the students’ individual needs” at needs extreme improvement. For the Ed.S. and Ed.D. programs, respondents rated all indicators at above expected level or average.

On the MDE survey, the highest number of “Disagree” responses
from first-year teachers was found on “The teacher is knowledgeable about state and federal regulations concerning instruction of students with special needs.” The highest numbers of “Disagree” responses from principals were found on “The teacher can use successful strategies for handling special learning situations (e.g., special needs, gifted, nonreader)” and “The teacher has established a professional, supportive relationship with the other teachers at school.”