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#### Mission / Purpose

The Bachelor of Science degree in Biological Sciences (Licensure) is designed to provide an undergraduate education that prepares the student to pursue teaching in secondary education, a professional post-baccalaureate degree, and/or to enter the workforce with skills necessary for lifelong professional achievement.

#### Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**SLO 1: Understanding of the scientific process**

Students will develop an understanding of the scientific process.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Entry-Level Assessment (Laboratory Report)**

Entry-level assessment: Students enrolled in BSC 110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I Laboratory) and BSC 111L (Principles of Biological Sciences II Laboratory) complete laboratory exercises that introduce students to scientific methodology and evaluation of scientific research.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

70% of students receive an overall score of average (70%) or better using the rubric designed to assess written laboratory reports. The rubric addresses content and format.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: In the BSC 110L, 66.3% (n = 421) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. In the BSC 111L, 78.7% (n = 174) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. Gulf Coast: In the BSC 110L, 92.9% (n = 28) of students scored 70% or greater on a laboratory written assignment summarizing scientific journal articles. Assignments were assessed using a rubric addressing content and format. BSC 111 is not offered on this campus during the Fall semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: In the BSC 110L, 70.6% (n = 143) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. In the BSC 111L, 82.2% (n = 242) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. Gulf...
Coast: In the BSC 111L, 97.4% (n = 39) of students scored 70% or greater on a laboratory written assignment summarizing scientific journal articles. Assignments were assessed using a rubric addressing content and format. BSC 110 is not offered on this campus during the Spring semester.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Counsel students on writing**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

Though this student learning outcome was not met for this academic year in the B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure), the targ...

**M 2: Upper Division Assessment (Laboratory Report)**

Upper Division Coursework Assessment: Students enrolled in BSC 380L (Microbiology Lab) complete two formal laboratory reports that require students to explain scientific methodology and to evaluate scientific research.

**Source of Evidence:** Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

70% of students receive a rating of average (70%) or better on each report using the rubric designed to assess the formal laboratory report. The rubric addresses content, format, and style.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: In BSC 380L, 75% (n = 4) of students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) scored 70% or greater on the first formal laboratory report as determined using a rubric designed to assess content, format, and style. 100% (n = 4) of students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences scored 70% or greater on the second formal laboratory report as determined using a rubric designed to assess content, format, and style. Gulf Coast: There were not students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester.

Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: There were not students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester. Gulf Coast: BSC 380 is not offered on the Gulf Coast in the Spring.

**M 4: Praxis II exam (Biology: Content Knowledge)**

The Praxis II: Biology Content Knowledge exam is administered by the Educational Testing Services and measures the subject knowledge of prospective teachers of biology in a secondary school. The exam consists of 150 multiple-choice questions, and must be completed within two hours. Exam questions come from the following content areas: basic principles of science (8%); molecular and cellular biology (25%); classical genetics and evolution (15%); diversity of life, plants, and animals (30%); ecology (15%); and science, technology, and society (7%).

**Source of Evidence:** Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**

80% of Licensure students taking the Praxis II exam pass on the first attempt. [In Mississippi the minimum passing score on the Praxis II (Biology: Content Knowledge) is 150.] 100% of students who do not pass receive mentoring
from the program advisor and are advised to audit BSC 110/110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), BSC 111/111L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), and other Biological Sciences courses with content in the areas where the student earned a low score.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) taking the Praxis II exam this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.

SLO 2: Broad-based knowledge of Biology
Students will acquire broad-based content knowledge of Biology, namely: understanding the characteristics that unite living organisms; understanding diversity of life; understanding the similarities and differences among organisms, i.e., systematics; understanding the relationship between structure and function at all levels of organization; understanding the physical and chemical properties of organisms and processes that occur in living things; understanding the cellular basis of life; understanding the nature and function of the gene and the flow of genetic information in the cell, the organism, and the population; understanding homeostatic control mechanisms that allow organisms to respond to changes in the internal and external environment; understanding the interdependence and interrelationships among organisms and between organisms and their environment; understanding the origin of life and the process of evolution; understanding the historical background leading to contemporary views on major biological topics and awareness of the dynamic processes of scientific inquiry.

Related Measures:

M 3: Upper Division Assessment (Exam Questions)
Upper Division Coursework Assessment: Students enrolled in BSC 380 (Microbiology) demonstrate an understanding of course-specific content. Though this is one course, the materials covered in BSC 380 (Microbiology) touch on many aspects of biological sciences. This course is required for all students and provides a mechanism for measuring student understanding of many aspects of biology.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
In BSC 380 (Microbiology), 70% of students score 70% or better on the comprehensive final exam, which comprises questions designed to assess understanding of course-specific concepts. Answers are graded subjectively by the instructor.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) scored 70% or greater on the comprehensive final exam. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in the BSC 380 course. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in the BSC 380 course. Gulf Coast: BSC 380 is not offered on the Gulf Coast in the Spring.
M 4: Praxis II exam (Biology: Content Knowledge)
The Praxis II: Biology Content Knowledge exam is administered by the Educational Testing Services and measures the subject knowledge of prospective teachers of biology in a secondary school. The exam consists of 150 multiple-choice questions, and must be completed within two hours. Exam questions come from the following content areas: basic principles of science (8%); molecular and cellular biology (25%); classical genetics and evolution (15%); diversity of life, plants, and animals (30%); ecology (15%); and science, technology, and society (7%).

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
80% of Licensure students taking the Praxis II exam pass on the first attempt. [In Mississippi the minimum passing score on the Praxis II (Biology: Content Knowledge) is 150.] 100% of students who do not pass receive mentoring from the program advisor and are advised to audit BSC 110/110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), BSC 111/111L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), and other Biological Sciences courses with content in the areas where the student earned a low score.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) taking the Praxis II exam this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.

SLO 3: Technical skills consistent with major
Student will demonstrate technical skills consistent with their major.

Related Measures:

M 5: Entry-Level Assessment (Technical Skill)
Entry-level assessment: Students enrolled in BSC 110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I Lab) and BSC 111L (Principles of Biological Sciences II Lab) are assessed on their ability to properly use a microscope.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
70% of students will receive an overall score of satisfactory, as judged subjectively by the Teaching Assistant.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: In the BSC 110L course, 86.4% (n = 447) of students were judged to be satisfactory at properly using a microscope by the teaching assistants. In the BSC 111L course, 86.8% (n = 174) of students were judged to be satisfactory at properly using a microscope by the teaching assistants. Gulf Coast: In the BSC 110L course, 81.3% (n = 32) of students were judged to be satisfactory at properly using a microscope by the instructor. BSC 111 is not offered on this campus in the Fall semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: In the BSC 110L course, 96.1% (n = 155) of students were judged to be satisfactory at properly using a
microscope by the teaching assistants. In the BSC 111L course, 83.1% (n = 249) of students were judged to be satisfactory at properly using a microscope by the teaching assistants. Gulf Coast: In the BSC 111L course, 64.1% (n = 39) of students were judged to be satisfactory at properly using a microscope by the instructor. BSC 110 is not offered on this campus in the Spring semester.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Technical Skills Rubric**  
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

Currently the assessment for introductory students' technical skills is evaluated subjectively by teaching assistants. The imp...

**M 6: Upper Division Assessment (Technical Skills)**

Upper Division Coursework Assessment: Students enrolled in BSC 380L (Microbiology Lab) complete two formal laboratory reports that require students to use different sets of technical skills. The first report involves bacterial plate counts; students perform serial dilutions, inoculate pour plates, and then count and assess colonies. The second report involves identification of unknown bacterial cultures; students subculture their sample and then perform routine staining and biochemical testing.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

70% of students receive an overall score of average (70%) or better on each lab report. The grade is assigned using a rubric that assesses content, format, and style.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: In BSC 380L, 75% (n = 4) of students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) scored 70% or greater on the first formal laboratory report as determined using a rubric designed to assess content, format, and style. 100% (n = 4) of students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences scored 70% or greater on the second formal laboratory report as determined using a rubric designed to assess content, format, and style. Gulf Coast: There were not students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: There were not students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester. Gulf Coast: BSC 380 is not offered on the Gulf Coast in the Spring.

**SLO 4: Skill in scientific written and oral communication**

Students will exhibit effective skills in scientific writing and oral communication of scientific information.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Entry-Level Assessment (Science Writing)**
Entry-Level Assessment: Students in enrolled in BSC 110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I Lab) and BSC 111L (Principles of Biological Sciences II Lab) complete a laboratory exercise that introduces students to scientific writing.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
70% of students receive an overall score of average (70%) or better using the rubric designed to assess scientific writing. The rubric addresses content and format.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: In the BSC 110L, 66.3% (n = 421) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. In the BSC 111L, 78.7% (n = 174) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. Gulf Coast: In the BSC 110L, 92.9% (n = 28) of students scored 70% or greater on a laboratory written assignment summarizing scientific journal articles. Assignments were assessed using a rubric addressing content and format. BSC 111 is not offered on this campus during the Fall semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: In the BSC 110L, 70.6% (n = 143) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. In the BSC 111L, 82.2% (n =242) of students scored 70% or greater on a lab report using a rubric addressing content and format. Gulf Coast: In the BSC 111L, 97.4% (n = 39) of students scored 70% or greater on a laboratory written assignment summarizing scientific journal articles. Assignments were assessed using a rubric addressing content and format. BSC 110 is not offered on this campus during the Spring semester.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Counsel students on writing**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

Though this student learning outcome was not met for this academic year in the B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure), the targ...

**M 8:NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric**
The National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric is an assessment measure specific to science teaching and is based on the NSTA Standards for the Preparation of Science Teacher 2005. Pre-service teachers are evaluated on ten standards: Content, Nature of Science, Inquiry, Issues, General Skills of Teaching, Curriculum, Science in the Community, Assessment, Ethics, Safety and Welfare, and Professional Development. The USM supervisor evaluates the student teacher’s knowledge and practice of these standards during each of the two 8 week student teaching experiences (in junior high science and in high school biology classes).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.
100% of students who do not meet the "3 = Proficient level" are advised by the USM supervisor before the second evaluation of the standards is made.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching in the Fall semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.

**M 10: Field Experience Professional Portfolio (FEPP)**

Students complete two 8-week student teaching experiences (in junior high science and in high school biology classes, respectively) and complete a portfolio for each experience. The FEPP includes the following: General School Information Form, Class Description, 7 Weekly Reports of Teaching and Events, 8 Reflective Journals, Assessment of Students Academic/Functional Growth with Reflection, 3 Observations of Teaching with Reflective Analysis, 1 Videotaped Teaching with Reflective Analysis, 1 Classroom Management Profile with Reflection, 1 Instructive/Interactive Bulleting Board lesson, 6 weeks of Electronic Lesson Plans with Hyperlinks to resources/supplementary materials. The total number of points possible is 1781.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**

80% of student teachers earn an average range of scores from 1656 to 1497 (equal to "Proficient") and a range from 1781 to 1657 (equal to "Distinguished"). 100% of students who experience difficulty during the student teaching experience undergo remediation from the USM Office of Field Experiences.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range.

**M 11: Teacher Candidate Assessment Tools (TCAT)**


Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target:**
80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors. 80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations done by the mentor and by the USM supervisor. 80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations done by the mentor and USM supervisor, respectively.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% of (n = 1) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor; and 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations by the mentor and USM supervisor. Gulf Coast: Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester. . Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% of (n = 4) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 4) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor; and 100% (n = 4) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations by the mentor and USM supervisor. Gulf Coast: 100% of (n = 2) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor; and 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations by the mentor and USM supervisor.

**SLO 5: Qualified to teach high school biology**
Students who pursue the Licensure Option will be qualified to teach high school biology.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Praxis II exam (Biology: Content Knowledge)**
The Praxis II: Biology Content Knowledge exam is administered by the Educational Testing Services and measures the subject knowledge of prospective teachers of biology in a secondary school. The exam consists of 150 multiple-choice questions, and must be completed within two hours. Exam questions come from the following content areas: basic principles of science (8%); molecular and cellular biology (25%); classical genetics and evolution (15%); diversity of life, plants, and animals (30%); ecology (15%); and science, technology, and society (7%).

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target:
80% of Licensure students taking the Praxis II exam pass on the first attempt. [In Mississippi the minimum passing score on the Praxis II (Biology: Content Knowledge) is 150.] 100% of students who do not pass receive mentoring from the program advisor and are advised to audit BSC 110/110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), BSC 111/111L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), and other Biological Sciences courses with content in the areas where the student earned a low score.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) taking the Praxis II exam this semester. attempt. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.

M 8:NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric
The National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric is an assessment measure specific to science teaching and is based on the NSTA Standards for the Preparation of Science Teacher 2005. Pre-service teachers are evaluated on ten standards: Content, Nature of Science, Inquiry, Issues, General Skills of Teaching, Curriculum, Science in the Community, Assessment, Ethics, Safety and Welfare, and Professional Development. The USM supervisor evaluates the student teacher’s knowledge and practice of these standards during each of the two 8 week student teaching experiences (in junior high science and in high school biology classes).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience. 100% of students who do not meet the "3 = Proficient level" are advised by the USM supervisor before the second evaluation of the standards is made.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience. Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching in the Fall semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Proficient level" or "4 = Distinguished level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.

M 9:ETS Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (PLT)
The Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT): Grades 7-12 is a test is administered by the Educational Testing Services and is used to assess a student
teacher’s knowledge of various job-related criteria. Such knowledge is typically obtained in courses such as Educational Psychology, Human Growth and Development, Classroom Management, Instructional Design and Delivery Techniques, Evaluation and Assessment, and other professional preparations.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**
80% of Licensure students taking the ETS PLT test pass on the first attempt. (In Mississippi the minimum passing score on the PTL test is 152.) 100% of students who do not pass the test are mentored and are advised to audit a subject-specific methods course and CIE 302 (Classroom Management).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the ETS PLT test passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: There were no students taking the ETS PLT test this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students taking the ETS PLT test passed on the first attempt. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students taking the ETS PLT test passed on the first attempt.

**M 10: Field Experience Professional Portfolio (FEPP)**
Students complete two 8-week student teaching experiences (in junior high science and in high school biology classes, respectively) and complete a portfolio for each experience. The FEPP includes the following: General School Information Form, Class Description, 7 Weekly Reports of Teaching and Events, 8 Reflective Journals, Assessment of Students Academic/Functional Growth with Reflection, 3 Observations of Teaching with Reflective Analysis, 1 Videotaped Teaching with Reflective Analysis, 1 Classroom Management Profile with Reflection, 1 Instructive/Interactive Bulleting Board lesson, 6 weeks of Electronic Lesson Plans with Hyperlinks to resources/supplementary materials. The total number of points possible is 1781.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
80% of student teachers earn an average range of scores from 1656 to 1497 (equal to "Proficient") and a range from 1781 to 1657 (equal to "Distinguished"). 100% of students who experience difficulty during the student teaching experience undergo remediation from the USM Office of Field Experiences.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range. Gulf Coast: Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range.

**M 11: Teacher Candidate Assessment Tools (TCAT)**
TCAT includes several rubrics used to assess student teaching. Mentors use three rubrics: Formative Evaluation, In-class Evaluation, and Summative/Dispositions Evaluation. The USM supervisor uses two rubrics: In-class Evaluation and
Final/Dispositions Evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors. 80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations done by the mentor and by the USM supervisor. 80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations done by the mentor and USM supervisor, respectively.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% of (n = 1) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor; and 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations by the mentor and USM supervisor. Gulf Coast: Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester. . Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% of (n = 4) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 4) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor; and 100% (n = 4) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor. Gulf Coast: 100% of (n = 2) student teachers (n = 2) earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" on the In-class Evaluations by the mentor and by the USM supervisor; and 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earn an average score of "3=Proficient" and "4=Distinguished" in the Summative/Dispositions and Final/Dispositions evaluations by the mentor and USM supervisor.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O/O 6:Employment and professional/graduate education**
Students will gain content knowledge of Biology that enables them to obtain employment consistent with their interest in teaching biological sciences, and/or pursue professional school/graduate education, or be satisfied that the degree met other personal objectives.

**Related Measures:**

**M 12:Employment/Professional School/Graduate Education**
Student will state in an Exit Survey whether or not they have found professional employment related to their major or if they will be pursuing post-graduate training
or education or if they have otherwise met personal goals.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
70% of seniors surveyed during the semester they graduate will report that they have secured professional employment or that they have been accepted into a professional program (medical school, dental school, etc.) or into a graduate studies program or that they have met their personal goals.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 0% (n = 1) of students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) indicated that they had secured professional employment. *Student moved to a different state due to family medical issues and is currently seeking employment. Gulf Coast: Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 4) of students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) indicated that they had secured professional employment. Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 2) of students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) indicated

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Continued mentoring for employment opportunity**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

The BSC (Licensure) faculty regularly mentor students on employment issues. In the Fall 2012 case, faculty continue to communic...

**M 13:Exit Survey (Student Self-Assessment)**

During the semester they will graduate, students complete an informal instrument that allows self-assessment of content knowledge, understanding of the scientific process, development of technical skills and skills in written and oral communication, and satisfaction with their qualifications for employment or post-graduate positions.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Using a 5 point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree): 75% of students indicate 4 or above that their content knowledge of Biology increased. 75% of students indicate 4 or above that their understanding of the scientific process increased. 75% of students indicate 4 or above that they developed technical skills consistent with their major. 75% of students indicate 4 or above that they developed the ability to communicate scientific information in writing. 75% of students indicate 4 or above that they developed the ability to communicate scientific information orally. 75% of students indicate 4 or above that they are satisfied with their qualifications for professional employment or for post-graduate positions.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: The survey was not administered during this semester. Gulf Coast: The survey was not administered during this
semester. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: The survey was not administered during this semester. Gulf Coast: The survey was not administered during this semester.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Develop New Exit Survey**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
A new exit survey will be developed and implemented for students graduating with a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Counsel students on Praxis II preparation**  
100% of students who do not pass receive mentoring from the program advisor and are advised to audit BSC 110/110L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), BSC 111/111L (Principles of Biological Sciences I and Laboratory), and other Biological Sciences courses with content in the areas where the student earned a low score.

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*  
*Priority: Medium*

**Responsible Person/Group:** Science Education Faculty

**Counsel students on writing**  
In these introductory courses, students' writing ability may not be well developed. Introducing students who are not performing up to standard to the Writing Center may be a useful tool.

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*  
*Implementation Status: In-Progress*  
*Priority: Medium*

**Responsible Person/Group:** BSC Assessment Committee, BSC 110/111 Lab Coordinator
Counsel students on writing
Though this student learning outcome was not met for this academic year in the B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure), the target was met in the other B.S. degree programs. These results are most likely an effect of the low sample size; however, students that have difficulty in meeting the written communication standards will be advised to attend a counseling session at the Writing Center.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Entry-Level Assessment (Laboratory Report) | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of the scientific process
  Measure: Entry-Level Assessment (Science Writing) | Outcome/Objective: Skill in scientific written and oral communication

Responsible Person/Group: BSC Assessment Committee, BSC 380 Faculty

Technical Skills Rubric
Currently the assessment for introductory students' technical skills is evaluated subjectively by teaching assistants. The implementation of a grading rubric would correct for differences among various individuals with varying degrees of teaching experience.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Entry-Level Assessment (Technical Skill) | Outcome/Objective: Technical skills consistent with major

Responsible Person/Group: BSC Assessment Committee, BSC 110/111 Lab Coordinator

Continued mentoring for employment opportunity
The BSC (Licensure) faculty regularly mentor students on employment issues. In the Fall 2012 case, faculty continue to communicate with the student about employment opportunities, providing guidance when needed.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Employment/Professional School/Graduate Education | Outcome/Objective: Employment and professional/graduate education
Develop New Exit Survey
A new exit survey will be developed and implemented for students graduating with a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure).

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Survey (Student Self-Assessment) | Outcome/Objective: Employment and professional/graduate education

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessment data from the AY 2012 - 2013 year indicate that our students show improvement in written communication over the course of their education. Student understanding of the scientific process also shows improvement over the course of their educations. Student opinions of these criteria also indicate that our students are satisfied with their learning process as well. Though our students’ performances on the national ETS Major Fields Exam still fall short of our goal, we have seen improvement from year to year. As a whole, our faculty have shown more interest in the assessment process and see the value the data provide for improvement in our program. That has spurred discussions of proactive methods to better improve our students’ experience at USM. The BSC Assessment Committee is also developing more mechanisms to make the collection of assessment data as easy as possible.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
After several years of inattention to the assessment progress, the Department of Biological Sciences has made a concerted effort to improve. This effort has been successful in many ways. Most of the data needed for the degree assessment are collected regularly. Faculty involved in the assessed courses are considering the data and thinking of ways to improve student learning in areas where assessment goals are not met. For the most part, faculty are seeing the assessment process as much more beneficial now. For the 2012 - 2013 year, we still struggle with reporting of data from all sections of the Capstone course. The faculty teaching the course are working hard to meet the goals of the course, but at times some information is not reported. The BSC Assessment Committee will meet with BSC 495 faculty at the beginning of each semester and discuss the data needed and the rationale for each set. Exit survey data was not reported by all BSC 497 faculty. The exit survey data are important for measure our students' opinions about their education process. If we are not aware of how are students feel about certain aspects of their education process, we will not make needed adjustments for improvement.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Department of Biological Sciences (BSC) is the largest academic unit in the College of Science and Technology with 35 faculty and over 900 undergraduate students and 75 graduate students (approximately 40 PhD and 35 MS). BSC generates approximately 25% of the total student credit hours in the entire College of Science and Technology via teaching a large number of BSC students and non-major students. The Department is a research-intensive unit in which our faculty explore areas from biomedical/molecular biology to field biology and marine biology. This year the BSC faculty secured approximately $7 million in extramural funds in support of their research. This funding was largely from federal sources (National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Department of Defense, Department of Energy, Department of Agriculture as well as from state sources and some private foundations). Typically faculty in BSC submit about 40-50 research proposals each year and have a very good record of success (approx. 20% funding rate). Undergraduate research is likewise a vital part of our efforts to train the next generation of scientists, researchers, clinicians, policy makers, etc., of the future. Generally, each faculty member mentors 2-4 undergraduate research students (and sometimes high school students) in their laboratories. Typically these students disseminate the results of their research via presentations at regional or national scientific meetings and/or via publication in peer-reviewed journals. Additionally, BSC is the lead on the state-wide MS-INBRE (Mississippi IDeA Networks of Biomedical Research Excellence) project funded by the National Institutes of Health. In this work, we reach out to students across the entire state of Mississippi to provide hands-on research training via an intensive 12-week undergraduate summer research internship.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

The BSC Assessment Committee continues to discuss mechanisms to improve data collection and reporting for the degree assessments. Currently, members of the Assessment Committee are considering meeting with Capstone course faculty to discuss possible improvements in course curriculum that will provide the needed assessment data but also make the course more meaningful to the students. Also, the Assessment Committee is considering new ways of administering the Exit Survey to ensure that more students are providing the data so that these measures are more beneficial for the department. As a department, we need to be aware of our students’ opinions about their education process and to improve communication and understanding in areas where our students do not feel they have improved.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

New action plans have been proposed to improve Exit Survey administration. The main focus is to provide an easy and smooth process of administering the surveys to as many students as possible on both campuses, in the Fall and Spring semesters. Coordination among Assessment Committee members and Capstone course faculty is one of the first steps we will take this Fall. In addition, we will continue providing guidance to our students concerning improvement in writing, particularly making students aware of the Writing Center or campus.
Mission / Purpose

The Bachelor of Science Degree in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry is designed as a rigorous curriculum that will be the best possible preparation for graduate studies, professional schools, chemical industry, and, in the case of the licensure option, a career as a high school teacher.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Chemistry content knowledge
Students graduating with a B.S. degree in Chemistry-teacher certification will demonstrate basic knowledge of the content of chemistry required to teach high school chemistry.

Relevant Associations:
American Chemical Society

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis II exam scores
Licensure students must take the Praxis II exam in order to be certified to teach. The exam addresses content knowledge of chemistry and professional skills. It is required by the Mississippi Department of Education and meets the National Science Teacher Association standard one for chemistry content.

Target:
Seventy five percent of the students taking the Praxis II will make a passing grade of 151 before they graduate.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All (2/2) licensure students passed the Praxis II exam prior to graduation. One student passed on the first try. The other student repeated the test and passed on the 2nd try.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Praxis II preparation
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Dr. Booth will assist students with more focused preparation for the Praxis II exam.

M 3: Student teaching experience
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and
evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% teacher candidates met the target. 100% (2/2) were rated exemplary.

**M 5: Earning Professional Education Gold Card**
The University of Southern Mississippi Professional Education Committee has set content standards that the students must pass before being formally enrolled in the professional education program at Southern Miss. If a student passes these standards they receive a Gold Card. The content standards are also recommended by the National Science Teacher Association.

**Target:**
At least 75% of the candidates will receive their Gold Card during their Junior Year.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% met target. Both of the new licensure candidates (2/2) that are Gold Card eligible were able to get their Gold Card and enter the school for professional educators during their junior year.

**M 7: Research and Investigation Project**
Each teacher candidate must demonstrate that they can design, conduct, report and evaluate investigations in science. They must also show they can use mathematics to report and process data, and that they can solve problems in their field of licensure. Each candidate will present their research to a faculty committee in the chemistry licensure program. The faculty committee will use two separate rubrics for evaluation of chemistry content knowledge and research/inquiry ability. The scale on the rubrics will be exemplary, mastery, marginal, or unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy five percent of the students will be rated as exemplary or mastery level on their chemistry content knowledge and their research/inquiry ability.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% (2/2) teacher candidates in the methods course CHE 471 were able to complete a research and investigation project at the exemplary level using the NCATE rubric.

**SLO 2: Skills of teaching chemistry**
Students will have mastered the general skills required to teach chemistry in a high school chemistry class.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A
separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of the student teacher met the target. Both teacher candidates (2/2) were evaluated and completed all of their skills of teaching chemistry with a exemplary rating with the NCATE rubric.

**M 4: Student teaching portfolio**
Each teacher candidate will assemble a student teaching portfolio documenting all aspects of their student teaching. These aspects will be evaluated by the department's chemical education specialist and the results forwarded to the Undergraduate Committee for evaluation. The education specialist will use rubrics for each learning outcome - nature of science, inquiry, current issues, general skill of teaching, curriculum, and science in the community. The rubric results will be reported on a scale of exemplary/mastery/marginal or unacceptable.

**Target:**
The target is that at least 75% of the students will be rated as attaining exemplary or mastery level on each aspect of the portfolio.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Both teacher candidates successfully completed their student teaching portfolio, skills of teaching with an exemplary rating, using the NCATE rubric.

**SLO 3: Conduct research and implement classroom inquiry**
Students will be able to conduct research and implement inquiry in a high school class.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% met the target. Both student teachers (2/2) successfully conducted classroom inquiry and were rated exemplary. This was assessed with the NCATE rubric.

**M 4: Student teaching portfolio**
Each teacher candidate will assemble a student teaching portfolio documenting all aspects of their student teaching. These aspects will be evaluated by the department's chemical education specialist and the results forwarded to the
Undergraduate Committee for evaluation. The education specialist will use rubrics for each learning outcome - nature of science, inquiry, current issues, general skill of teaching, curriculum, and science in the community. The rubric results will be reported on a scale of exemplary/mastery/marginal/ or unacceptable.

**Target:**
The target is that at least 75% of the students will be rated as attaining exemplary or mastery level on each aspect of the portfolio.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Both teacher candidates were able to implement classroom inquiry and conduct research with exemplary rating, using the NCATE rubric.

**M 7: Research and Investigation Project**
Each teacher candidate must demonstrate that they can design, conduct, report and evaluate investigations in science. They must also show they can use mathematics to report and process data, and that they can solve problems in their field of licensure. Each candidate will present their research to a faculty committee in the chemistry licensure program. The faculty committee will use two separate rubrics for evaluation of chemistry content knowledge and research/inquiry ability. The scale on the rubrics will be exemplary, mastery, marginal, or unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy five percent of the students will be rated as exemplary or mastery level on their chemistry content knowledge and their research/inquiry ability.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% (2/2) student teachers were able to implement a classroom inquiry with research during their teaching experience that was rated exemplary using the NCATE rubric.

**SLO 4: Classroom integration of the nature of science**
Students will be able to integrate the nature of science into a high school class.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of the teacher candidates met the target. Both student teachers (2/2) were rated exemplary and successfully integrated the nature of science into their teaching experiences. This was assessed with the NCATE rubric.

**M 4: Student teaching portfolio**
Each teacher candidate will assemble a student teaching portfolio documenting all aspects of their student teaching. These aspects will be evaluated by the
department's chemical education specialist and the results forwarded to the Undergraduate Committee for evaluation. The education specialist will use rubrics for each learning outcome - nature of science, inquiry, current issues, general skill of teaching, curriculum, and science in the community. The rubric results will be reported on a scale of exemplary/mastery/marginal/ or unacceptable.

**Target:**
The target is that at least 75% of the students will be rated as attaining exemplary or mastery level on each aspect of the portfolio

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Both teacher candidates integrated the nature of science into their lessons during their student teaching. They completed this task with an exemplary rating using the NCATE rubric.

**SLO 5: Safe chemistry learning environment**
Students will be able to plan and organize a safe learning environment for high school chemistry students in accordance with National Standards

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of the teacher candidates met the target. Both student teachers (2/2) were rated exemplary using the NCATE assessment rubric.

**M 6: Methods of teaching science course - safety**
Each student’s performance in organizing a safe learning environment for high school students is measured in SME 460 - Methods of teaching science in high school. Students are required to prepare a safety and liability plan that makes provisions for the care and treatment of living things. This assignment is rated by the classroom instructor on a scale of exemplary/ mastery/marginal/unacceptable. The results will be given to the chemical education specialist of the chemistry department for recording and analysis.

**Target:**
Seventy five percent of the students will be rated at either the exemplary or mastery level.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of the candidates met the target. Both teacher candidates (2/2) that completed the SME 460, Methods of Teaching Science, were able to plan for a safe learning environment. They were both rated exemplary with the NCATE rubric.
SLO 6: Relate to local and regional communities
Students will be able to relate chemistry to the local and regional communities in a high school chemistry class

Related Measures:

M 3: Student teaching experience
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

Target:
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the teacher candidates met the target. Both student teachers (2/2) were exemplary in their ability to relate lessons to the local and regional communities. Assessed with the student teaching rubric for NCATE.

M 4: Student teaching portfolio
Each teacher candidate will assemble a student teaching portfolio documenting all aspects of their student teaching. These aspects will be evaluated by the department's chemical education specialist and the results forwarded to the Undergraduate Committee for evaluation. The education specialist will use rubrics for each learning outcome - nature of science, inquiry, current issues, general skill of teaching, curriculum, and science in the community. The rubric results will be reported on a scale of exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

Target:
The target is that at least 75% of the students will be rated as attaining exemplary or mastery level on each aspect of the portfolio

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Both teacher candidates related their lessons during student teaching to local and regional communities. Both received an exemplary rating using the NCATE rubric.

SLO 7: Professional Growth
Students will have provided evidence of professional growth by the time they graduate.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE

Related Measures:

M 2: Overall portfolio and Exit Interview
Each teacher candidate’s overall performance during their undergraduate career is evaluated by their university supervisor/advisor. This is judged by having an exit interview with the student and by examining their overall portfolio. The portfolio contains their safety and liability plan, their practicum portfolios from SME 460, CIS 313, and CHE 471, their student teaching portfolios from SME 489 and 490, their...
philosophy of teaching, their resume, and their professional growth plan. The sections of the portfolio and their interview will be scored on separate rubrics for their professional growth and their ability to assess chemistry learning in a high school class. The rubrics will have a scale of exemplary, mastery, marginal, or unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy five percent of the students will be rated as exemplary or mastery level for both learning outcomes.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% met the target. Both (2/2) Licensure candidates successfully completed their overall portfolio and exit interview with exemplary ratings.

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% met target. Both student teachers (2/2) submitted a professional growth plan in their student teaching portfolios. They were rated exemplary with the NCATE rubric.

**SLO 8: Contemporary science and technology issues**
Students will be able to integrate contemporary science and technology related issues in society in a high school class.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of the teacher candidates met the target. Both teacher candidates (2/2) successfully integrated contemporary science and technology issues in their teaching experiences. Their scores were exemplary, as scored with the NCATE rubric.

**M 4: Student teaching portfolio**
Each teacher candidate will assemble a student teaching portfolio documenting all aspects of their student teaching. These aspects will be evaluated by the department's chemical education specialist and the results forwarded to the Undergraduate Committee for evaluation. The education specialist will use rubrics for each learning outcome - nature of science, inquiry, current issues, general skill of teaching, curriculum, and science in the community. The rubric results will be reported on a scale of exemplary/mastery/marginal/ or unacceptable.

Target:
The target is that at least 75% of the students will be rated as attaining exemplary or mastery level on each aspect of the portfolio

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Both teacher candidates incorporated contemporary and technological issues in their lessons during student teaching. Both were rated as exemplary, using the NCATE rubric.

SLO 9: Effective curriculum for high school chemistry
Students will be able to plan and implement an effective curriculum in a high school chemistry class.

Related Measures:

M 3: Student teaching experience
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

Target:
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of the student teachers met the target. Both teacher candidates (2/2) were rated exemplary and planned effective curriculum lessons for their high school student teaching classes. this was accessed with the NCATE rubric

M 4: Student teaching portfolio
Each teacher candidate will assemble a student teaching portfolio documenting all aspects of their student teaching. These aspects will be evaluated by the department's chemical education specialist and the results forwarded to the Undergraduate Committee for evaluation. The education specialist will use rubrics for each learning outcome - nature of science, inquiry, current issues, general skill of teaching, curriculum, and science in the community. The rubric results will be reported on a scale of exemplary/mastery/marginal/ or unacceptable.

Target:
The target is that at least 75% of the students will be rated as attaining exemplary or mastery level on each aspect of the portfolio

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Both teacher candidates were able to plan effective curriculum for a high
school chemistry class during their student teaching. They were both rated exemplary using the NCATE rubric.

**SLO 10: Assess chemistry learning in high school class**
Students will be able to assess learning of high school chemistry students in accordance with National Standards

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Overall portfolio and Exit Interview**
Each teacher candidate’s overall performance during their undergraduate career is evaluated by their university supervisor/advisor. This is judged by having an exit interview with the student and by examining their overall portfolio. The portfolio contains their safety and liability plan, their practicum portfolios from SME 460, CIS 313, and CHE 471, their student teaching portfolios from SME 489 and 490, their philosophy of teaching, their resume, and their professional growth plan. The sections of the portfolio and their interview will be scored on separate rubrics for their professional growth and their ability to assess chemistry learning in a high school class. The rubrics will have a scale of exemplary, mastery, marginal, or unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as exemplary or mastery level for both learning outcomes.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% met the target. Both student teachers (2/2) were rated exemplary and successfully assessed chemistry learning of high school students during their student teaching experiences. This was assessed with the NCATE rubric for assessment of student learning.

**M 3: Student teaching experience**
Licensure students will complete extensive field experience in their student teaching. The department's chemical education specialist will observe and evaluate their student teaching for each of the listed learning outcomes. A separate rubric will be used for each learning outcome. The scale for each rubric will be exemplary/mastery/marginal/unacceptable.

**Target:**
Seventy-five percent of the students will be rated as achieving the exemplary or mastery level for each learning outcome.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of the student teacher met the target. Both teacher candidates (2/2) were rated exemplary and successfully assessed the learning in their student teaching high school classroom. assessed with NCATE rubric

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Complete revamp of assessment plan**
Assessment plan for licensure BS should not parallel the standard BS. It should instead reflect the assessments unique to the licensure program, i.e. the NCATE assessments.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Fall 2008  
Responsible Person/Group: Deborah Booth

**Praxis II preparation**
Dr. Booth will assist students with more focused preparation for the Praxis II exam.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Praxis II exam scores | Outcome/Objective: Chemistry content knowledge  
Implementation Description: Dr. Booth will assist students with more focused preparation for the Praxis II exam.  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Deborah Booth

**Assessment**
Complete Assessment for all Candidates

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Collect data from CHE 471 & Student Teaching  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Deborah Booth

**NCATE Goals**
The licensure program is accredited by NCATE. Currently we are assessing the licensure program to comply with NCATE assessments.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Finished  
Priority: High  
Responsible Person/Group: Deborah Booth

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?  
Teacher candidate performance on the Praxis II exam shows an improvement trend over the years. Caveat: student numbers are low. Student teacher performance has remained excellent throughout the years.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The objectives covered in the Praxis II test will continue to need special attention during CHE 471 (action plan to better prepare students in progress).

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
This was a good year again for the licensure program. Both of our graduates were very strong academically and in their performance as student teachers. Both have high school teaching jobs starting in the fall of 2013.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
The content objectives covered by the Chemistry Content Knowledge section of the Praxis II will continue to require extra attention in CHE 471 (see change in associated action plan status).

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
As the coordinator for the licensure program I will need to continuously monitor the content objectives covered in the Praxis II examination (action plan status changed) and continuously monitor the NCATE standards. The program will require updating as the standards and objectives change.
Mission / Purpose

The University of Southern Mississippi's School Counseling Program is committed to meeting the needs of P-12 students by preparing tomorrow's professional school counselors for the challenges of the 21st Century schools and communities. The school counseling program strives to provide a framework to transform the lives and communities of students. This competency-based school counseling program prepares professional school counselors to implement comprehensive programs and promote success for all students in the areas of academic, career, personal, and social development. Through advocacy, collaboration, and leadership, the professional school counselor candidate will be prepared to empower students through cooperation with families, individual/group counseling, and classroom guidance. The USM school counseling program will empower future professional school counselors to support, promote, and enhance student development and achievement while demonstrating strong legal and ethical principles. The School Counseling program at the University of Southern Mississippi is designed to provide professional school counselor candidates with the tools and knowledge to be strong advocates in the socio-political context of the education. The mission is achieved through the following program goals: To provide an innovative, high-quality program design that accommodates full-time working professionals and allows for an enriched student experience. To provide opportunities for the examination of current research and the dissemination of essential data, thereby supporting student achievement in P-12 education. To prepare the school counselor to be an integral part of the leadership team for school accountability. To promote an understanding of positive relationship in a pluralistic society through support for human diversity. In addition the program will promote (a) current, relevant, and intellectually rigorous teaching (b) preservation and expansion of the research and knowledge base of the educational disciplines included within the scope of this department through scholarly research and publication efforts; and (c) provision of quality professional service to the University, the community, and various state, regional, and national professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Foundational Knowledge of School Counseling
Cohort will demonstrate competence in group counseling/guidance, career development and information services, and consultation.

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The 175 objective Master's Comprehensive Examination which covers core curricula for School Counseling.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target: Cohort will complete the comprehensive exams on the four entrance courses with a 70% pass score.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - The cohort (N=9) passed the comprehensive exam on the four entrance courses with at least an overall score of 70% or greater.

M 2: Praxis Exam
School counseling candidates whose states require the Praxis will complete the Praxis exam.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 60% of USM’s school counseling Praxis participants will pass the exam on the first attempt.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
50% (N=2) of school counseling candidates passed the Praxis exam on the first attempt. The test number changed for the school counseling Praxis exam. It is not clear if Peoplesoft picked up the new exam number in this reporting. Also we want to continue to encourage each student to report their scores to USM. Report period June 2012 - May 2013.

SLO 2: Comprehensive Knowledge of School Counseling
Cohort will demonstrate competence in organization/administration of guidance services, counseling theory and practice, and testing and individual analysis.

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The 175 objective Master's Comprehensive Examination which covers core curricula for School Counseling.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: Cohort students will complete the comprehensive exams on the three exit courses with a 70% pass score.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - The exiting cohort (N=9) completed the comprehensive exam on the three exit courses with a 70% overall pass score.

M 2: Praxis Exam
School counseling candidates whose states require the Praxis will complete the Praxis exam.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 60% of USM’s school counseling Praxis participants will pass the exam on the first attempt.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
50% (N=2) of school counseling candidates passed the Praxis exam on the first attempt. The test number changed for the school counseling Praxis exam. It is not clear if Peoplesoft picked up the new exam number in this reporting. Also we want to continue to encourage each student to report their scores to USM. Report period June 2012 - May 2013.

SLO 3: Counseling Skills
Students will master a variety of counseling skills in order to effectively assist K-12 students.

Related Measures:

M 3: Mentor's Evaluation of the Internship
Counseling students will master a variety of counseling skills.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of school counseling students will master 80% of assessed counseling skills.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% (n=9) of school counseling students mastered 80% of assessed counseling skills.

M 4: Final Skills Taping
Students will master effective use of skills.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
80% of school counseling students will perform to 80% mastery of skills, relationship building, and maintaining of client in session.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students (N=12) performed 80% mastery of skills, relationship building, and maintaining of client in session.

M 9: Course/Program Reflection
Candidate Course/Program Reflections. Reflections are used solely for program development and are scored by completion only. However, program committee members feel strongly that students continue their learning through personal reflections of progress. Students will also reflect on their ability to establish & maintain relationships and their progress toward becoming an effective counselor.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Each cohort will complete a reflection. One cohort focuses on personal growth and the other cohort includes their analysis of the program.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% Cohort I (N=12) and Cohort II (N=9) completed a reflection. These reflections spoke favorably about the instructors in the program and their
genuineness. Specifically they spoke of instructors taking time to speak with them one-on-one for encouragement or extended compliments. Student(s) reported having strong confidence in their abilities as they return the school environment to work with the children. Overall, the reflections spoke highly of the work done by the faculty and instructors in the program. Some areas of focus were perhaps having a one day workshop to deal with the required RCR modules, Plagiarism tutorials, etc. The format of the program brings students to campus during the summer months for intense course preparation. They have been left to complete and guide these processes as they work through the summer work. Evidently, it is reported to be an unfamiliar process and with so many other matters to complete, they would prefer to have guidance on the processes. The students spoke of their confidence and readiness to work with children in the school. All felt ready and excited to do the work in the actual setting. Areas for improvements were identified and will be addressed during the practicum experience with the students.

**SLO 4: Establish and Maintain Relationships**

Students will establish and maintain relationships with their K-12 students.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Mentor’s Evaluation of the Practicum**

Mentor’s Evaluation of student’s performance during the practicum (Area 2)

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

90% of students will receive a minimum rating of "mastery" on the competency checklist for "ability to establish and maintain a relationship" in the practicum experience.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

100% of students who responded (N=9) received a mastery on Area 2 "ability to establish and maintain relationship. Cohort II Summer 2013

**M 6: Self Assessment of Program**

Student rating of program’s preparation in assisting them in establishing and maintaining relationships with students.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**

80% of school counseling students will feel satisfactory to the program’s ability to assist them in establishing and maintaining relationships with students.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

100% of students who competed the assessment (N=6) feel satisfactory that the program assist them in establishing and maintaining relationships with students.

**M 9: Course/Program Reflection**

Candidate Course/Program Reflections. Reflections are used solely for program development and are scored by completion only. However, program committee
members feel strongly that students continue their learning through personal reflections of progress. Students will also reflect on their ability to establish & maintain relationships and their progress toward becoming an effective counselor.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Students from the second year cohort will complete a survey rating the program's ability to assist them in establishing and maintaining relationships with their k-12 students.

**SLO 5: Professional Dispositions**
Students will demonstrate professional dispositions.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Mentor’s Evaluation of Professional Dispositions**
Mentors’ evaluation on dispositions as measured by the competency rating.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
90% of school counseling students will exhibit a skill level of "mastery" on dispositions as measured on the Competency Rating.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
90% (N=9) of school counseling students exhibited a skill level of "mastery" on professional dispositions as measured on the Competency Rating.

**M 8: Evaluation of Dispositions**
School counseling candidates will self evaluate their professional dispositions in a TK-20 survey.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
90% of school counseling students will identify at the "mastery" level on the dispositions self survey.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
90% of school counseling students identified at the mastery level or greater on the dispositions self-assessment. Assessment provided valuable information concerning students perceptions, beliefs, and dispositions about themselves.

**M 9: Course/Program Reflection**
Candidate Course/Program Reflections. Reflections are used solely for program development and are scored by completion only. However, program committee members feel strongly that students continue their learning through personal reflections of progress. Students will also reflect on their ability to establish & maintain relationships and their progress toward becoming an effective counselor.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
100% will complete a course/program reflection

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Advisory Board
The work of the School Counseling Advisory Board for 2011-12 has been exceptional. The results of the work that was accomplished may manifest in possible revisions of assessments and the data we want to see from the school counselor.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The board will analyze the way the program is collecting certain data, discuss detailing the assessments, and decide if the assessments are assisting us in gathering appropriate data.
Responsible Person/Group: Ursula Whitehead

Professional Dispositions
Assure that the Professional Dispositions instrument is in place and ready for dissemination. The assessment time will be spring semester rather than summer. It is apparent that the summer load is heavy and requires more attention coursework. Therefore, moving the assessment to spring will reduce the likelihood of misinterpretations of which instrument they are to complete.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Send out the survey instrument in the spring semester when students.
Projected Completion Date: 04/29/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Ursula Whitehead

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The assessments for the School Counseling Program shows continually that our instructors are the core of what we do. The favorable feedback and the meeting of the measures shows that we are aligned and presenting a purposeful group of counselors. It also shows us that we need to show more focus on the "other required" nonacademic graded materials. Facilitating the process of those requirements more closely and pursuing them more strategically will alleviate the stress and benefit the students which in turn will provide more focus for academic progress. The students who continue in the program are professional and good representatives for our university. The students enter into the schools with confidence and a set of skills appropriate to serve students in k-12 schools. The consistent mastery performance on the required skills for counseling and facilitating a counseling session with students are essential to being a good counselor. Their performance on these assessments support the work they are doing in the program and the preparation for the field.
What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

The completion of the various modules will require additional attention in the future. The course reflections addressed having an orientation prior to the week of class. Traditionally, students have been from various parts of the country. This particular cohort was from the southern area and would have appreciated an opportunity to meet and greet each other and exchange information as they prepared to start the intense summer work both online and face to face. Discussions have taken place to offer that opportunity in a more detailed orientation which will allow them to meet and greet as well as discuss and facilitate the nonacademic required nongraded components. Several proposals have been discussed to determine how to best meet this need. The program coordinator is working with the appropriate offices to determine the approach to ensure that the necessary information for Praxis data retrieval. There may be some discrepancy in the retrieval process since the new test has a new test number. Also it was discussed that perhaps overall students are not as informed about the necessity of the scores for program evaluation and therefore may not be reporting the nonrequired scores to the university. We are also considering asking the student to upload the scores in TK-20 upon receipt as a part of their university portfolio.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
There are so many kudos this year for the program. The Advisory Board met once in the fall and was provided an online summary and update in the spring. Their work has been very valuable. We restructured the practicum and internship requirements to advance students skills and experience. There is discussion of offering coursework outside the cohort for license renewal and continuing education units. The board brought valuable information to the table. There will be continuous meetings in the future to maintain the work that has been established. We also were approved to offer coursework on the Gulf Coast campus to meet the needs and demands of our coast constituents who expressed interest in the School Counseling program. The program has initiated a $500.00 annual scholarship in honor of Gwen Hitt, former MCA president and talented Advisory Board member for her dedication to the state of Mississippi's school counselors as well as her support on our Advisory Board. Former school counseling programs students accepted an invitation to partner with EFE (Educational Field Experiences) to facilitate their focus groups during professional development for the teaching candidates. They provided feedback to EFE and the collaboration across programs is an important theme in the mission of our college. As program coordinator I have wanted to see recent graduates submit for publication and peer reviewed presentations. This year we have a student who will co-present with the coordinator at the Mississippi Counseling Association's annual conference. This unstated goal is resulting in interest from upcoming graduates to do the same. Also I am finding an increased interest in our students in actively engaging in the professional association and consider working toward leadership positions. As recruitment efforts are increasing, we held our first Meet and Greets for interested students both in the fall and the spring. This gave interested candidates the opportunity to ask questions and learn more information face to face. We have strategically put an increased emphasis on recruitment by setting up in schools and providing information on the program. We have been attending district wide trainings as well as school level meetings. I am thankful to have had such a successful year which has been possible only through collaborative efforts within and outside of the department.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
Our work with the Advisory Board work will continue. Their insight and invaluable experience brings forth professional and creative perspectives for our program. We will attempt to have two meetings this year, one in the fall and one in the spring. There will be some adjustments to a few of our measures to better analyze the progress being made. We actually gave the professional dispositions to both the entering and exiting cohort to have an opportunity to evaluate personal self reported growth. The first year cohort data will also be analyzed with the mentor's evaluation on the professionalism competency to determine if there is a gap in perceptions that needs to be addressed after the first exposure in the practicum experience. There was a search for an assistant professor during this time. However, the search was unsuccessful and the ad will be run again this year. This opportunity to hire new faculty will strengthen the program and the students' experience. The advisory board has been integral in providing assistance to the program from a variety perspectives and is also looking forward to the filling of this position.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
During the 2011-12 year there was a miscommunication concerning the assessment of Professional Dispositions as a self survey which in turn caused a lack of data for the assessment. This year we were successful at gathering the data and also decided to give it to both cohorts as an opportunity to compare the results with the mentor assessed professionalism/disposition assessment. This provides an opportunity to identify weaknesses that may need to be addressed prior to entering into the final experience. This measure also provided great insight into the perspectives of the students concerning many entities. This is a valuable assessment. This action plan is now closed. Also the initiation of the Advisory Board has proven to be a system of checks and balances for the program as well as an opportunity for professionals from the state department, area schools, university and community to discuss the challenges and successes of the school counselor today. This board also reminds us of how the university might consider evaluating what we are doing in our preparation of school counselors as it pertains to the needs of today's practitioner. This action plan in now closed. However, an annual update will be provided in the program summary. This board has succeeded in its efforts and is committed to maintaining this partnership.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the dance program at The University of Southern Mississippi is to integrate theoretical and practical aspects of dance in a way that is meaningful to our students’ lives. By providing a myriad of diverse perspectives to the study of contemporary and traditional forms of dance, and by engaging the students in holistic and comprehensive approaches to the study of dance, USM's programs-its faculty, courses and opportunities-prepare the students for successful participation in the field of dance.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Perform exit competencies in dance technique
Students are able to perform 400 level (advanced level) exit competencies in dance technique. A minimum of two semesters of both DAN 402 and DAN 401 are required.

Related Measures:

M 1: Performance exam
400-level students complete semesterly juried assessment. Juries assess technical and artistic skills, and disposition and professionalism on a standardized 5 point rubric. The jury is the full dance faculty. The overall highest score possible is 5.0.

Target:
75% earn minimum score of 3.5 out of 5.0.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
FA12: (performance juries only occur in the Fall semester) Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) completed performance jury and received score of at least 3.5 (out of 5). Average score was 4.6 (out of 5).

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Performance Exam
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Student scores in annual juried assessments did not meet targets.

M 2: Self-evaluation
As a part of DAN 401, students complete informed, written self-evaluation on their technical progress in relation to given objectives and established criteria for excellence and competency. These competencies include alignment/placement, range of motion/flexibility, strength and control, rhythmic skills/sequencing, coordination/connectivity, focus, musicality and phrasing, qualitative range combined with individual course objectives. Self-evaluations display synthesis of
objectives and personal growth.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
90% of students successfully earn grade of at least 75 (out of 100) for informed written self-evaluation on technical progress in relation to given objectives and established criteria for excellence and competency.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) earned grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 91. SP13: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 94. Overall, target met with 100% of students (7 of 7) earning grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 92.5.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**DAN 401 self evaluations**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Students in DAN 401 complete summative self evaluations that are directed, yet personalized and reflective. The range of methods...

**M 3:DAN 401 Performance Exam**
As a part of DAN 401, students complete instructor-determined performance exams based on given objectives and established criteria for excellence and competency. These competencies include alignment/placement, range of motion/flexibility, strength and control, rhythmic skills/sequencing, coordination/connectivity, focus, musicality and phrasing, qualitative range combined with individual course objectives. Exams are midterm and/or final performance exams. In these exams, skills are both applied and exactly demonstrated/identified.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% of students in DAN 401 earn score of 75 or higher (out of 100) on instructor-determined performance exams based on instructor and program approved competencies.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 90 (out of 100). SP13: Target met. 100% of students (7 of 7) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 89 (out of 100). Overall, target met. 100% of students (10 of 10) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 89.5 (out of 100).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.
Performance exams in DAN 401 and assessing them  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

The process of aggregating the data suggests a variance in how students are being assessed in performance exams in individual ...

**M 4:DAN 402 Variation performances**  
In DAN 402, students perform a variety of instructor-selected ballet variations that intentionally range in style from classic to contemporary. These performances allow students to demonstrate and apply technical skills as well as develop artistry.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**  
80% of students perform variations that demonstrate technical and artistic skills and competence and earn at least 37.5 out of 50.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 44 (out of 50).  
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 41 (out of 50).  
Overall, target met. 100% of students (6 of 6) earned at least 75 (out of 50) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 42.5 (out of 50).

**M 5:Growth grade in DAN 402**  
In DAN 402, student technical and artistic growth is quantified in a growth grade that is based on defined ballet exit competencies and includes technical, artistic and performance skills and knowledge. These skills and knowledge are articulated in detail as well as aggregated into a single score for the student.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**  
80% of students earn a score of 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**  
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402. Average score was 91 (out of 100).  
SP13: Target not met. 33% of students (1 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402. Average score was 73 (out of 100). Overall, target not met. 66% of students (4 of 6) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on growth grade in DAN 402. Average score was 82 (out of 100).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**DAN 402 growth grade for DED majors**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
Target not met in 2012-2013. Target will not be changed, but monitored in future reporting cycles. At present, we maintain the s...
M 6: Alumni Survey- Dance Technique
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. 90% of respondants rank technical preparedness at 3/5 out of 5 or higher.

**Target:**
80% of responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. 80% of respondents rank technical preparedness at 4 or higher (out of 5).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 reporting cycle. Data is reported separately for alumni and graduates from 2012-2013. Alumni findings:
Target met. 92% of responders (12 of 13) to alumni survey indicated they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. Average score was 4.4 out of 5 with 12 of 13 responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness. 2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of responders (5 of 5) to graduate survey indicated they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. Average score was 4.8 out of 5 with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness. Overall, target met for graduate and alumni with 17 of 18 responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness. Overall average score was 4.6 (out of 5).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Administer exit survey to alumni**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

**SLO 2: Comprehensive knowledge of dance**
Students display an integrated and comprehensive knowledge of the dance field -- historical, cultural, theoretical, and aesthetic, practical, and pedagogic.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Capstone final Presentation**
Students complete final project in Capstone course, DAN 491, that integrates field of dance education to other areas of scholarship. Final oral presentation involves thesis statement, review of literature, annotated bibliography, explanation of main points and is delivered with accompanying power point presentation.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**
80% of all projects will earn minimum score of 2.8 out of 4.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
FA12: Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) earned a score of at least 2.8 (out of 4) on final research presentation in Capstone course. Average score was 3.2. (Capstone is only offered in Fall semesters.)
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Capstone course final presentation
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Because this is a culminating project, it is expected that it's quality be high and that the stakes be correspondingly high. T...

M 8: Final Projects
Students complete final projects in individual dance theory courses (DAN 131, DAN 240, DAN 351, DAN 431, DED 360, DAN 340, DED 260, DED 361)

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of all projects will earn minimum score of 75 out of 100.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
FA12: DAN 131: Target met. 100% of students (9 of 9) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 94. DAN 240: Target not met. 75% of students (3 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 83. DAN 431: Target met. 86% of students (6 of 7) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 90. DED 360: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 93. DED 361: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project (autonomous lesson). Average score was 85. SP13: DAN 340: Target met. 93% of students (4 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 94. DED 260: Target met. 100% of students (4 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 90. Overall, target met. 94% of students (34 of 36) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final projects. Average score was 90.

M 9: Exit Interview
Seniors complete exit interview with faculty sub-committee where they discuss their progression through the program, their benchmarks of major growths, their growth, and their cognitive discoveries/understandings. Exit interview incorporates student response to standard questionnaire that addresses the above issues in addition to career/artistic goals.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
80% of students pass exit interview with faculty subcommittee (program director, academic advisor and another selected faculty member). Interview is preceded with written submission of initial survey/questionnaire. Interview is assessed in terms of professionalism, quality of answers to subcommittee questions, and clarity in statement of career objectives and strategies for attaining them. A score of at least 2.5 out of 4 is passing.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
SP13: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) passed exit interview with
faculty subcommittee with a score of at least 2.5 (out of 4). Average score was 3.7. (Exit interviews are only conducted in Spring semesters).

**M 10:Portfolio - DED 460/461 Student Teaching**

Dance education students present two portfolios (that adhere to University and state licensure guidelines) of student teaching experience. These portfolios are compilations of both mentor and supervising teacher assessments of the skills, knowledge and disposition they display during their teaching placement as well as all required written work in a diversity of supporting pedagogical areas. Examples include weekly lesson and unit plans, reflective journals, student assessment studies, and classroom management profiles and plans to name a few.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**

90% of students earned at least 910 points out of 1138 on OEFE/SPA portfolio.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

SP13: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 910 points (out of 1138) on OEFE/SPA portfolio. Average score was 901. (Student teaching only happens in the Spring semester).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Teaching Portfolio target**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

This is the first reporting cycle for this measure, so even though it was not met we will not change the target for at least one...

**SLO 3: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance**

Graduates are prepared to successfully participate in the dance field as performers, choreographers, licensed dance educators, graduate students, and/or scholars.

**Related Measures:**

**M 11: Participation in the Repertory Dance Company**

Students gain adequate experience in dance repertory, public performance, and professional rehearsal situations through successfully completing a minimum of two semesters in DAN 420. Students are given Process and Product grades by the choreographers with whom they work. The Process Grade includes:

- Professionalism/Approach & Attitude
- Commitment to the Choreographic Process
- Consistency in Work Ethic
- Ability to Receive & Apply Feedback
- Coachability
- Investment in the Development/Evolution of the Dance
- Spirit of Exploration
- Personal Improvement in Artistry
- Commitment to Fellow Cast Members & Choreographer

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**

At least 100% of students earn at least 54 (out of 60) on Process Grade for Repertory Dance Company.
**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**

FA12: Target not met. 66% of students (6 of 9) earned targeted score. Average score was 55. SP13: Target not met. 63% of students (5 of 8) earned targeted score. Average score was 52. Overall, target not met. 65% of students (11 of 17) earned targeted score. Average score was 54.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**RDC target**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

An updated RDC rubric requires an updated target. The new rubric does not have a "process" portion. 2012-2013 finding are likely...

**M 13:External Evaluations**

Students work with guest artists while participating in DAN 420/Repertory Dance Company. Guest artists set new works and offer evaluations of students to the RDC director. The 100 point Dancer Evaluation rubric addresses disposition/professionalism, clarity of choreographic detail and quality, and performance in the creative process and product. Rubric is developed from similar instrument used in DAN 220 and DAN 420. If no guest artist is available faculty will evaluate students in RDC performance on "Evaluation of the Dancer" rubric.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

**Target:**

50% of dancers earn 80 points or higher (out of 100) on the Dancer Evaluation rubric for their work with guest artists.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

SP13: Target met. 100% of students (1 of 1) earned at least 80 (out of 100) in evaluation from guest artist. Score was 89 is a combination of Adrienne Clancy and faculty rehearsal director. (Guest artist residency only took place in Spring semester).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Substitute for external evaluations of RDC members**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

No data was reported this cycle because our guest artists residencies did not include setting a work (and thus evaluating) our R...

**M 15:Licensure**

Dance education graduates with licensure who try to achieve employment will have a job in the field.

**Target:**

75% of dance education graduates with licensure who seek employment in the field achieve it.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. 75% of graduates who
attempted to find work as licensed dance educators (3 of 4) achieved employment.

M 16: Praxis II exam
Students will take and pass the Praxis II state teacher’s examination. This exam correlates to University and state measures of effective teaching and professional readiness.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
90% of students will pass Praxis II exam.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. 100% of students who took the Praxis II exam (5 of 5) passed it.

M 17: Teacher Candidate Evaluations
Teacher candidates are evaluated by supervising teachers using standardized instrument from the Office of Educational Field Experiences. In-class (TIAI) and final-summative evaluations are used. Scores from second placement are used in annual assessment reporting. The TIAI assesses student skills, knowledge and professional dispositions in dance and educational practices/pedagogy. It concentrates on class planning, instruction, student diagnosis and assessment, and classroom management. The summative rubric is used by the cooperating teacher only and it focuses primarily on the evaluation of the student teacher’s professional and personal dispositions in terms of being an effective, ethical and quality professional educator.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
90% of students earn at least 468 points (out of 586) on supervising teacher’s in-class (TIAI) and final evaluations in second placement.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 468 points (out of 586) on final evaluation in second placement. Average score was 534. (Student teaching occurs in the spring semester only).

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

mentor/supervisor evaluations and targets
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Target language needs to be updated to read "388 points (out of 454)"
for mentor teacher evaluations and "778 points (out of 972..."

M 18: Program alumni as mentor teachers
Dance program alumni become mentor teachers in their schools, K-12. Becoming a mentor teacher requires 5 years of service at a school as well as proven excellence as an arts educator.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
50% of eligible K-12 dance education graduates become mentor teachers after 3 years of service. "Eligible" refers to graduates who are in-state and/or within reasonable distance so that no courtesy fee is required.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We had no program graduates who were eligible to become mentor teachers in this reporting cycle. We did add two new mentor teachers to the ranks, but they are not dance department graduates.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

mentor teacher recruitment
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Once we have graduates who have been in a school for 3 years, they will be strongly recruited for mentor teachership. This is ...

M 19:Alumni Survey- Career Preparedness
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate that their course of study was integrated and comprehensive and prepared them to enter the field of dance.

Target:
80% of respondents rate dance program curriculum at 4 or higher (out of 5).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 along with survey of 2012-2013 graduates. Findings are presented independently and combined. Alumni findings: Target met. 100% of alumni responders (12 of 13) rated the comprehensiveness of the dance program and their preparedness to enter the profession at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.3 (out of 5) with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum. 2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of graduating students (5 of 5) rated the comprehensiveness of the dance program and their preparedness to enter the profession at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.8 (out of 5) with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum. Overall, target met with 17 of 18 alumni and 2012-2013 graduates "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum. Average score was 4.55.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Administer exit survey to alumni
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

SLO 4:Articulate dance theoretically and aesthetically
Students are able to articulate the dance experience and situate their pedagogical practices and experiences in the larger field of dance both theoretically and aesthetically.

**Related Measures:**

**M 20: Teacher Candidates presenting concerts**
Dance education majors choreograph in their second K-12 teacher candidate placement and/or produce dance concerts in the public schools where they student teach. This project includes working on a group of dancers in developmentally appropriate ways while maintaining a commitment to the fundamental principles of quality dance-making. Final work is evaluated by the supervising teacher and through a self evaluation by the participants. Project also includes a final reflective paper that details the learning process and product, a log of all rehearsals and progress made in each as well as a comparison of the student's junior choreographic work to their dance made in the schools.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students earn at least 90 points out of 100 in creating and presenting dance in the public schools where they student teach.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Student teaching happens only in the Spring semester. SP13: Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 90 (out of 100) in creating and presenting dance in the schools in which they student taught. Average score was 97 (out of 100).

**M 21: Alumni Survey-Theoretical/aesthetic understanding**
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were able to participate in the field of dance with a clear sense of theoretical and/or aesthetic placement and/or understanding.

**Target:**
80% of responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were able to participate in the field of dance with a clear sense of theoretical and/or aesthetic placement and/or understanding.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 along with survey of 2012-2013 graduates. Findings are presented independently and combined. Alumni findings: Target met. 81% of alumni responders (21 of 26) rated their sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4 (out of 5). 2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of graduating students (5 of 5) rated their sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.8 (out of 5). Overall, target met with 83% (26 of 31) of alumni and 2012-2013 graduates rating their sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.4.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.
Administer exit survey to alumni

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

SLO 5: Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making
Students apply broad knowledges and experiences to dance-making and demonstrate a developed sense of what constitutes a serious work of dance with coherent and embodied goals and ideas.

Related Measures:

M 22: Festival Adjudication
Student dancers and choreographers annually and successfully adjudicate work at American College Dance Festival. ACDFA is a conference for college and university dance programs. Students perform formally, informally, and take master classes. Formal performances are evaluated by a panel of three respected figures in the field.

Target:
Continuous and multi-part target: a) Student choreographers annually adjudicate work at American College Dance Festival. b) At least every other year, student dancers and/or choreographers are selected for Gala Concert and/or national festival. c) Compiled anecdotal feedback is positive.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
a) Target met. Student work "worlds in conflict" was adjudicated at American College Dance Festival. b) There was no Gala concert offered at the festival for this reporting cycle (for the first time ever). USM work was selected in previous reporting cycle, so we will report on target being met in 2013-2014 reporting cycle. c) Target met. Compiled anecdotal feedback was constructive and positive for the student work.

M 23: Oral and written presentation
Students track and articulate their individual choreographic and aesthetic preferences and technical growth. This is evidenced in oral and written research presented in DAN 212, DAN 310, and DAN 312. Journals, project proposals and final papers are the written documents required. They are evaluated with a rubric and put into student files.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
a. 90% of students earn at least 3 points (out of 4) on project proposal in DAN 310, 312. b. 90% of students earn at least 3 points (out of 4) on final paper in DAN 212, 310, 312. c. 90% of students earn at least 4 points (out of 4) on journal in DAN 212, 310, 312.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
a. Project proposal SP13: DAN 312. Target not met. 50% of students (1 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on project proposal. Average score was 2.7 (out of 4). b. Final paper FA12: DAN 212. Target not met. 50% of students (2 of 4) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.1 (out of 4). SP13: DAN 310. Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.3 (out of 4). SP13:
DAN 312. Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.9 (out of 4). Overall for final paper, target not met. 78% of students (29 of 35) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final paper. Average score was 3.4 (out of 4). c. Journal FA12: DAN 212. Target not met. 33% of students (1 of 3) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 2.5 (out of 4). SP13: DAN 310. Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 3.6 (out of 4). SP13: DAN 312. Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 4 (out of 4). Overall for journal, target not met. 75% of students (6 of 8) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on journal. Average score was 3.4 (out of 4).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Written and oral presentations**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

Targets were not all met and will be considered by appropriate faculty for update. Procedures for scoring press blurbs needs to ...

**DAN 212, 310, 312 targets**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

Target have not been met over successive reporting cycles. Scope of target may be too broad (should 212 and 310 be included?) Ar...

**M 24:Alumni Survey- Apply and Demonstrate Knowledge**

Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they are able to apply and demonstrate their broad experiences of dance-making in post-baccalaureate creative work.

**Target:**

80% of responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they are able to apply and demonstrate their broad experiences of dance-making in post-baccalaureate creative work.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Alumni survey administered in 2012-2013 along with survey of 2012-2013 graduates. Findings are presented independently and combined. Alumni findings: Target met. 85% of alumni responders (11 of 13) rated their ability to apply and demonstrate knowledge of dance-making at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.2 (out of 5). 2012-2013 graduates findings: Target met. 100% of alumni responders (5 of 5) rated their ability to apply and demonstrate knowledge of dance-making at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.4 (out of 5). Overall, target met with 89% (16 of 18) of alumni and 2012-2013 graduates combined rating their ability to apply and demonstrate knowledge of dance-making at at least 4 (out of 5). Average score was 4.5 (out of 5).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Administer exit survey to alumni**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Administer exit survey to alumni**

The survey is done. The mailing list is a work in progress. Electronic and snail mail.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Alumni Survey- Apply and Demonstrate Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey- Career Preparedness | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepared to participate in various fields of dance
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey- Dance Technique | **Outcome/Objective:** Perform exit competencies in dance technique
- **Measure:** Alumni Survey-Theoretical/aesthetic understanding | **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate dance theoretically and aesthetically

**Implementation Description:** Su 2011: Professor Meredith Early has taken over this project. The majority of all alumni contacts are updated. The survey is being reviewed and will be posted to Survey Monkey (or another survey source) and we hope to administer the survey Fall 2012.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Meredith and Stacy

**Written and oral presentations**

Targets were not all met and will be considered by appropriate faculty for update. Procedures for scoring press blurbs needs to be formalized across sections of DAN 312 and DAN 410.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Oral and written presentation | **Outcome/Objective:** Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making

**Implementation Description:** Summer 2011: The dance composition and choreography faculty had a summit where we reconsidered and revisited all assessment instruments and materials in these courses. Scoring is now updated and consistent across courses. We are piloting our new system to see if it is successful.

Press blurb scoring is now included in "choreographer responsibility" portion of assessment instrument.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy, Meredith, Kelly, Elizabeth

**Capstone course final presentation**

Because this is a culminating project, it is expected that it's quality be high and that the stakes be correspondingly high. The full faculty (upon review of this report) will discuss
if the target should be changed. Data for this reporting cycle reflects a weakness of one student.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Finished  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Capstone final Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive knowledge of dance

Implementation Description: Fall 2011 faculty discussion: We will change the target to 80% and see how this works after gathering 2 years of data. Hopefully, this will better address intellectual disparity.  
Projected Completion Date: 08/29/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy and full faculty

DAN 401 self evaluations  
Students in DAN 401 complete summative self evaluations that are directed, yet personalized and reflective. The range of methods through which professors of this course (there are between 2 to 4 per academic year) meet this objective is widely varied. The self evaluations need to be addressed as a faculty as a whole (including some new instructors for this course) so that we can assure that the divergent methods we use to assess this outcome are still targeted to the same end. Because this target has been met in the past, we will review the data in this report and see if we can interpret what it implies. Are our students not meeting our expectation? Or can the faculty do a better job in measuring this outcome?

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: Finished  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Self-evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

Implementation Description: Fall 2011: The dance faculty decided to utilize a "reflective paper" rubric to assess all student written work in DAN 401. The rubric allows for consistency in assessment, with the appropriate amount of flexibility for individual instructor assignments. This was first used Fall, 2011. This change will apply to all majors.  
Projected Completion Date: 10/29/2011  
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy with dance faculty  
Additional Resources Requested: allocated dance faculty meeting

mentor teacher recruitment  
Once we have graduates who have been in a school for 3 years, they will be strongly recruited for mentor teachership. This is actually part of the long term planning for the dance education program. We simply didn't have anyone "come up" this year, but we will next year.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Program alumni as mentor teachers | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

Projected Completion Date: 10/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy, Julie, Elizabeth

mentor/supervisor evaluations and targets
Target language needs to be updated to read “388 points (out of 454)” for mentor teacher evaluations and “778 points (out of 972)” for supervising teacher evaluation. Also, update this to be a two-part target. The actual target may need to also be updated to reflect more accurately what we expect from our students in relation to what the university and/or mentor teachers expect.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teacher Candidate Evaluations | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

Implementation Description: FA11: The faculty met and decided to update this target for the 11-12 Plan. The mentor teacher’s scores will not be used as they are often inflated. We are lowering the target after 2 yrs of data and with knowing that it is not possible for teacher candidates to be excellent at everything; the portfolio is too diverse. A significant amount of growth will still be needed to meet the target.
Projected Completion Date: 10/29/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy, Julie, Elizabeth

Performance exams in DAN 401 and assessing them
The process of aggregating the data suggests a variance in how students are being assessed in performance exams in individual sections of DAN 401. DAN 401 faculty should meet as a whole to determine their assessment methods and which are shared and which are unique. The content of the performance exams is not the issue, but how each individual instructor determines if they are being met or not perhaps is. Each student encounters up to 4 different instructors and assessment processes per year in DAN 401, so this action is certainly relevant to assuring course continuity in terms of the experience of the students who take it repeatedly.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: DAN 401 Performance Exam | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2011: The dance faculty met to review this measure and target. We decided to NOT change the target, but to work harder to impart and share the relevance of the final performance assessments with our students. Specifically, these activities prepare students for high stakes performing, which they will encounter in the profession. Additionally, these activities reflect the rigor and high expectations within our program. Also these performances are just a component of the final grade.

**Projected Completion Date:** 10/29/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy, Meredith, Kelly, Elizabeth

### Student Teaching Portfolio target

This is the first reporting cycle for this measure, so even though it was not met we will not change the target for at least one more reporting cycle.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
- **Implementation Status:** Finished  
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Portfolio- DED 460/461 Student Teaching | **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehensive knowledge of dance

**Implementation Description:** Target was modified to students earning 715 out of 894 points.

**Projected Completion Date:** 08/29/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy

### Substitute for external evaluations of RDC members

No data was reported this cycle because our guest artists residencies did not include setting a work (and thus evaluating) our RDC dancers. Residencies instead included master classes and lectures. For the upcoming year, we will have at least one guest artist who can do this evaluation. However, is there an alternative in case the opportunity doesn't exist for an external judgement such as this? Should faculty evaluate RDC members not in their own works? And should we do so with a slightly different perspective, one that is maybe more akin to what exists in the professional world of dance? Dance faculty to brainstorm the idea with the objective being: how can we satisfy this measure when we do not have a guest artist set a work?

- **Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
- **Implementation Status:** Finished  
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** External Evaluations | **Outcome/Objective:** Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

**Implementation Description:** If no guest artist is available, faculty will evaluate students in RDC performance on "Evaluation of the Dancer" rubric. Evaluation will be done outside the scope of faculty and students working together in faculty choreographic projects.

**Projected Completion Date:** 10/29/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy and full dance faculty
212/210/312/410 targets change
In both emphasis areas, all targets for this measure were mainly not met. There has been some revision to the written work required in these courses (project proposal, final paper, journal), but targets were also not met last year. The targets should be REVISED as clearly program expectations are not in line with student achievement. At the same time, the accompanying and observable work of student in their choreography IS meeting expectations, so while our targets are high, lowering them should not sacrifice the quality of student creative work.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Faculty discussion FA12. Faculty decided to modify targets.
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy

Applying broad experiences of dance making
Target was not met, but due the the sample size, there is little concern in this area. Target will remain.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Stacy

Performance Exam
Student scores in annual juried assessments did not meet targets.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Performance exam | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

Implementation Description: Analyze findings with full faculty to determine if expectations are reasonable.
Responsible Person/Group: dance faculty
Additional Resources Requested: dedicated faculty meeting

Repertory Dance Company Process Score target
Target was not met by either Dance Education or Dance Performance/Choreography students. This was the first year we have used this measure, so we will wait to see if it is met or not next year. 12-13 reporting cycle was not met either. Full attention needs to be given to this in terms of the instrument used and the expectations in relation to the program SLO. Knowing the average RDC Process Score will, in a larger view, assist the dance department in determining where student weakness are in the RDC experience.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Wait for another cycle of data reporting to gain fuller understanding of student achievement in relation to this measure and target.
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy and dance faculty

Student Teaching Portfolio scores
Target was almost met. Target was newly revised, so it will be kept for another year to see if student achievement meets target in 12/13.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Target modified to students earning 715 out of 894 points.
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy and dance education faculty

Summer/winter study off campus
Students are not participating in off campus training during summer and winter breaks. The faculty greatly supports this effort and we have taken steps towards making it a reality for our majors. The results do not yet show that it is working. Is this target needed? Or should the measure be changed to measure the results of students who DO study/train off campus? It could be that our current measure only measures who (financially) is able to pursue this.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: faculty discussion in FA12.
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy plus dance faculty

Teacher candidate evaluation target not met.
This measure and target were both updated for the 11-12 reporting cycle, so we will keep it for an additional year without changing it to see the results of capturing 2 years of data.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Discussion with dance education faculty in FA12.
Target was met in 12-13 reporting cycle.
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy, Julie, Elizabeth

DAN 212, 310, 312 targets
Target have not been met over successive reporting cycles. Scope of target may be too broad (should 212 and 310 be included?) Are assessment instruments consistent? Are expectations too high? What is the relation between Quality of Work score and scores in these areas (project proposal, final paper, journal)?
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Oral and written presentation | Outcome/Objective: Applies and demonstrates knowledge of dance-making

Responsible Person/Group: SRF plus composition/choreography faculty

**DAN 402 growth grade for DED majors**
Target not met in 2012-2013. Target will not be changed, but monitored in future reporting cycles. At present, we maintain the same standards and expectations for Licensure and performance/choreography emphasis area majors. Typically, student achievement is consistent across both areas, but this will be monitored.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Growth grade in DAN 402 | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

Responsible Person/Group: SRF and DED faculty.

**RDC target**
An updated RDC rubric requires an updated target. The new rubric does not have a "process" portion. 2012-2013 finding are likely skewed for this reason.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Participation in the Repertory Dance Company | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

Responsible Person/Group: SRF and dance faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
You will notice overlap in this section and the following in the Licensure emphasis and the Performance/Choreography emphasis area assessment reports. This is intentional and reflects that our majors, regardless of emphasis area, are in the same courses and are held to the same expectations. When measures are specific to one area, they are
only addressed in the corresponding report. Reviewing the findings in this report reveal
that we are primarily meeting targets for all SLOs. SLO#2 and #4 were met by all
measures. This indicates that students are meeting our expectations for displaying an
integrated and comprehensive knowledge of dance and for being able to articulate
dance theoretically and aesthetically. In particular, SLO#2 utilizes 4 measures
(capstone presentation, final projects in eight DAN/DED courses, exit interview, Student
Teaching portfolio) to assess student achievement. The portfolio measure has been
inconsistent in previous reporting cycles, so we look forward to future reporting cycles
to support this year’s findings. Meeting 5 of 6 measure targets for SLO#1 indicates that
we are doing well in developing the technical skills of our majors. Four SLO #1
measures vary from performance to written work, so we are assured that our majors
are proficient in their skill acquisition on both physical and cognitive levels. That SLO #1
and #2 are mainly met affirms our department value for majors being skilled and further
able to integrate their skills to "non-dance" coursework. Part of training artists in any
field is preparing them for the realities of the "real world" when they graduate. SLO #3 is
directly concerned with this. The Licensure area measures this outcome through
assessing student work in RDC, their ability to gain employment in the field, evaluations
of their work in student teaching, development of alumni to mentor teacher status and
results from an alumni/graduate survey. We are most satisfied with the student teacher
evaluation measure being met as we have grappled with the most appropriate and
effective way to include it in our WEAVE reports. As mentioned elsewhere in this report,
the summative evaluation from the supervising teacher in the second experience
appears to be our best indicator of actual student performance in this area. We look
forward to future reporting cycles to affirm this. SLO#3 was met except for the measure
regarding student work in the Repertory Dance Company which is under review.
(Student achievement is not the issue, but how our unit measures it is.) It is worth
highlighting that one measure for this SLO, as in others, is the results of an alumni
survey. That alumni view themselves as prepared for the field is perhaps the most
valuable indicator of this outcome SLO#5 was met in 2 of 3 measures. That we expect
Licensure majors to demonstrate an ability to apply knowledge of dance making reflects
that the degree in a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree and that all our dance educators need
to be able to engage in the craft of dance making as proficiently as they do their
pedagogical practices.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives
that will require continued attention?

While each program SLO was met through more than one measure, there are still
areas for improvement. They are: 1. It appears that guest artists evaluate our student
dancers from a less rigorous perspective than the regular dance faculty do. This was
immediately apparent in the data received and for this reason, we have modified the
measure/target to reflect a score that is partially the guest artist and partially the RDC
director or faculty rehearsal director. 2. We are still not satisfied with how we are
assessing/reporting on student written work in composition/choreography courses. Our
measure (meas. #23) regarding journals, final papers and project proposals in DAN
212, 310, 312 and 410 needs attention. In the past 3 years we created and
implemented a consistent assignment across these courses, but it appears that there is
not yet consistency in how they are evaluated (by the instructors, who rotate) and/or in
how "featured" or attended to they are in each course (specifically the journal). 3.
Assessment of student work in RDC needs attention. The measure (meas. #11) was
changed for the 12-13 reporting cycle, but mid-cycle the assessment instrument was
changed as well. The data in this report does not completely capture what we wish for-
which is student work in the rehearsal process (not the process and product combined).
What we ultimately care about knowing is how prepared out students are for the "real
world" (SLO #3). 4. An area for attention is related to Measure 5 (DAN 402 Growth
Grade). This measure was not met in the cycle and reflects an issue that emerges
periodically. This measure was met by performance/choreography emphasis area majors and we have the same expectations and standards for performance and growth in DAN 402 (Advanced ballet) for majors from both emphasis areas. When Licensure majors underachieve (yes, the sample size was small: 3) we need to be assured that this is not because we are advancing our licensure students too early in their technical training. Every semester as the faculty discussed technique level placement, we encounter this issue. Findings this year brings it to light, again.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The following events were unique to the 2012-2013 year. This section is the same for both BFA emphasis areas. · We expanded our faculty to seven with the addition of an Instructor. Rebecca McArthur instructed 10 courses and contributed to the artistic community. Students benefitted from her perspectives on technical training and faculty benefitted from a new (non-USM) perspective. · Due to asbestos abatement, our primarily performance venue, the Mannoni Performing Arts Center (PAC) was not available to us. We had anticipated this for the Fall semester, but the February 2013 tornado rendered it unusable for our Spring production. We compensated (and met accreditation standards for performance and choreographic opportunities for our majors) through producing a series of site-specific works in the Hattiesburg area in fall and in reconfiguring our Spring PAC concert into a series of smaller concerts in the convertible dance studio theatre. It was not ideal, but we managed. The site-specific works were wildly successful in terms of audience attendance, creating visibility for the department and in generating buzz. · On July 1, 2013, we officially became a stand-alone department at USM. We split from the Theatre department and now govern ourselves autonomously within the institution. This is the result of several years of work and planning and has been a point of pride and celebration all year long. · Faculty were prolific in their creative research, Prof. White published in the Journal of Dance Education, and faculty made off campus research and creative presentations. White was awarded the CoAL Teacher of the Year and Reischman Fletcher was honored with the Dance Teacher magazine 2013 Award in Higher Education. Faculty are serving on national board and hold leadership positions in service organizations. Lester chaired the UAC and Reischman Fletcher the Academic Council. · Surprisingly, there was no Gala concert at the American College Dance Festival in March 2013. Our department made a very good showing, especially with the faculty works, but we missed the opportunity to show our work more than once in the regional setting. · 2012-2013 saw the advent of departmental strategic planning, which includes curricular revisions and possible degree expansion. The process is inclusive, focused and will generate a 5 year plan for the department. This is in part a result of the Spring 2012 reaccreditation visit. · The department (White and Lester) administered a grant-funded guest artist residency with ClancyWorks, a company from Washington D.C.. The residency had a large education component and integrated our licensure program in a way not typical. We are continuing to attract a larger number and more talented incoming class. The ramifications of a more skilled incoming class should be manifest in the level of student achievement in areas such as those presented in this report. Will targets need to be adjusted in the future to account for this? Will their technical growth be paralleled by “academic” growth? Accepting students who are pre-prepared for our program and who have gone through the audition-acceptance process also appears to be contributing to a higher retention rate (although in 2012 we started deliberately addressing retention through student engagement and faculty contact). Because contemporary dance is more mainstream than it was even 5 years ago is aiding us in attracting students, assuaging parent fears about majoring in the arts and in guaranteeing that our incoming majors have exposure to the field in relevant ways.
Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
1. Administering the alumni survey was a large scale departmental initiative and encompassed and addressed more than one SLO. The electronic survey was administered to about 40 USM dance program alums. This survey polled respondents on each of the SLOs in this WEAVE report. The responses are reported in this annual report and the department is using them for further department planning and decision making (curricular, artistic and programmatic). The alumni survey is being utilized in establishing the Dance Advisory Board, which will start work in summer, 2013. Generally, survey results are positive and reflect that our graduates are using their degrees and are satisfied with their USM dance education. 2. In 2012-2013 we continued with administering the Chicago Dance Artist Series (CDAS). This program brings a variety of working artists from Chicago to USM to work with students in classes, rehearsals, performances, lec-dems and informal discussion. We had always intended for this program to be a way to expose our majors to dance outside of the immediate geographic region. Literally, we have brought the Chicago dance scene to our majors (and the public who participate). Our original intentions have been magnified and we now have proof that exposure to the larger dance world is essential to the training and development of our students (and will be addressed in our strategic plan). We have seen immediate success and already have a 2012 graduate performing professionally in Chicago. We intend to continue the CDAS model with dance artists from other cities and to see how we can mine the idea to augment our students' educational and artistic experiences at USM. CDAS is not included in this report as a measure because its intent (and rewards) transcend more than one program objective. 3. We are using assessment results to help us make decisions about curricular progression across series of courses. For instance, Capstone final presentations, which are used as a key indicator of student achievement in their final year of study have been (yet again) revised in terms of the scope and expectations for the assignment. 2012-2013 saw modified targets and they were met for both emphasis areas. The curricular links between Capstone and the subsequent course in thesis writing are clearer now and we are better able to see how they work together to develop student skills. The next step is configuring how the pre-Capstone writing/speaking intensive course (DED 360) and the post-Capstone student teaching experience can likewise be beneficial and benefited within the existing curricular structure. 4. We are revising our juried performance assessment instrument (and perhaps processes). The present one has been in use for many years. We are using new(er) faculty to contribute an outside/objective eye to our processes. We are concerned with remaining relevant and being efficient in our juried assessments.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
1. For the licensure emphasis area, effort spent determining what evaluation tools are most appropriate (summative), from whom (supervising teacher) and in which experience (second) are paying off and we are now generating useful data that tells us what we want to know and data that we can use for program improvements. We remain flexible with the sometimes "moving target" that is the Office of Educational Field Experience and of how certain assignments change in terms of how many points they are worth, etc. We look forward to continuing to learn about our licensure program/students through several cycles of reporting and analyzing data that emerges from the measures and targets included in this (and future) reports. 2. In addition to developing mentor teachers from the pool of our program graduates in the K-12 sector, we are developing mentor teachers who come from other disciplines. This ultimately aids us in assuring consistency and a high quality of student teaching experience for our licensure majors. Plus, having more qualified mentor teachers creates more placement opportunities for our students. While this doesn't capture the successes of our students and graduates, it does reflect a growing need and ever-
increasing partnership we have with the regional K-12 sector. 3. Some departmental processes (for both emphasis areas) are now working effectively and efficiently and reflect past time spent as a result of annual assessment reporting and follow through. They include: assessing student work in ballet and modern technique courses with rigor and consistency; evaluating written work in modern technique courses in a way that is standard, yet flexible for the range of professors who instruct these courses; administering the exit interview and using it as a way to capture student self perceptions on their achievement at the point of graduation (literally, these happen the week of graduation). All of the above have been under review/revision for several reporting cycles and now we see the rewards of their implementation.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Content Knowledge
Graduates will demonstrate the content knowledge necessary to serve as educational leaders.

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exam (Bldg)
Students on a Building Level plan of study will take a comprehensive exam during the end of their course work to evaluate their mastery of content knowledge from their program of studies based on ELCC/ISLLC standards for building level leaders.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
80% of the candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was inadvertently reported in the findings last for 2011-2012. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=3) of candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=2) of candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

M 2: School Improvement Plan (Bldg)
Students on a Building Level plan of study will research and evaluate data to develop an appropriate school mission statement, vision statement, and strategies for achieving goals related to student learning.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will complete a School Improvement Plan for student achievement at a level of mastery (3) or better based on the overall grading rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2012 data was inadvertently reported in the 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - No building level specialist students were enrolled in the course in which the plan is associated. Spring 2013 - The course associated with this assessment was not offered in the Spring.

M 11: Comprehensive Exam (District)
Students on a District Level plan of study will take a comprehensive exam during the end of their course work to evaluate their mastery of content knowledge from their program of studies based on ELCC/ISLLC standards for district level leaders.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
80% of the candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive exam.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no district level specialist students to complete the comps. Spring 2013 - There were no district level specialist students to complete the comps.

**M 12:District Improvement Plan (District)**
Students on a District Level plan of study will research and evaluate data to develop an appropriate district mission statement, vision statement, and strategies for achieving goals related to student learning.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students will complete a District Improvement Plan for student achievement at a level of mastery (3) or better based on the overall grading rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was inadvertently reported in the 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - No building level specialist students were enrolled in the course in which the plan is associated. Spring 2013 - The course associated with this assessment was not offered in the Spring.

**SLO 2: Relevant Research**
Graduates will conduct and interpret relevant research.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Applied Research Project (Bldg)**
Students on a Building Level plan of study will conduct and interpret relevant research through a two-semester project based on relevant, pre-approved, research related to a school which includes: review of literature, data collection, and data analysis.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students will complete action research as outlined in the rubric at a level of mastery (3 or >).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**
This assessment is only collected in the spring of each year. Summer 2012 - Data inadvertently reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Data not collected in fall semester. Spring 2013 - 75% (N=4) of students completed...
action research at a level of 3 or greater. Student had circumstances that warranted an incomplete. Will report final grade.

M 4: RCR Training (Bldg)
Students will demonstrate competency in research through completion of the RCR training module.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of students will complete the RCR training module prescribed by the department at 85% accuracy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
Summer 2012 data reported in 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=1) completed the RCR training at 85% mastery. Spring 2013 - No students (N=2) completed the RCR training at 85% mastery.

M 13: Applied Research Project (District)
Students on a District Level plan of study will conduct and interpret relevant research through a two-semester project based on relevant, pre-approved, research related to a district which includes: review of literature, data collection, and data analysis.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will complete action research as outlined in the rubric at a level of mastery (3 or >).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This assessment is only collected in the spring of each year. Summer 2012 - Data inadvertently reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Data not collected in fall semester. Spring 2013 - There were no district level specialist students enrolled in Action Research.

M 14: RCR Training (District)
Students on a District Level plan of study will demonstrate competency in research skills by completing RCR training modules prescribed by the university.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Students will pass the RCR Department module with 85% accuracy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - No student (N=1) completed the RCR training at 85% accuracy. Spring 2013 - No students were listed for the Spring semester as registered for RCR training.

SLO 3: Student Learning
Graduates will promote and increase student achievement.

Related Measures:
**M 5:SLLA Content Areas (Bldg)**
The SLLA is a licensure exam administered through ETS. It is designed to assess mastery of ISSLC standards. Each state sets its own pass score required for licensure. In MS students must score 169 or higher for licensure. Content knowledge is measured in six areas: vision, instruction, management, Collaboration, Ethics, and Socio-political Contexts. Assessment given multiple times per year. Scores will be reported for each CY.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
80% of program completers will score in the 75th quartile or > in 3 of the 4 subcontent areas.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 information was provided in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - No data to report. This data has proven to be more complex to attain and analyze than expected. 2013 - No data to report. This data has proven to be more complex to attain and analyze than expected.

**M 6:Strategic Budget (Bldg)**
Students on the Building Level plan of study complete a Strategic Budget which requires them to conduct a comprehensive financial analysis of their school's existing budget, collect data, interpret results and prepare a new school budget that effectively aligns resources with meeting instructional and learning needs within the school.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students will complete a Strategic Budget (Using Dollars Wisely) at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 - Data was inadvertently reported with 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=1) of students completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=1) of students completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better.

**M 15:District Leadership Case Study (District)**
Students on the District Level plan of study take a District Leadership Case Study in a designated course (EDA 742). The essay/case study is scenario based and requires students to apply content knowledge of district leadership based on ELCC Standards.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
80% of students will score mastery (3 or >) on the Case Study based on rubric criteria.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 - Data inadvertently included with 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=1) scored mastery or better on the Case Study
based on the scoring rubric. Spring 2013 - Course not offered in the spring semester.

**M 16: Strategic Budget (District)**

Students on the District Level plan of study complete a Strategic Budget which requires them to conduct a comprehensive financial analysis of their district's existing budget, collect data, interpret results and prepare a new school budget that effectively aligns resources with meeting instructional and learning needs within the district.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**

80% of students will score mastery or better on the requirements for the District Strategic Plan.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Summer 2012 - Data was inadvertently reported with 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no district level students enrolled in the course in which this project is assessed. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=1) of students completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better.

**SLO 4: ISSLC Standards**

Graduates will demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Graduate Survey (Bldg)**

Graduates will evaluate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to ISSLC Standards. Assessment is given to graduates each spring. Sent to graduates in their 1st, 3rd, and 5th year since degree completion.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**

80% of students will score proficient or better (3 or >) on a 4-point scale on the rating scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Summer 2012 data reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Survey not given each semester. No data to report. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=2) of students scored at level 3 or better on all the ISLLC standards measured in the survey.

**M 8: Internship (Bldg)**

To prepare students who demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**

80% of completed surveys will be rated proficient or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale).
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was inadvertently reported with 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=3) of students were rated proficient or better (3 or >) on the Internship rubric. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=1) of students scored proficient or better on the internship rubric.

M 17: Graduate Survey (District)
Graduates will evaluate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to ISSLC Standards. Assessments given to graduates each spring. Sent to graduates in their 1st, 3rd, and 5th year since degree completion.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
80% of students will score mastery or better (3 or >) on the graduate survey.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Survey not given each semester. No data to report. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=3) of students scored an overall level 3 or better on the ISLLC standards measured in the survey. One student felt limited (level 2) on one of the 24 standards assessed.

M 18: Internship (District)
Students on the District Level plan of study will complete internships in school district settings and demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
80% of students will score mastery or better (3 or >) on the requirements for the Internship evaluation.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported with the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no district level specialist students enrolled in the internship during the fall semester. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=1) scored proficient or better on the internship evaluation.

SLO 5: Successful Licensure
Graduates will successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.

Related Measures:

M 9: SLLA Composite Score (Bldg)
The SLLA is a licensure exam administered through ETS. It is designed to assess mastery of ISLLC Standards. Each state sets its own pass score required for licensure. In MS students must score 169 or higher for an administrator license. Assessment is given multiple times per year. Scores will be reported for each CY.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: 80% of program completers will pass the SLLA exam at the required score for their state (MS pass score is 169).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no building level specialist program completers who took the SLLA exam in the fall. Spring 2013 - 100% of building level specialist program completers (N=2) met the required score for the SLLA. Yearly data reflects that (N=2) 100% of building level specialist program completers passed the SLLA.

M 10: Degree Completion (Bldg)
Candidates will successfully matriculate through the program with all required criteria.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% of admitted candidates will successfully complete the program within 6 years of enrollment.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was included in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - No building level students completed the program in the fall semester. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=3) successfully completed the program meeting all criteria within 6 years.

M 19: Holds Valid Administrator License (District)
In MS there is not a separate license for building level and district level licenses. Therefore, candidates must hold a valid administrator license to be admitted into the program on a District Level plan of study. Documentation of an administrator license will be verified in Admissions Pro.

Source of Evidence: External report

Target: 100% of students will hold a valid administrator's license before entering the program,

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of admitted students (N=1) held an administrator's license before entering the program. Spring 2013 - There were no admitted students in the spring of 2013.

M 20: Degree Completion (District)
Candidates will successfully matriculate through the program and meet all requirements for degree completion.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 80% of the students will successfully complete the administration program within 6 years of enrollment.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was included in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=1) of students successfully completed the program meeting all criteria within 6 years. Spring 2013 - There were no district level specialist students who completed the program in the spring semester.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was included in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=1) of students successfully completed the program meeting all criteria within 6 years. Spring 2013 - There were no district level specialist students who completed the program in the spring semester.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Program assessments indicate that students are mastering program content and national standards. In particular students are passing their licensure exam (SLLA) at a higher rate. During previous review cycles, it was noted that the SLLA pass rate had declined, in part due to the fact that the state raised the score needed to pass the exam. In response, the department instituted an optional test-prep workshop provided to students each semester.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although the pass rate for the SLLA (licensure exam) has improved, we want to continue to monitor and improve in this area. To that end, faculty will continue to align course activities and assessments with national standards and are encouraged to include select vignettes and case studies in each course. Additionally, the department is developing a 1 hour student orientation course that will include a module related to the SLLA exam, test taking strategies, and the national standards (ISLLC) on which the exam is based. The department has also identified problems with data management that make tracking progress on many of our assessments very cumbersome. Improving data management will be a priority for the department.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The 36-hour EDS program is designed for students who are interested in pursuing a graduate degree above the master's in the field of educational administration. The program offers two tracks, one for students who have a graduate degree in educational administration and/ or hold an administrator license. The second track is for students who do not have a graduate degree in educational administration and do not have an administrator license. Almost exclusively, students are full-time employees in K12 schools/districts and attend classes on a part-time basis. Therefore, coursework is offered at night, on weekends, and online. The program includes field-based experiences, embedded into coursework and an internship; these experiences provide authentic application of content. Students take courses at their own pace and can be admitted each fall, spring, or summer. In lieu of a thesis, students complete a research project across two-semesters.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
The department has identified a few challenges with data management including the tracking of several program milestones, e.g., RCR training. The department is developing a 1hr student orientation course to ensure that students complete certain modules early in the program including, RCR training, plan of study, plagiarism tutorial, select readings, etc. Additionally, EDA courses are offered to majors and non-majors; students at the specialist and doctoral levels take the same core courses. Therefore, any given course in Educational Administration may include majors at the EDS, EDD, and PHD level, and non-majors including students taking courses to renew their educator license and students in related fields who take our courses as electives. It is also possible that a student who begins their coursework as a major in one of our programs or as a non-degree student may then transfer into a different program within our department before graduating. This creates challenges in tracking students and presents missing data points. Additionally, we have discovered that there are inconsistencies in how students are coded in SOAR. Due to coding, transfers, and the variety of students who take our courses, we are not confident that the queries we are able to run truly reflect our program outcomes. Therefore, data management is our top priority for the next review cycle.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

The program made positive strides to respond to lessons learned in previous review cycles. Each semester SLLA workshops are now offered to students in an effort to improve pass rates on this licensure exam. Strategic enrollment efforts have focused on growing numbers at the master's level and limiting numbers at the EDS/Doctoral levels. Assessments and course syllabi were better aligned with national and state standards. Course rotations have been improved to limit the number of course substitutions that were prevalent in the past. The department also hired a "Recruitment and Retention Specialist" who has begun assisting with recruiting strong students and in assisting in meeting student needs in an effort to keep students in the program after they are admitted. The department currently faces the challenge of having only 2 tenured faculty members, 3 non-tenured faculty members and 3 unfilled faculty lines. Hiring and faculty development will be top priorities for the upcoming year.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Content Knowledge
Graduates will demonstrate the content knowledge necessary to serve as educational leaders.

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exam (Bldg)
Students on a Building Level plan of study will take a comprehensive exam during the end of their course work to evaluate their mastery of content knowledge from their program of studies based on ELCC /ISLLC standards for building level leaders.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
80% of the candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported with 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=4) passed the comprehensive exams on the first attempt. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=2) passed the comprehensive exams on the first attempt.

M 2: School Improvement Plan (Bldg)
Students will research and evaluate data for comprehensive analysis and report for school improvement.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
80% of students will complete the School Improvement Plan at a level of mastery (3 or >) or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=5) completed the School Improvement Plan at a level of mastery or better. Summer 2013 - The course attached to this assessment was not offered in the Spring semester.

M 11: Comprehensive Exam (District)
Students on a District Level plan of study will take a comprehensive exam during the end of their course work to evaluate their mastery of content knowledge from their program of studies based on ELCC /ISLLC standards for district level leaders.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
80% of the candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported with 2011-2012 report. Fall 2012 - There were no district level doctoral students to complete comprehensive exams. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=4) successfully completed the comprehensive exams on the first attempt.

**M 12: District Improvement Plan (District)**
Students on a District Level plan of study will research and evaluate data to develop an appropriate district mission statement, vision statement, and strategies for achieving goals related to student learning.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students will complete the District Improvement Plan at a level of mastery or better (3 or >).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=7) completed the District Improvement Plan at a level of mastery or better. Summer 2013 - The course attached to this assessment was not offered in the Spring semester.

**SLO 2: Relevant Research**
Graduates will conduct and interpret relevant research.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Dissertation (Bldg)**
Students on a Building Level plan of study will conduct and interpret relevant research: review of literature, data collection, and data analysis.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
90% of candidates will successfully defend the dissertation within 8 years of admit date.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported with 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no building level doc students who completed a dissertation in the fall. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=5) completed a dissertation in the spring.

**M 4: RCR Training (Bldg)**
Students on a Building Level plan of study will demonstrate competency in research skills by completing RCR training modules prescribed by the university.
Target:
80% of candidates will complete the RCR training module prescribed by the department at 85% accuracy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2012 data was included in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no students listed for RCR training. Spring 2013 - There were no students listed for RCR training.

M 13:Dissertation (District)
Students will conduct research, data analysis, and interpret results to develop a successful dissertation which adds to the body of knowledge in the education field.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of candidates will successfully defend the dissertation within 8 years of admit date.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was collected for the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=15) successfully defended the dissertation. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=4) successfully defended the dissertation.

M 14:RCR Training (District)
Students on a District Level plan of study will demonstrate competency in research skills by completing RCR training modules prescribed by the university.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students will complete the RCR training module prescribed by the department at 85% accuracy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 33% of students (N=3 or 1 of 3) completed the RCR training at 85% mastery. Spring 2013 - No students (N=1) completed the RCR training at 85% mastery.

SLO 3:Student Learning
Graduates will promote and increase student achievement.

Related Measures:

M 5:SLLA Content Areas (Bldg)
Successful completion of the educator licensure within content areas of the exam for building track candidates.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
80% of program completers will score in the 75th quartile or > in 3 of the 4 subcontent areas.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2012 information was provided in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - No data to report. This data has proven to be more complex to attain and analyze than expected. 2013 - No data to report. This data has proven to be more complex to attain and analyze than expected.

M 6: Strategic Budget (Bldg)
Students on the Building Level plan of study complete a Strategic Budget which requires them to conduct a comprehensive financial analysis of their school's existing budget, collect data, interpret results and prepare a new school budget that effectively aligns resources with meeting instructional and learning needs within the school.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will complete the District Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale using the scoring rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=3) completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=6) completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better.

M 15: District Leadership Essay/Case Study (District)
Students on the District Level plan of study take a District Leadership Essay/Case Study in a designated course (EDA 742). The essay is case study scenario based and requires students to apply content knowledge of district leadership based on ELCC Standards.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of students will complete the District Level Essay at mastery or better (3 or better).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=5) completed the essay/case study at mastery or better. Spring 2013 - Course not offered in the spring semester.

M 16: Strategic Budget (District)
Candidates will conduct research, analyze data and interpret results for a comprehensive financial analysis of the school or district.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
80% of students will complete a Strategic Budget (Using Wise Dollars) at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=5) of students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=1) of students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better.

SLO 4: ISSLC Standards
Graduates will demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

Related Measures:

M 7: Graduate Survey (Bldg)
Graduates will evaluate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to ISSLC Standards. Assessment is given to graduates each spring. Sent to graduates in their 1st, 3rd, and 5th year since degree completion.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
80% of students will score mastery or better (3 or >) overall on the criteria for the graduate survey.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Survey not given each semester. No data to report. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=17) of students scored at level 3 or better overall on the ISLLC standards measured in the survey.

M 8: Internship (Bldg)
To prepare students who demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
80% of students will score proficient or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards in the final evaluation.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=7) of students scored proficient or better on the internship evaluation. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=11) of students scored proficient or better on the internship evaluation.

M 17: Graduate Survey (District)
Students will evaluate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in a survey based on the ISLLC standards.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
**Target:**
80% of students will score mastery or better (3 or >) overall on the criteria for the graduate survey.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Survey not given each semester. No data to report. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=14) of students scored at level 3 or better overall on the ISLLC standards measured in the survey.

**M 18: Internship (District)**
Students on the District Level plan of study will complete internships in school settings and demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
80% of students will score proficient or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards for district level standards in the final evaluation.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students (N=7) scored proficient or better on the internship evaluation. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=3) scored proficient or better on the internship evaluation.

**SLO 5: Successful Licensure**
Graduates will successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: SLLA Composite Score (Bldg)**
The SLLA is a licensure exam administered through ETS. It is designed to assess mastery of ISLLC Standards. Each state sets its own pass score required for licensure. In MS students must score 169 or higher for an administrator license. Assessment is given multiple times per year. Scores will be reported for each CY.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
80% of program completers will pass the SLLA exam at the required score for their state (MS pass score is 169). This is for building track only.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no building level doctoral program completers in the fall. Spring 2013 - One building level doctoral program completer took the SLLA in the spring and did not meet the required score. 0% passed. Yearly data reflects that one building level doctoral program completer took and did not pass the SLLA exam. 0% passed.

**M 10: Degree Completion (Bldg)**
Candidates will successfully matriculate through the program and meet all requirements for degree completion.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of admitted candidates will successfully complete the program within 6 years of enrollment.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - There were no building level doctoral students who completed the program in the fall. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=5) of students successfully completed the program within 6 years.

**M 19: Holds a Valid Administrator License (District)**
In MS there is not a separate license for building level and district level licenses. Therefore, candidates must hold a valid administrator license to be admitted into the program on a District Level plan of study. Documentation of an administrator license will be verified in Admissions Pro.

Source of Evidence: External report

**Target:**
100% of students will hold a valid administrator's license before entering the program.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2012-2013 findings. Fall 2012 - 100% of students admitted (N=3) held administrator's license prior to entering the program. Spring 2013 - 100% students admitted (N=1) held administrator's license prior to entering the program.

**M 20: Degree Completion (District)**
Candidates will successfully matriculate through the program for completion of all required criteria.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of program completers will graduate within the six year time period as allotted.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was included in 2012-2013. Fall 2012 - 100% (N=15) successfully completed the program within 6 years of enrollment. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=4) successfully completed the program within 6 years of enrollment.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
Program assessments indicate that students are mastering program content and national standards. In particular students are passing their licensure exam (SLLA) at a higher rate. During previous review cycles, it was noted that the SLLA pass rate had
declined, in part due to the fact that the state raised the score needed to pass the exam. In response, the department instituted an optional test-prep workshop provided to students each semester.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Although the pass rate for the SLLA (licensure exam) has improved, we want to continue to monitor and improve in this area. To that end, faculty will continue to align course activities and assessments with national standards and are encouraged to include select vignettes and case studies in each course. Additionally, the department is developing a 1 hour student orientation course that will include a module related to the SLLA exam, test taking strategies, and the national standards (ISLLC) on which the exam is based. The department has also identified problems with data management that make tracking progress on many of our assessments very cumbersome. Improving data management will be a priority for the department.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The 60-hour doctoral program is designed for students who are interested in pursuing a graduate degree above the master's or specialist's in the field of educational administration. The program offers two tracks, one for students who have a graduate degree in educational administration and/or hold an administrator license. The second track is for students who do not have a graduate degree in educational administration and do not have an administrator license. Almost exclusively, students are full-time employees in K12 schools/districts and attend classes on a part-time basis. Therefore, coursework is offered at night, on weekends, and online. The program includes field-based experiences, embedded into coursework and an internship; these experiences provide authentic application of content. Students take courses at their own pace and can be admitted each fall, spring, or summer. Students complete a formal dissertation after completing coursework. In the past, the department admitted large numbers of doctoral students in cohorts. However, the department did not anticipate the faculty turnover that occurred, nor the workload required in shepherding such large numbers of doctoral students once they reached the dissertation stage. At present, the department has limited enrollment at the EDS and doctoral levels until it builds faculty capacity and has fewer students at the dissertation stage.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

The department has identified a few challenges with data management including the tracking of several program milestones, e.g., RCR training. The department is developing a 1hr student orientation course to ensure that students complete certain modules early in the program including, RCR training, plan of study, plagiarism tutorial, select readings, etc. Additionally, EDA courses are offered to majors and non-majors; students at the specialist and doctoral levels take the same core courses. Therefore, any given course in Educational Administration may include majors at the EDS, EDD, and PHD level, and non-majors including students taking courses to renew their educator license and students in related fields who take our courses as electives. It is also possible that a student who begins their coursework as a major in one of our programs or as a non-degree student may then transfer into a different program within our department before graduating. This creates challenges in tracking students and presents missing data points. Additionally, we have discovered that there are inconsistencies in how students are coded in SOAR. Due to coding, transfers, and the variety of students who take our courses, we are not confident that the queries we are
able to run truly reflect our program outcomes. Therefore, data management is our top priority for the next review cycle.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

The program made positive strides to respond to lessons learned in previous review cycles. Each semester SLLA workshops are now offered to students in an effort to improve pass rates on this licensure exam. Strategic enrollment efforts have focused on growing numbers at the master's level and limiting numbers at the EDS/Doctoral levels. Assessments and course syllabi were better aligned with national and state standards. Course rotations have been improved to limit the number of course substitutions that were prevalent in the past. The department also hired a "Recruitment and Retention Specialist" who has begun assisting with recruiting strong students and in assisting in meeting student needs in an effort to keep students in the program after they are admitted. The department currently faces the challenge of having only 2 tenured faculty members, 3 non-tenured faculty members and 3 unfilled faculty lines. Hiring and faculty development will be top priorities for the upcoming year.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the specialist's level, the mission of the Elementary Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to enable elementary education candidates to serve as teaching specialists in K-8, to serve as curriculum leaders and consultants in school districts and agencies, to conduct and apply evidence-based research to improve teaching and learning, and to promote economic development that supports teaching and learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate elementary education content knowledge.
Specialist Candidates will articulate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge bases in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM

Related Measures:

M 1: Specialist’s Field Project and Oral Defense
Specialist candidates will complete a Thesis or Field Project. The candidate will identify a relevant topic; critically review the current literature; develop a research proposal; complete a thesis or field project; and present and defend the thesis or field study to the specialist committee. The committee will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of specialist candidates will complete the thesis/field project and successfully defend the thesis/field project on the first attempt. A specialist committee comprised of a minimum of three faculty members will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed and defended.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) completed the field project and successfully defended the project on the first attempt.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Mentor Ed.S. candidates through IRB process.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
A committee chair will be assigned to each Ed.S. candidate to mentor the candidate through the IRB and research processes.

M 2: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant writing activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of specialist candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary or proficient level of the scoring rubric for articulating elementary education content knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored proficient or exemplary on the rubric for articulating elementary education content knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Designate an initial course to provide orientation to the portfolio.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the each of the outcomes of the specialist program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of Ed.S. candidates responding to the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of elementary education content knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 Ed.S. candidates graduated in summer 2012. Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating elementary education knowledge. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating elementary education knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application moves forward.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that the Exit Survey/Interview is completed, CISE Graduate Advisor/Staff will require that the assessment is completed...

SLO 2: Articulate elementary education pedagogy.
Specialist's Candidates will articulate an elementary education pedagogical knowledge base.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM

Related Measures:

M 1: Specialist’s Field Project and Oral Defense
Specialist candidates will complete a Thesis or Field Project. The candidate will identify a relevant topic; critically review the current literature; develop a research proposal; complete a thesis or field project; and present and defend the thesis or field study to the specialist committee. The committee will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of specialist candidates will complete the thesis/field project and successfully defend the thesis/field project on the first attempt. A specialist committee comprised of a minimum of three faculty members will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed and defended.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) completed the field project and successfully defended the project on the first attempt.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 2: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant writing activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work
Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of specialist candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary or proficient level of the scoring rubric for articulating elementary education pedagogy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored proficient or exemplary on the rubric for articulating elementary education pedagogy.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Designate an initial course to provide orientation to the portfolio.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the each of the outcomes of the specialist program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of Ed.S. candidates responding to the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of educational pedagogy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 Ed.S. candidates graduated in summer 2012. Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating elementary education pedagogy. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating elementary education pedagogy.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application moves forward.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that the Exit Survey/Interview is completed, CISE Graduate Advisor/Staff will require that the assessment is completed...

SLO 3: Conduct research for improvement of teaching.
Specialist's Candidates will analyze, synthesize, evaluate and conduct research to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE

Related Measures:

M 1: Specialist’s Field Project and Oral Defense
Specialist candidates will complete a Thesis or Field Project. The candidate will identify a relevant topic; critically review the current literature; develop a research proposal; complete a thesis or field project; and present and defend the thesis or field study to the specialist committee. The committee will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of specialist candidates will complete the thesis/field project and successfully defend the thesis/field project on the first attempt. A specialist committee comprised of a minimum of three faculty members will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed and defended.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) completed the field project and successfully defended the project on the first attempt.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Mentor Ed.S. candidates through IRB process.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
A committee chair will be assigned to each Ed.S. candidate to mentor the candidate through the IRB and research processes.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Provide orientation to the portfolio.**
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
Designate an initial course to provide orientation to the portfolio.
M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the each of the outcomes of the specialist program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of Ed.S. candidates responding to the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding conducting research for the improvement of teaching.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 Ed.S. candidates graduated in summer 2012. Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for conducting research for the improvement of teaching. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for conducting research for the improvement of teaching.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application moves forward.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that the Exit Survey/Interview is completed, CISE Graduate Advisor/Staff will require that the assessment is completed...

SLO 4: Participate in professional development.
Specialist's Candidates will participate in and value professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE Conceptual Framework

Related Measures:

M 2: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant writing activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of specialist candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary or proficient level of the scoring rubric for valuing professional development.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored proficient or exemplary on the rubric for participating in professional development.
Provide orientation to the portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Designate an initial course to provide orientation to the portfolio.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the each of the outcomes of the specialist program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of Ed.S. candidates responding to the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding valuing professional development.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 Ed.S. candidates graduated in summer 2012. Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for participating in professional development. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for participating in professional development.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application moves forward.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that the Exit Survey/Interview is completed, CISE Graduate Advisor/Staff will require that the assessment is completed...

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O/O 5: Become employed in a specialized educational position.
Elementary education Ed.S. graduates will obtain employment in specialized educational positions.

Related Measures:

M 4: Placement Data
CISE staff will contact Ed.S. graduates to determine their employment.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target:
90% of Ed.S. graduates will be employed in specialized educational positions upon graduation.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 Ed.S. candidates graduated in summer 2012 Fall 2012 0 Ed.S. candidates graduated in fall 2012. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) became employed in a specialized educational position immediately following graduation.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Follow up on employment status of Ed.S. graduates.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Develop a follow-up instrument for Ed.S. graduates to track employment status.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
Designate an initial course to provide orientation to the portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: On-Hold
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Articulate elementary education content knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy. | Conduct research for improvement of teaching. | Participate in professional development.

Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: CISE Graduate Faculty

Mentor Ed.S. candidates through IRB process.
A committee chair will be assigned to each Ed.S. candidate to mentor the candidate through the IRB and research processes.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Specialist’s Field Project and Oral Defense | Outcome/Objective: Articulate elementary education content knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy. | Conduct research for improvement of teaching.

Responsible Person/Group: CISE Graduate Faculty and Graduate Adviser

Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application moves forward.
To ensure that the Exit Survey/Interview is completed, CISE Graduate Advisor/Staff will require that the assessment is completed electronically before the application for graduation is moved to the next level.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Exit Interview/Survey  
**Outcome/Objective:** Articulate elementary education content knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy. | Conduct research for improvement of teaching. | Participate in professional development.

**Projected Completion Date:** 07/30/2011

**Enhance communication with Ed.S. candidates.**  
Ed.S. candidates are typically full time teachers in the field. Because they do not participate in a residency, there is a need to enhance electronic and face-to-face communication with the candidates concerning IRB development, research design, and university deadlines.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  

**Responsible Person/Group:** CISE graduate faculty and CISE Graduate Office

**Follow up on employment status of Ed.S. graduates.**  
Develop a follow-up instrument for Ed.S. graduates to track employment status.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Placement Data  
**Outcome/Objective:** Become employed in a specialized educational position.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/30/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate administrative assistant and graduate advisor.

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

Although all outcomes were met, analysis of data for the 2012-2013 Ed.S. program is limited since typical candidates are full-time public school teachers who are seeking to...
advance from AA to AAA licensure status and may pursue this degree over a period of six years while taking only one course per semester. In 2012-2013, there were only two candidates at the assessment transition points; however, formative assessments were administered within the graduate courses. Qualitative data indicate that candidates are meeting program outcomes and appreciate the experiences in the Ed.S. program. Candidates believe that the Ed.S. degree will enable them to attain leadership roles in their school districts to improve teaching and learning.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Because Ed.S. candidates are not required to give up their teaching positions and participate in a full-time residency, there are limited data to review, other than GPA information and formative course assessments. Qualitative data suggest that continued attention is required for assisting candidates with conducting and analyzing research for the field project, especially when candidates do not live close to campus. Attention needs to be given to using better means of communicating, both electronically and face-to-face, with Ed.S. candidates. Ongoing attention is required for providing enhanced communication to off-campus Ed.S. candidates concerning graduate school processes such as registration, IRB submissions, and other deadlines.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Ed.S. (Elementary Education) degree is a practitioner's graduate degree populated by classroom teachers interested in increasing licensure standing and improving teaching skill, and is an option available for educators who desire extended professional growth and development beyond a master's degree. There were 6 Ed.S. candidates in the elementary education program in 2012-2013. Emphasis areas in the Ed.S.(Elementary Education) program were merged into one core program with electives in the areas of reading instruction, early childhood or general elementary education. This merger has resulted in a more streamlined program that ensures that required courses are available each semester. Although this is a relatively small program, the Ed.S. degree provides teachers an avenue for advancing to the next licensure level. Graduates most often are employed as curriculum specialists or lead teachers in their school districts upon graduation. The CISE Ed.S. program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit that was completed in 2012. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty consult in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
The CISE Graduate Committee meets regularly as part of the ongoing evaluation process. As a result on continuous improvement initiatives, the Ed.S. degree program was redesigned to address a number of issues including number of hours required, sequencing of courses, assessments, and program requirements. The revisions resulted in an improved Ed.S. program. Efforts are underway to develop more online offerings to make the Ed.S. program more accessible.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Actions implemented included merging emphasis areas into one core program with emphasis area electives, aligning coursework and assessments to National Board for
Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), enhancing training for the IRB process, providing more effective mentoring of Ed.S. candidates, and providing more effective research coursework. These actions resulted in candidates being more successful with the research requirements of the Ed.S. programs.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the doctoral level, the mission of the Elementary Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as teacher educators at the college/university level, to serve as curriculum leaders and consultants in school districts and educational agencies, to contribute to the educational and pedagogical knowledge base through conducting and publishing evidence-based research, and to secure funding to support research and development.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge.
Doctoral Candidates will synthesize and articulate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM

Related Measures:

**M 1: Qualifying Examinations**
After the doctoral foundation courses are completed, doctoral candidates take a preliminary essay examination to determine their qualifications to further pursue the degree and to assist in planning their degree program. A scoring rubric is used for scoring. The rubric consists of a five-point scale with an average score of three on both mastery of content and on mastery of communication being required for successful completion of the examination. The examinations are evaluated by a minimum of two faculty members with a third faculty member reading if needed for consensus.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) will successfully complete the doctoral qualifying examinations. Results will be used to plan the candidates’ programs.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 took qualifying examinations Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) passed qualifying examinations on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 took qualifying examinations.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Develop a plan for recruitment of doctoral students.**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

CISE faculty and staff will develop a plan for recruiting doctoral students from regional K12 schools.

**M 2: Doctoral Professional Portfolio**

The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**

80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated mastery 1/2 (50%) rated exemplary Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Provide a structure for reporting Ph.D. portfolio results.**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

The Ph.D. is developed and rated in the doctoral level research classes. Upon completion of the portfolio the results will be r...

**M 3: Comprehensive Examinations**

The Doctoral Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific doctoral degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by members of the candidates’ doctoral committee according to the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
Ninety-five percent of doctoral candidates will pass the doctoral comprehensive examination on the first attempt. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated according to the rubric by five faculty members who comprise the candidates’ doctoral committee.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 took comprehensive examinations Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on comprehensive examinations. Spring 2013 0 took comprehensive examinations.

M 4:Dissertation
The dissertation is an original and significant contribution to the knowledge base in the specific doctoral content area. After completion, a final oral examination of the dissertation and related fields is conducted by the candidate`s doctoral committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will complete the dissertation and successfully defend the dissertation within eight calendar years from the date of initial enrollment in the doctoral program. The dissertation defense will be evaluated and approved by the five faculty members who comprise the Doctoral Committee.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates were at the dissertation stage of the program. Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 candidates were at the dissertation stage of the program.

M 5:Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of elementary education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding acquisition of the elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2012 0 candidates graduated. Fall 2012 1 candidate graduated, but did not complete the exit survey. Spring 2013 0 candidates graduated.

SLO 2:Synthesize and articulate learning theories.
Doctoral Candidates will synthesize and articulate information across the knowledge bases of elementary education learning theories and teaching to inform student learning.
Relevant Associations:
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM

Related Measures:

**M 1: Qualifying Examinations**
After the doctoral foundation courses are completed, doctoral candidates take a preliminary essay examination to determine their qualifications to further pursue the degree and to assist in planning their degree program. A scoring rubric is used for scoring. The rubric consists of a five-point scale with an average score of three on both mastery of content and on mastery of communication being required for successful completion of the examination. The examinations are evaluated by a minimum of two faculty members with a third faculty member reading if needed for consensus.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) will successfully complete the doctoral qualifying examinations. Results will be used to plan the candidates’ programs.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 took qualifying examinations Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) passed qualifying examinations on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 took qualifying examinations.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop a plan for recruitment of doctoral students.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE faculty and staff will develop a plan for recruiting doctoral students from regional K12 schools.

**M 2: Doctoral Professional Portfolio**
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated mastery 1/2 (50%) rated exemplary Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for synthesizing and articulating learning theories.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Provide a structure for reporting Ph.D. portfolio results.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The Ph.D. is developed and rated in the doctoral level research classes. Upon completion of the portfolio the results will be r...

M 3: Comprehensive Examinations
The Doctoral Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific doctoral degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by members of the candidates’ doctoral committee according to the rubric.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/ end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
Ninety-five percent of doctoral candidates will pass the doctoral comprehensive examination on the first attempt. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated according to the rubric by five faculty members who comprise the candidates’ doctoral committee.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 took comprehensive examinations Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on comprehensive examinations. Spring 2013 0 took comprehensive examinations.

M 4: Dissertation
The dissertation is an original and significant contribution to the knowledge base in the specific doctoral content area. After completion, a final oral examination of the dissertation and related fields is conducted by the candidate’s doctoral committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will complete the dissertation and successfully defend the dissertation within eight calendar years from the date of initial enrollment in the doctoral program. The dissertation defense will be evaluated and approved by the five faculty members who comprise the Doctoral Committee.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates were at the dissertation stage of the program.
Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 candidates were at the dissertation stage of the program.

**M 5: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of elementary education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 0 candidates graduated. Fall 2012 1 candidate graduated, but did not complete the exit survey. Spring 2013 0 candidates graduated.

**SLO 3: Conduct and publish research.**
Doctoral Candidates will analyze, synthesize, evaluate, conduct, and publish research to contribute to the development of the educational and pedagogical knowledge base.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Doctoral Professional Portfolio**
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for conducting and publishing research.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated mastery 1/2 (50%) rated exemplary Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for conducting and publishing research.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Provide a structure for reporting Ph.D. portfolio results.**
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The Ph.D. is developed and rated in the doctoral level research classes. Upon completion of the portfolio the results will be r...

**M 4:Dissertation**
The dissertation is an original and significant contribution to the knowledge base in the specific doctoral content area. After completion, a final oral examination of the dissertation and related fields is conducted by the candidate’s doctoral committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will complete the dissertation and successfully defend the dissertation within eight calendar years from the date of initial enrollment in the doctoral program. The dissertation defense will be evaluated and approved by the five faculty members who comprise the Doctoral Committee.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates were at the dissertation stage of the program. Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 candidates were at the dissertation stage of the program.

**M 5: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of elementary education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding conducting and publishing research.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 0 candidates graduated. Fall 2012 1 candidate graduated, but did not complete the exit survey. Spring 2013 0 candidates graduated.

**SLO 4: Integrate technological resources.**
Doctoral Candidates will integrate technological resources and skills into teaching and learning.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE Conceptual Framework-Technology

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Doctoral Professional Portfolio**
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for integrating technological resources.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated mastery 1/2 (50%) rated exemplary Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for integrating technological resources.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Integrate cutting-edge technology.**
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
Candidates will be given the opportunity to integrate cutting edge technology into teaching and research. Candidates will partic...

**Provide a structure for reporting Ph.D. portfolio results.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
The Ph.D. is developed and rated in the doctoral level research classes. Upon completion of the portfolio the results will be r...

**M 5: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of elementary education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding integrating technological resources for improvement of teaching and learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 0 candidates graduated. Fall 2012 1 candidate graduated, but did not complete the exit survey. Spring 2013 0 candidates graduated.

**SLO 5: Value professional development.**
Doctoral Candidates will value professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE Conceptual Framework

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Doctoral Professional Portfolio**
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectvies/outcomes that are required of
doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for valuing professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated mastery 1/2 (50%) rated exemplary Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for valuing professional development.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Provide a structure for reporting Ph.D. portfolio results.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
The Ph.D. is developed and rated in the doctoral level research classes. Upon completion of the portfolio the results will be r...

**M 5: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of elementary education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding valuing professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 0 candidates graduated. Fall 2012 1 candidate graduated, but did not complete the exit survey. Spring 2013 0 candidates graduated.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Provide experiences with grant writing.**
Candidates should be advised to take a grant writing course.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty Advisors
Integrate cutting-edge technology.
Candidates will be given the opportunity to integrate cutting edge technology into teaching and research. Candidates will participate in Promethian Board training and in the development of teaching strategies using the technology.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: Doctoral Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technological resources.

**Implementation Description:**  Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

Revise the research coursework requirements.
Revise the requirements for the development of the research tools in the Ph.D. program. Work with the REF Department in COEP to require a sequential series of statistics courses that enable graduates to use complex statistical procedures for research.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:**  Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** CISE Graduate Faculty with REF Faculty

Provide a structure for reporting Ph.D. portfolio results.
The Ph.D. is developed and rated in the doctoral level research classes. Upon completion of the portfolio the results will be reported to the graduate office and stored electronically.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  

**Projected Completion Date:**  12/14/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Perrin Lowrey and CISE Graduate Advisor/Staff

Develop a plan for recruitment of doctoral students.
CISE faculty and staff will develop a plan for recruiting doctoral students from regional K12 schools.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
There were five Ph.D. in Elementary Education candidates at various transition points in the program in 2012-2013. Although all outcomes were met, there are assessments each semester with no reported data because candidates have up to eight years to complete the program, resulting in candidates not being at the assessment transition points in the reporting academic year. One of the Ph.D. candidates graduated from the program in the fall 2012 and immediately obtained employment. The strong residency requirement in CISE allows candidates to work closely with faculty to attain outcomes that enable them to be successful as university professors. Outcome exit data through the years indicate that the close association with faculty mentors and the opportunities candidates have during residency to teach university classes, supervise clinical experiences, collaborate with faculty on research projects and work with departmental grants results in graduates who are successfully employed in university positions.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The assessments for 2012-2013 for the Ph.D. in Elementary Education did not indicate any deficiencies; however, continued attention will be given to providing high quality, diverse experiences during the residency. Traditionally, Ph.D. candidates work in the department as graduate assistants during and beyond the residency year. This allows those candidates to experience the full range of activities of a university professor as they participate with mentors in teaching, service and research as well as in faculty meetings, professional development, curriculum team meetings, and any other activities that CISE faculty members experience. Qualitative data indicate the need to provide doctoral candidates more opportunities to engage in research for publication. Continued attention will be given to enhancing and expanding research opportunities. Additionally, continued attention is being given to enhancing assessment to better track achievement throughout the program.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
There were five Ph.D. in elementary education candidates at various transition points in the program in 2012-2013. The Ph.D. in elementary education plays a critical role in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education’s overall contribution to the field of education at state and national levels. This specialized Ph.D. program is a vital initiative for establishing and maintaining recognition as a research university, in that our doctoral students and graduates contribute significantly to the field of education. The graduate faculty serve to foster the professional growth and research interests of students through active collaboration and guidance. As one of the primary
specialized degrees for graduates at this level, the Ph.D. in elementary education provides a platform for directly contributing to the state, region, and nation. Doctoral students and faculty associated with this initiative value their responsibility and contributions through numerous activities. The CISE Ph.D. program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit that was completed in 2012. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty consult in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations. Further, the Ph.D. program accommodates and addresses the unique needs of the field of education as a whole. It is through advanced studies and inquiry that both the faculty and doctoral students serve to guide the direction of pedagogy, technology, professional development for educators, understandings of academic variables for students, and ultimately future directions for education. CISE doctoral students, often through collaboration with faculty, have received honors and awards directly associated with their research. Numerous doctoral students' works have been recognized at the university level associated with the graduate research symposium. Further recognition has been provided at the regional level as CISE graduate students annually present at the Mid-South Educational Research Association (MSERA) graduate symposium. Ph.D. candidates in elementary education are known and respected for their annual involvement and contributions associated with MSERA. Faculty and doctoral students directly impact, outside the university, advancements in the field. Both faculty and students serve in leadership capacities with state, regional, and national organizations. CISE faculty serve on committees and boards for organizations such as the Association for Childhood Education International and International Reading Association, and are actively involved in partnerships and collaboration with local school districts and state agencies contributing to advancements in education initiatives for the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE). MDE relies on the expertise of our faculty and doctoral students in the areas of reading, content literacy, curriculum, and professional development for teachers. Ph.D. candidates for this initiative work closely with faculty members to provide professional development for elementary teachers in local schools as well as conduct research to assess critical issues while offering research supported instructional strategies to improve teaching and learning in area schools. CISE service grants and research secured by CISE faculty contribute to educational change at the local and state level and allow for contributions to research. Additionally, the faculty mentors within the doctoral program provide Ph.D. candidates with meaningful and authentic professorship opportunities. Through publications and grant activities, our graduates and faculty are able to disseminate valuable information related to education practices and insights. Furthermore, the Ph.D. candidates, in collaboration with junior and senior faculty, are able to significantly enhance the learning experiences of undergraduate students by collaborating in meaningful and authentic teaching experiences both in our university classrooms and clinical settings.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
CISE graduate faculty meet on a regular monthly schedule to evaluate the CISE doctoral level programs. Sequencing and scheduling of doctoral level classes are monitored to ensure that the program is accessible to candidates. Assessment results are reviewed to determine mastery of program standards, including National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) and International Reading Association (IRA). CISE graduate faculty review doctoral experiences to enhance experiences for those doctoral candidates who do not serve as graduate assistants. Additionally, assessments are being enhanced to better track outcomes throughout the program. CISE faculty and staff are developing a
recruitment plan to recruit doctoral candidates from regional school districts and to recruit at a national level through professional organizations.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
To "close the loop" CISE graduate faculty and graduate students have participated in national Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS) professional development activities throughout 2012-2013 in order to remain current with national initiatives to improve teaching and learning. CISE graduate faculty have reviewed and enhanced the Ph.D. program in the past two years through providing a better sequence of research courses and through ensuring that all Ph.D. candidates have the opportunity to participate in teaching, research, service and grant activities. Additionally, the written comprehensive examinations were revised for enhanced alignment with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. These are ongoing activities that will be continued in the next academic year.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the specialist's level, the mission of the Special Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as special education teaching specialists in Grades K-12, to serve as curriculum leaders and consultants in school districts and agencies, to conduct and apply evidence-based research to improve teaching and learning, and to promote economic development that supports teaching and learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate special education content knowledge.
Specialist's degree candidates will articulate special education content and theoretical knowledge in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S.candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary (4) or proficient (3) level of the four-point scoring rubric for articulating special education content knowledge. The Specialist Committee comprised of three or more faculty members will evaluate the portfolio using the four-point rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated (4) exemplary on articulating special education content knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio. 
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Develop guidelines for the specialist portfolio. Establish an initial course for the portfolio to be introduced. Committee membe...

M 2: Specialist’s Field Project and Oral Defense
Specialist’s candidates will complete a Thesis or Field Project. The candidate will identify a relevant topic; critically review the current literature; develop a research proposal; complete a thesis or field project; and present and orally defend the thesis or field study to the specialist committee. The committee will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of specialist’s degree candidates will complete the thesis/field project and successfully defend (orally) the thesis/field project on the first attempt with an overall rating of >3 on the rubric. The Committee of at least three faculty members will determine successful completion of the project based on the rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) completed the field project with a rating of >3 on the first attempt. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the specialist program.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of special education content knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the exit survey rubric for articulating special education content knowledge. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Require Exit Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
To ensure that exit interview assessment data is received, the graduate advisor/staff will require that graduation applicants co...

SLO 2: Articulate special education pedagogy.
Specialist's degree candidates will articulate a special education content-specific pedagogical knowledge base.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/CEC
Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary (4) or proficient (3) level of the four-point scoring rubric for articulating special education pedagogy. The Specialist Committee comprised of three or more faculty members will evaluate the portfolio using the four-point rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated (4) on articulating special education pedagogy.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Develop guidelines for the specialist portfolio. Establish an initial course for the portfolio to be introduced. Committee membe...

M 2: Specialist`s Field Project and Oral Defense
Specialist`s candidates will complete a Thesis or Field Project. The candidate will identify a relevant topic; critically review the current literature; develop a research proposal; complete a thesis or field project; and present and orally defend the thesis or field study to the specialist committee. The committee will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed.

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of specialist`s degree candidates will complete the thesis/field project and successfully defend (orally) the thesis/field project on the first attempt with an overall rating of >3 on the rubric. The Committee of at least three faculty members will determine successful completion of the project based on the rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric to pass on the first attempt. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education specialist candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the specialist program.

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates answering the
exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of special education pedagogy.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the exit survey rubric for articulating special education pedagogy. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point

**SLO 3: Conduct research for improvement of teaching.**
Specialist's degree candidates will analyze, synthesize, evaluate and conduct research to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Professional Portfolio**
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary(4) or proficient(3) level of the four-point scoring rubric for conducting research for the improvement of teaching. The Specialist Committee comprised of three or more faculty members will evaluate the portfolio using the four-point rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated (4) exemplary on conducting research for the improvement of teaching.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Develop guidelines for the specialist portfolio. Establish an initial course for the portfolio to be introduced. Committee membe...

**M 2: Specialist’s Field Project and Oral Defense**
Specialist’s candidates will complete a Thesis or Field Project. The candidate will identify a relevant topic; critically review the current literature; develop a research proposal; complete a thesis or field project; and present and orally defend the thesis or field study to the specialist committee. The committee will determine if the thesis/field project is successfully completed.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of specialist’s degree candidates will complete the thesis/field project and successfully defend (orally) the thesis/field project on the first attempt with an overall rating of >3 on the rubric. The Committee of
at least three faculty members will determine successful completion of the project based on the rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric to pass on the first attempt. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the specialist program.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding conducting research for the improvement of teaching.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the exit survey rubric for conducting research for improvement of teaching. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point

**SLO 4: Participate in professional development.**
Specialist's degree candidates will participate in and value professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE Conceptual Framework

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Professional Portfolio**
The professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections upon the artifacts/tasks that represent a sample of the teaching, service, research and grant activities that are required of specialist-level leadership personnel in education.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates will produce portfolio reflections at the exemplary (4) or proficient (3) level of the four-point scoring rubric for valuing professional development. The Specialist Committee comprised of three or more faculty members will evaluate the portfolio using the four-point rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated (4) exemplary on participating in professional development.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Develop guidelines for the specialist portfolio. Establish an initial course for the portfolio to be introduced. Committee membe...

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education specialist candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the specialist program.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education Ed.S. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding valuing professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the exit survey rubric for participating in professional development. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point.

**SLO 5: Become employed at a school or agency in a specialized position.**
Ed.S. graduates will obtain a position of employment in a school or agency in a specialized position.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Placement data**
CISE staff will contact graduates to determine employment status.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**
90% of Ed.S. graduates will be employed in a school or agency in a specialized position.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 1/1 graduate became employed in a specialized position in a school. Fall 2012 0 candidates graduated. Spring 2013 0 candidates graduated.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**revise current action statements for SPED(EdS)**
Revision of current action statements will take place with faculty of special education programs early fall 2006

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
**Implementation Status:** Finished
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** early fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** department Chair and special ed faculty

**Collect baseline data for the new assessments**
Collect baseline data for the new assessments that have been developed for the SPE Specialist program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  

**Responsible Person/Group:** Special Education Faculty

**Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.**
Develop guidelines for the specialist portfolio. Establish an initial course for the portfolio to be introduced. Committee members will review/evaluate the portfolio at program transition points. Portfolio will be developed on TK20.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Professional Portfolio  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate special education content knowledge. | Articulate special education pedagogy. | Conduct research for improvement of teaching. | Participate in professional development.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Special Education Faculty

**Mentor Ed.S. candidates through IRB process.**
A committee chair will be assigned to each Ed.S. candidate early in the program to mentor the candidate through the IRB and field research.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  

**Responsible Person/Group:** CISE Graduate Faculty and Graduate Adviser

**Provide orientation to the portfolio.**
Designate an initial course in the SPE Ed.S. program for introducing candidates to the portfolio.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** Medium  

**Require Exit Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.**
To ensure that exit interview assessment data is received, the graduate advisor/staff will require that graduation applicants complete the exit interview electronically before their graduation application is moved to the next level.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
   Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Articulate special education content knowledge.

Develop a plan to provide online Ed.S. program.
CISE faculty will investigate the possibilities of providing a complete online Ed.S. program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: CISE Graduate Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
   Although all outcomes were met, analysis of data for the 2012-2013 Ed.S (Special Education) program is limited since typical candidates are full-time public school teachers who are seeking to advance from AA to AAA licensure status and may pursue this degree over a period of six years while taking only one course per semester. In 2012-2013, there was only one special education candidate at an assessment transition point; however, formative assessments were administered within the graduate courses. Qualitative data indicate that candidates are meeting program outcomes and appreciate the experiences in the Ed.S. program. Candidates believe that the Ed.S. degree will enable them to attain leadership roles in their school districts or special education agencies.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
   Because Ed.S. candidates are not required to give up their teaching positions and participate in a full-time residency, there was limited data to review in the past evaluation cycle other than GPA information and formative course assessments. Qualitative data suggest that continued attention is required for assisting candidates with conducting and analyzing research for the field project, especially when candidates do not live close to campus. Attention needs to be given to using better means of communicating both electronically and face-to-face with Ed.S. candidates. Ongoing attention is required for providing enhanced communication to off-campus Ed.S. candidates concerning graduate school processes such as registration, IRB submissions, and other deadlines.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Ed.S. (Special Education) degree is a practitioner's degree populated by special education teachers interested in increasing licensure from AA to AAA status and in improving their teaching and leadership skills to serve as educational specialists, and is an option available for educators who desire extended professional growth and development beyond a master's degree. There were three Ed.S. candidates in the special education program in 2012-2013. The emphasis areas in the Ed.S. (Special Education) program are merged into one core program with electives in the areas of high incidence disabilities, behavior disorders, low incidence disabilities and gifted education. This has resulted in a more streamlined program that ensures that required courses will be available each semester. Although this is a relatively small program, the Ed.S. provides teachers an avenue for advancing to the next licensure level. It is anticipated that the revisions and enhancements that have been made to the program will result in a larger enrollment in the future. Through Project REACH, the Mississippi Personnel Preparation Development Grant, the Special Education Pre-Service Improvement Grant, the Mississippi Deaf-Blind Project, and the USM Autism Demonstration Project and Project LINK, special education faculty have participated in collaborative work with P-12 school districts, the Mississippi Council on Developmental Disabilities, the Mississippi Department of Education, and the Department of Psychology within the College of Education and Psychology. Furthermore, the Center for Professional Development and Outreach is engaged with a nationally-affiliated, disability-rights advocacy organization, the ARC of Mississippi. The CISE Ed.S. special education program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit that was completed in 2012. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty consult in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
The CISE Graduate Committee meets regularly as part of the ongoing evaluation process. As a result on continuous improvement initiatives, the Ed.S. degree program was redesigned to address a number of issues including number of hours required, sequencing of courses, assessments, and program requirements. The revisions resulted in an improved Ed.S. program. Efforts are underway to develop more online offerings to make the Ed.S. program more accessible with the goal of offering fully online Ed.S. programs in the future.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Actions implemented included merging emphasis areas into one core program with emphasis area electives, enhancing training for the IRB process, providing more effective mentoring of Ed.S. candidates and providing more effective research coursework. These actions resulted in candidates being more successful with the research requirements of the Ed.S. programs.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the doctoral level, the mission of the Special Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as teacher educators at the college/university level, to serve as curriculum leaders and consultants in school districts and educational agencies, to contribute to the educational and pedagogical knowledge base through conducting and publishing evidence-based research, and to secure funding to support research and development.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge.
Doctoral Candidates will synthesize and articulate special education content and theoretical knowledge in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 1: Qualifying Examinations
After the doctoral foundation courses are completed, doctoral candidates take a preliminary essay examination to determine their qualifications to further pursue the degree and to assist in planning their degree program. A scoring rubric is used for scoring. The rubric consists of a five-point scale with an average score of three on both mastery of content and on mastery of communication being required for successful completion of the examination. The examinations are read by a minimum of two faculty members with a third faculty member reading if needed for consensus.

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) will successfully complete the doctoral qualifying examinations. Results will be used to plan the candidates` programs regarding special education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 1/1 (100%) successfully completed qualifying examinations on the first attempt Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) successfully completed qualifying examinations on the first attempt. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) successfully completed qualifying examinations on the first attempt.
M 2: Doctoral Portfolio
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated exemplary (3) 1/1 (100%) rated mastery (2) Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

M 3: Comprehensive Exam
The Doctoral Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific doctoral degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by members of the candidates’ doctoral committee according to the rubric.

Target:
Ninety-five percent of doctoral candidates will pass the doctoral comprehensive examination on the first attempt. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by the five members of the candidate’s doctoral committee according to the rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) scored 3 or higher on a 5-point rating scale for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revise the written comprehensive examination.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Revise the written comprehensive examinations. Questions will be developed by the candidate’s committee in their area(s) of expe...
M 4: Dissertation
The dissertation is an original and significant contribution to the knowledge base in the specific doctoral content area. After completion, a final oral examination of the dissertation and related fields is conducted by the candidate’s doctoral committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will complete the dissertation and successfully defend the dissertation within eight calendar years from the date of initial enrollment in the doctoral program. A final oral defense of the dissertation and related fields is evaluated and approved by the candidate’s doctoral committee which is comprised of five faculty members.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation. Total 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation.

M 5: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of special education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding acquisition of special education content and theoretical knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 graduates Fall 2012 0 graduates Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on 5-point scale for articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Total 1/1 (100%) rated >3 on a five point scale for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

SLO 2: Synthesize and articulate learning theories.
Doctoral Candidates will synthesize and articulate information across the knowledge bases of special education learning theories and teaching.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/CEC

**Related Measures:**

M 2: Doctoral Portfolio
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery
(2) on the professional portfolio outcome for synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated exemplary (3) 1/1 (100%) rated mastery (2) Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

**M 3: Comprehensive Exam**
The Doctoral Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific doctoral degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by members of the candidates’ doctoral committee according to the rubric.

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent of doctoral candidates will pass the doctoral comprehensive examination on the first attempt. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by the five members of the candidate’s doctoral committee according to the rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) scored 3 or higher on a 5-point rating scale for synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Revise the written comprehensive examination.**
*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*
Revise the written comprehensive examinations. Questions will be developed by the candidate’s committee in their area(s) of exper...

**M 4: Dissertation**
The dissertation is an original and significant contribution to the knowledge base in the specific doctoral content area. After completion, a final oral examination of the dissertation and related fields is conducted by the candidate’s doctoral committee.

**Source of Evidence:** Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will complete the dissertation and successfully defend the dissertation within six calendar years from the date of initial enrollment in the doctoral program. A final oral defense of the dissertation and related fields is evaluated and approved by the candidate’s doctoral committee which is comprised of five faculty members.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 UPDATE 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation Total 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation

M 5: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Target:
Ninety (90%) of special education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 graduates Fall 2012 0 graduates. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 5 on 5-point scale for synthesizing and articulating learning theories. Total 1/1 (100%) rated >3 on a five point scale for synthesizing and articulating learning theories.

SLO 3: Conduct and publish research.
Doctoral Candidates will analyze, synthesize, evaluate, conduct, and publish research to contribute to the development of the special education educational and pedagogical knowledge base to empower a community of learners.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 2: Doctoral Portfolio
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for conducting and publishing research.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated exemplary (3) 1/1 (100%) rated mastery (2) Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for conducting and publishing research.

M 4: Dissertation
The dissertation is an original and significant contribution to the knowledge base in the specific doctoral content area. After completion, a final oral examination of the dissertation and related fields is conducted by the candidate’s doctoral committee.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will complete the dissertation and successfully defend the dissertation within eight calendar years from the date of initial enrollment in the doctoral program. A final oral defense of the dissertation and related fields is evaluated and approved by the candidate’s doctoral committee which is comprised of five faculty members.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 0 candidates at this transition point. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation Total 1/1 (100%) successfully defended the dissertation

**M 5: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of special education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding conducting and publishing research.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 graduates Fall 2012 0 graduates. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 4 on 5-point scale for conducting and publishing research. Total 1/1 (100%) rated >3 on a five point scale for conducting and publishing research.

**SLO 4: Integrate technological resources.**
Doctoral Candidates will integrate technological resources and skills.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE Conceptual Framework-Technology

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Doctoral Portfolio**
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for integrating technological resources.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated exemplary (3) 1/1 (100%) rated mastery (2) Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for integrating technological resources.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Integrate cutting-edge technology.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Candidates will be given the opportunity to integrate cutting edge technology into teaching and research. Candidates will partic...

M 5: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

Target:
Ninety (90%) of special education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding integrating technological resources into teaching and learning.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 0 graduates Fall 2012 0 graduates. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 4 on 5-point scale for Integrating technological resources. Total 1/1 (100%) rated >3 on a five point scale for Integrating technological resources.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Integrate cutting-edge technology.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Candidates will be given the opportunity to integrate cutting edge technology into teaching and research. Candidates will partic...

SLO 5: Participate in professional development.
Doctoral Candidates will participate in professional development and service to the community and value professional development as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

Related Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 2: Doctoral Portfolio
The doctoral professional portfolio is a collection of artifacts/tasks and reflections that demonstrate attainment of the objectives/outcomes that are required of doctoral-level candidates. The portfolio tasks are aligned with CISE doctoral level outcomes and with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).
A scoring rubric is completed by doctoral level faculty. Ratings on the rubric are exemplary (3), mastery (2), and unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of doctoral candidates will achieve a rating of exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on the professional portfolio outcome for participating in professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 candidates at this transition point Fall 2012 1/1 (100%) rated exemplary (3) 1/1 (100%) rated mastery (2) Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point. Total 2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on the outcome for participating in professional development.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Provide experiences with grant writing.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
Candidates will be required to take coursework in grantwriting and to develop a grant proposal to submit for funding of disserta...

**M 5: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the doctoral candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the doctoral program.

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of special education Ph.D. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five point scale regarding valuing professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 0 graduates Fall 2012 0 graduates. Spring 2013 1/1 (100%) rated 4 on 5-point scale for participating in professional development. Total 1/1 (100%) rated >3 on a five point scale for participating in professional development.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Revise the written comprehensive examination.**
Revise the written comprehensive examinations. Questions will be developed by the candidate’s committee in their area(s) of expertise and submitted to the Chair.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge. | Synthesize and articulate learning theories.

Responsible Person/Group: Chair CISE and Special Education Faculty

Revise the research coursework requirements.
Revise the requirements for the development of the research tools in the Ph.D. program. Work with the REF Department in COEP to require a sequential series of statistics courses that enable graduates to use complex statistical procedures for research.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: CISE and REF Graduate Faculty

Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.
Develop guidelines for the Ph.D. portfolio. The Committee Chair will inform the candidate about the development of the portfolio upon the candidate’s admission to the program. The Committee will review and evaluate the portfolio at each of the transition points.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: SPE faculty and Graduate Advisor

Provide experiences with grant writing.
Candidates will be required to take coursework in grantwriting and to develop a grant proposal to submit for funding of dissertation research. This has been optional in the past.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Doctoral Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Participate in professional development.

Implementation Description: Fall 2010
Responsible Person/Group: CISE and REF Graduate Faculty and Graduate Council

Secure current SPE technologies.
Secure current SPE assistive/augmentive technologies and other current SPE technologies to provide experiences for their use in K-12 schools.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Spring 09
Responsible Person/Group: Chair CISE and Special Education Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: Money allocated for technology from internal or external grant sources.

Integrate cutting-edge technology.
Candidates will be given the opportunity to integrate cutting edge technology into teaching and research. Candidates will participate in Promethean Board training and in the development of teaching strategies using the technology.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Doctoral Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technological resources.
  Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technological resources.

Implementation Description: Fall 2010 Candidates will participate with undergraduate cohorts in interactive white board training.
Responsible Person/Group: CISE Graduate Faculty and Co-hort Promethean Training

Involves graduate students in active research.
Special Education faculty will collaborate with special education doctoral students in conducting and publishing research in peer-reviewed journals.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
In 2012-2013 the assessments documented mastery of each outcomes/objectives for the academic year. Because candidates have up to eight years to complete the program, there are assessments each semester with no reported data since there are no candidates at that transition point in the reporting academic year. Data that were collected indicated that one of the twelve candidates successfully completed the dissertation, with one graduating in the in the spring of 2013. The one graduate gained employment in a university position upon graduating. The strong residency requirement in CISE allows candidates to work closely with faculty to attain outcomes that enable them to be successful as university professors or school district/agency leaders. Exit data that were reported indicate that the graduate feels highly qualified to hold her new
faculty position. This outcome is attributed to the close association with faculty mentors and the opportunities candidates have during residency to teach university classes, supervise clinical experiences, participate in internships with agencies that serve the disabled, and collaborate with faculty on research projects and departmental grants.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The assessments for 2012-2013 for the Ph.D. in Special Education indicated mastery of all outcomes. Ongoing attention is required, however, to ensure that candidates are involved with conducting and presenting research with more emphasis given to the actual publication of research prior to graduation. Many of the Ph.D. candidates work in the department as graduate teaching and grant assistants during and beyond the residency year. This allows those candidates to experience the full range of activities of a university professor as they participate with mentors in teaching, service and research, as well as in faculty meetings, professional development, curriculum team meetings, and any other activities that CISE faculty members experience. For the few candidates that do not serve as graduate assistants during or beyond their residency year, continued attention will be given to providing university experiences that they may have missed by not being graduate assistants. Plans are being developed by CISE faculty to provide additional university faculty experiences during doctoral coursework to fill those gaps. Additionally, continued attention will be given to enhancing assessments to better track achievement throughout the program.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
There were 12 Ph.D. in Special Education candidates at various transition points in the program in 2012-2013. The Ph.D. in Special Education plays a critical role in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education's overall contribution to the field of special education at state, regional and national levels. This specialized Ph.D. program is a vital variable in establishing and maintaining recognition as a research university, in that our doctoral students and graduates contribute significantly to the field of education. The graduate faculty serve to foster the professional growth and research interests of students through active collaboration and guidance. As one of the two primary specialized degrees for CISE graduates at this level, the Ph.D. in Special Education provides a platform for directly contributing to the state and our nation. Doctoral students and faculty associated with this initiative value their responsibility and contributions through numerous activities. The CISE Ph.D. special education program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit that was completed in 2012. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty consult in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations. Through Project REACH, the Mississippi Personnel Preparation Development Grant, the Special Education Pre-Service Improvement Grant, the Mississippi Deaf-Blind Project, and the USM Autism Demonstration Project and Project LINK, special education faculty have participated in collaborative work with P-12 school districts, the Mississippi Council on Developmental Disabilities, the Mississippi Department of Education, and the Department of Psychology within the College of Education and Psychology. Furthermore, the Center for Professional Development and Outreach is engaged with a nationally-affiliated, disability-rights advocacy organization, the ARC of Mississippi.
Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans

CISE graduate faculty meet on a regular monthly schedule to evaluate the CISE special education doctoral level programs. Sequencing and scheduling of doctoral level classes are monitored to ensure that the program is accessible to students. Assessment results are reviewed to determine mastery of program standards, including National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards. Graduate faculty are working to more explicitly describe expectations for the one-year residency so that there is consistency in its application and the outcomes experienced by our candidates, and faculty are enhancing experiences for those few doctoral candidates who do not serve as graduate assistants during their residency year. Additionally, assessments are being enhanced to better track outcomes throughout the program. CISE special education faculty are reviewing the revised plans of study to operationalize and institutionalize the professional outcomes to develop in our candidates across the areas of teaching, research, and service (including outreach, technical assistance, and external funding). We are revising the expectations of individualized courses/arranged courses within the major emphasis to ensure that each doctoral candidate has a mentored experience and has demonstrated the capacity to fulfill these three essential roles of university faculty and other leadership personnel in special education.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking

In previous academic years, faculty merged three programs [Ph.D. in Special Education, Ed.D. in Education (Special Education) and Ph.D. in Education (Special Education)] to become the Ph.D. in Education (Special Education). CISE graduate faculty identified and systematically offered a doctoral core across all emphasis areas in order to ensure candidates are well-rounded within the larger field of education. Faculty continue to work with the four special education emphasis areas to ensure that candidates have a variety of options for specialization within the field of special education. All of this has been accomplished and revised plans of study have been approved. Through the work within the emphasis areas, the doctoral program has benefited from the move to online delivery of emphasis area coursework shared by the M.Ed. and Ed.S. in Special Education.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the program is to produce "principals capable of proactive, positive leadership for schools in the 21st Century." A redefined mission and vision was a fundamental step in this process. The delivery format of the master's program addresses the needs of "mid-career professionals" who are employed in a school setting while simultaneously enrolled in the program. The program received favorable reviews on its online cohort model. Two curricular areas were addressed: specific coursework related to instruction and school leaders' use of technology. The Redesign Team identified three major "pillars" of the program: Teaching and Learning, Organizational Effectiveness, and Collaboration with Stakeholders.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1:SLLA - Licensure
To prepare graduates who can successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.

Related Measures:

M 1:SLLA Composite
The SLLA is a licensure exam administered through ETS. It is designed to assess mastery of ISSLC standards. Each state sets its own pass score required for licensure. In MS students must score 169 or higher for an administrative license. Assessment given multiple times per year. Scores will be reported for each CY.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
80% of program completers will pass the SLLA (MS pass score is 169) as required by their states. (Building Track Only).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Summer 2012 data was reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Spring 2013 - One program completer took the SLLA and did not meet the required pass score. N=1; 0% pass. Spring 2013 - 84% of program completers (N=6) took the SLLA and met the required pass score. Yearly data shows that program completers (N=7) overall passed the SLLA at 71%.

M 2:Degree Completion
80% of candidates who are admitted will complete all degree requirements.

Source of Evidence: Performance in subsequent schooling feedback
Target:
80% of admitted candidates will successfully complete the program.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - No students graduate in the fall in the cohort model. Spring 2013 - 100% (N=10) of admitted candidates successfully completed the program within the six year graduation period.

SLO 2: Content Knowledge
To prepare students who demonstrate the content knowledge necessary to serve as educational leaders.

Related Measures:

M 3: Student Achievement Plan
80% of students will score proficient or above (3 or >) on the criteria set for Student Achievement Plan.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will score Mastery (3) or better on the Student Achievement Plan based on the assignment criteria.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - EDA 605 80% of students (N=18) scored mastery or better on the Student Achievement Plan. 13 students scored Exemplary (4); 5 students scored mastery (3). Spring 2013 - Course is not offered in Spring semester.

M 4: School Improvement Plan
80% of students will score proficient or above (3 or >) on the School Improvement Plan

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students will score mastery (3) or better on the School Improvement Plan based on assignment criteria. EDA 607

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - EDA 607 100% (N=10) of students scored mastery or better. Spring 2013 - EDA 607 100% (N=18) of students scored mastery (3) or better. 14 of the 18 scored Exemplary.

SLO 3: Research
To prepare students who can conduct and interpret relevant research.

Related Measures:

M 5: Strategic Plan
Candidates will analyze data, goals, and relevant resources to develop a strategic plan.
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
At least 80% of students completing the Strategic Plan will score at the mastery level or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. FALL 2012 - EDA 606 100% (N=17) of the students scored at the mastery level or higher.
Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=18) scored mastery or above on the Strategic Plan. 15 of the 18 scored exemplary.

---

**M 6: Diversity Research Paper**
Assessment given once per year for each cohort. No data collected fall semesters.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
At least 80% of students completing the Diversity Research Paper will score at the mastery level or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - EDA 603 is not offered in the fall semester. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=16) scored mastery or better on the Diversity Research Paper. 13 of the 16 scored Exemplary.

---

**SLO 4: ISSLC**
To prepare students who demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Internship**
To prepare students who demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
80% of students will score proficient or better (3 or >) on the final evaluation.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 No students are in the internship in the fall semester. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=18) scored proficient or better on the final evaluation.

---

**M 8: Graduate Survey**
To prepare students who demonstrate practical applications of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educational leaders as outlined in the ISSLC standards. An Electronic Survey will be sent to graduates every 3 years.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
**Target:**
80% of completed surveys will be rated proficient or better (3 or >).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer data reflected in 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - Data not collected each semester. No data reported. Spring 2013 - 100% of students (N=26) scored at a level 3 or greater on all the ISLLC standards measured in the graduate survey.

**SLO 5: Student Learning**
To prepare students who can impact students learning.

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Case Study Analysis**
Assessment given once per year for each cohort. No data collected spring semesters.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of students will score mastery (3) or better on the Case Study Analysis based on the criteria in the assignment.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 data was reported in 2011-2012 findings. EDA 604 At least 80% of students N=18) scored mastery (3) or better on the Case Study Analysis. 13 scored Exemplary (4) and 5 scored mastery (3). EDA 604 course is not offered in the spring semester.

**M 10: SLLA Score (Content Area)**
The SLLA is a licensure exam administered through ETS. It is designed to assess mastery of ISSLC standards. Each state sets its own pass score required for licensure. In MS students must score 169 or higher for an administrative license. Assessment given multiple times per year. Scores will be reported for each CY.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**
80% of program completers will score in the 75th quartile or > in 3 of the 4 subcontent areas.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2012 information was provided in the 2011-2012 findings. Fall 2012 - No data to report. This data has proven to be more complex to attain and analyze than expected. 2013 - No data to report. This data has proven to be more complex to attain and analyze than expected.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**SLLA**
Review workshops are being offered to students to assist in the preparation of the SLLA exam.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Students are provided opportunities to sit in on review sessions for the SLLA exam.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Myron Labat

### Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**

The assessments embedded in our program have shown that our students are growing and progressing as future educational leaders based on their overall performance on the assessments. Our students are showing overall proficiency on the given assessments. Particularly, our students are showing marked improvement on their performance on the SLLA, which is the state licensure exam. To address the deficiency found in previous years, we implemented additional preparation and training in this area to better prepare our students to perform satisfactory on the licensure exam. Additionally, our course and assessments are aligned to the ELCC standards which the licensure exam is also aligned to. This provides additional preparation for our students and further increases the likelihood for success on the exam as well as the other embedded assessments.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**

Our students have shown overall improvement on the program assessments. However, we still realize that more improvement is needed in the area of performance on the SLLA. To address the previous deficiency on the student performance on the SLLA we have incorporated SLLA review and preparation within the 3rd block of our program to better prepare our students for success on the licensure exam. We have also incorporated case studies and scenario based assessments within our courses to better prepare our students for the types of questions that they will encounter on the SLLA exam. We are constantly looking for ways to improve our program by conducting continuous assessment of what is working as well as areas where there is still need for improvement. In an effort to assist us with program evaluation we are constantly soliciting the feedback and input of students who are currently in the program and those who have previously graduated from the program. We will continue to use this feedback to continuously improve the student experience while maintaining a rigorous and meaningful curriculum. One area that we would like to improve upon is tracking of our students who have completed the program, and their level of preparation once they have acquired a position as a school leader.

### Annual Report Section Responses

**Program Summary**

The M.Ed. in Educational Administration is offered in a cohort model providing an opportunity for students in the program to provided added support for one another throughout the program and beyond. The cohort model also offers additional opportunity for forming lasting relationships for students pursuing the same or similar career paths. The master's program offers two options for program completion. The
hybrid option begins in the summer and is made up of a combination of face to face and online instruction. The first block of the program begins with face to face instruction in an intense mini session format followed by additional online instruction. The fall and spring semesters are offered completely online to accommodate the teaching schedules of our students. The final block of the program is offered in the same format of the initial block with face to face instruction followed by online instruction. We also offer a fully online program option for those who prefer this format and those who do not live in close proximity to the Hattiesburg campus. This option also allows us to recruit nationally. Both program options include an embedded internship flowing throughout the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th blocks. Students are required to have internship experiences in at least two school levels to ensure a diverse experience.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

In an effort to continuously improve our program, we have decided based on feedback from the students to offer a fall cohort instead of the spring cohort, which will begin in the fall 2013 semester in fully online format. This cohort is being offered to better meet the needs of our students. This will result in three cohorts for a brief period of time as we phase out the Spring cohort. To support this online cohort which is offered as a Gulf Coast Program, we have hired an additional Gulf Coast faculty member. The new faculty member will also serve in an additional support role for Gulf Coast students and to conduct internship site visits. In addition, we have worked to structure our course offerings aligned to each individual faculty member’s strength. The course offerings are set up in spiral curriculum with intro and foundational courses offered initially, followed by advanced level courses. For improved continuity, we have structured these courses in such a way that the same professor teaches the introductory course and the advanced course in a given content area. This reduces the likelihood of redundancy and insures consistency. Also, to provide continuous improvement for the overall program, we have incorporated SLLA training and support to better prepare our students for success on the licensure exam. We also noticed a need to have better tracking and accountability for students taking the RCR training modules for responsible conduct in research. To address this need we have built this in as a module in our foundational course within the students’ first block of the program.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

Each semester the SLLA workshops were offered through core coursework to support and review standards and design of the SLLA exam. In 2011-12 the Action Plan SLLA was established to increase student preparedness for the recent redesign of the SLLA exam. Students reported that this workshop was helpful. Overall, the department found this effort to be successful and will continue this workshop in the future.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the master’s level, the mission of the Elementary Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as master educators in Grades K-12, to serve as leaders in school districts and agencies, and to apply scientific research to improve teaching and learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge.

Master’s Candidates will articulate a content and theoretical knowledge base in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM

Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio

The professional portfolio is a comprehensive electronic portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling on each component of the program. Self reflective practices include self analysis, environmental scanning, decision making skill and problem solving. It is scored on a three-point rubric aligned to National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates will score Exemplary(3) or Mastery(2) on the criteria of articulating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored exemplary(3) or mastery (2) on articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) scored exemplary(3) or mastery (2) on articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored exemplary(3) or mastery (2) on articulating content and theoretical knowledge.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
CISE faculty will provide orientation to the portfolio in a designated course.

Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the new faculty to be mentored in the use...

M 2: Comprehensive Exam
The Master`s Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific elementary education degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by members of the candidates` specialist committee according to the rubric.

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of master`s candidates will successfully complete the master`s comprehensive examinations on the first attempt. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the elementary education degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by three faculty members according to the rubric. A majority of the faculty must pass the candidate for successful completion.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the new faculty to be mentored in the use...

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of content and theoretical knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 11/15 (73%) rated 5 4/15 (27%) rated 4 Total 15/15 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Spring 2013 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Require Exit Interview/Survey to be completed by graduating M.Ed. students.**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
To ensure that all M.Ed. graduates complete the Exit Interview/Survey, require that candidates complete the assessment before th...

Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the new faculty to be mentored in the use...

**SLO 2: Articulate elementary education pedagogy.**
Master’s Candidates will articulate an elementary education pedagogical knowledge base.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/ACEI/IRA NCTM

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Professional Portfolio**
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive electronic portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling on each component of the program. Self reflective practices include self analysis, environmental scanning, decision making skill and problem solving. It is scored on a three-point rubric aligned to National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates will score Exemplary(3) or Mastery(2) on the criteria of articulating elementary education pedagogy.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored exemplary(3) or mastery (2) on articulating elementary education pedagogy. Fall 2012 2/2(100%) scored exemplary(3) or mastery (2) on articulating elementary education pedagogy. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored exemplary(3) or mastery (2) on articulating elementary education pedagogy.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Provide orientation to the portfolio.**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
CISE faculty will provide orientation to the portfolio in a designated course.

**Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

**Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the new faculty to be mentored in the use...

**M 2: Comprehensive Exam**
The Master’s Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific elementary education degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of
the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by members of the candidates’ specialist committee according to the rubric.

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of master’s candidates will successfully complete the master’s comprehensive examinations on the first attempt. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the elementary education degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part. The examinations are evaluated by three faculty members according to the rubric. A majority of the faculty must pass the candidate for successful completion.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating elementary education pedagogy. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating elementary education pedagogy. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating elementary education pedagogy.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

**Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the new faculty to be mentored in the use...

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of elementary education pedagogy.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 13/15 (87%) rated 5 2/15 (13%) rated 4 Total 15/15 (100%)
rated 4 or higher on articulating elementary education pedagogy. Fall 2012 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating elementary education pedagogy. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) rated 5 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 5 on articulating elementary education pedagogy.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Require Exit Interview/Survey to be completed by graduating M.Ed. students.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*  
To ensure that all M.Ed. graduates complete the Exit Interview/Survey, require that candidates complete the assessment before th...

**Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

**Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the new faculty to be mentored in the use...

**SLO 3: Use research to improve teaching and learning.**  
Master's Candidates will analyze, synthesize, and evaluate research to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning.

**Relevant Associations:**  
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Professional Portfolio**  
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive electronic portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling on each component of the program. Self reflective practices include self analysis, environmental scanning, decision making skill and problem solving. It is scored on a three-point rubric aligned to National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**  
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates will score Exemplary(3) or Mastery(2) on the criteria of using research to improve teaching and learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored mastery(2) or exemplary (3) on using research to improve teaching and learning. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) scored mastery(2) or exemplary (3) on using research to improve teaching and
Learning. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on using research to improve teaching and learning.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
CISE faculty will provide orientation to the portfolio in a designated course.

Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding using research to improve teaching and learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 13/15 (87%) rated 5 2/15 (13%) rated 4 Total 15/15 (100%) rated 4 or higher on using research to improve teaching and learning. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) rated 5 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 5 on using research to improve teaching and learning. Spring 2013 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on using research to improve teaching and learning.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

Require Exit Interview/Survey to be completed by graduating M.Ed. students.
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
To ensure that all M.Ed. graduates complete the Exit Interview/Survey, require that candidates complete the assessment before th...

Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

**SLO 4: Integrate technology into teaching and learning.**
Master's candidates will integrate current technological resources and skills into teaching and learning.

**Relevant Associations:**
NBPTS ACEI

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Professional Portfolio**
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive electronic portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling on each component of the program. Self reflective practices include self analysis, environmental scanning, decision making skill and problem solving. It is scored on a three-point rubric aligned to National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates will score Exemplary(3) or Mastery(2) on the criteria of integrating current technology into teaching and learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on integrating technology into teaching and learning. Fall 2012 2/2(100%) scored mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on integrating technology into teaching and learning. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored mastery (2) or exemplary (3) on integrating technology into teaching and learning.

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of elementary education M.Ed.candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding integrating current technology into teaching and learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 12/15 (80%) rated 5 2/15 (13%) rated 4 1/15 (7%)rated 2 Total 14/15 (93%) rated 4 or higher on integrating technology into teaching and learning. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) rated 5 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 5 on integrating technology into teaching and learning. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) rated 5 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 5 on integrating technology into teaching and learning.

**SLO 5: Value professional development.**
Master's Candidates will value professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM
Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive electronic portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling on each component of the program. Self reflective practices include self analysis, environmental scanning, decision making skill and problem solving. It is scored on a three-point rubric aligned to National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBTS).

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates will score Exemplary(3) or Mastery(2) on the criteria of valuing professional development.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 20/20 (100%) scored mastery(2) or exemplary (3) on valuing professional development. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) scored mastery(2) or exemplary (3) on valuing professional development. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) scored mastery(2) or exemplary (3) on valuing professional development.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
CISE faculty will provide orientation to the portfolio in a designated course.

Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master`s candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety (90%) of elementary education M.Ed. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding valuing professional development.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 14/15 (93%) rated 5 1/15 (7%) rated 4 Total 15/15 (100%) rated 4 or higher on valuing professional development. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) rated 5 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 5 on valuing professional development. Spring 2013 2/2 (100%) rated 5 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 5 on valuing professional development.
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Require Exit Interview/Survey to be completed by graduating M.Ed. students.**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2010-2011  
To ensure that all M.Ed. graduates complete the Exit Interview/Survey, require that candidates complete the assessment before th...

**Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.**  
*Established in Cycle*: 2012-2013  
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Align M.Ed. to ACEI and NBPTS standards.**  
CISE elementary education graduate faculty will align both ACEI and NBPTS standards to assessments.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status**: Finished  
**Priority**: High  
**Implementation Description**: Spring 09  
**Responsible Person/Group**: CISE Graduate Faculty

**Schedule graduate classes for two years.**  
CISE faculty will provide a two-year schedule for elementary education graduate classes.

*Established in Cycle*: 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status**: Finished  
**Priority**: High  
**Implementation Description**: Summer 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group**: CISE Graduate Faculty and Graduate Adviser

**Provide orientation to the portfolio.**  
CISE faculty will provide orientation to the portfolio in a designated course.

*Established in Cycle*: 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status**: In-Progress  
**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure**: Professional Portfolio  
**Outcome/Objective**: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy. | Use research to improve teaching and learning. | Value professional development.
Responsible Person/Group: CISE Graduate Faculty

Organize two new cohort groups for practicing teachers.
Organize two new cohort groups for practicing teachers with a program plan that is sequenced to meet the needs of the students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 07/30/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate advisor/staff CISE elementary education graduate faculty Graduate School staff

Require Exit Interview/Survey to be completed by graduating M.Ed. students.
To ensure that all M.Ed. graduates complete the Exit Interview/Survey, require that candidates complete the assessment before the graduation application is moved forward to the graduate school.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Implementation Description: CISE graduate advisor/staff will require each graduating M.Ed. student to complete the assessment before their applications are moved to the next level of approval.
Projected Completion Date: 08/21/2011
Responsible Person/Group: CISE graduate advisor/staff

Incorporate national Common Core Standards in appropriate graduate courses.
CISE Elementary faculty are incorporating CC-SS standards into the appropriate elementary education graduate classes.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy.
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy. | Use research
Mentor new graduate elementary education faculty in graduate assessment system.
There will be several new graduate faculty in the fall 2013. It will be necessary for the
new faculty to be mentored in the use of the program assessments for the elementary
education M.Ed. This mentoring will be provided by remaining elementary education
graduate faculty who have been teaching in the M.Ed. program.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive Exam | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and
theoretical knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy.
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and
theoretical knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy.
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and
theoretical knowledge. | Articulate elementary education pedagogy.

Implementation Description: A lead faculty member for each course will mentor
new faculty with the SPA standards for each course and the overall program
assessments.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or
progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessments indicated that all outcomes for the M.Ed.(Elementary Education) were
met each semester in 2012-2013. The M.Ed. (Elementary Education) cohort groups
that were developed for practicing teachers and the online cohorts demonstrated
excellent knowledge, skills, and dispositions on each measure. Qualitative assessment
data indicated a strong appreciation for the practicality and usefulness of the
coursework in applying theory to evidence-based practice and for the collaboration
among practicing teachers that was promoted by the cohort groups. These strengths
were further evidenced by the comprehensive examination results in which candidates
were able to articulate and synthesize both content and pedagogical knowledge to a
higher level than in past years.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives
that will require continued attention?
Although all outcomes were met, continued attention will be given to the sequencing of
the research course so that action research may be completed in the candidates’
classrooms. As new cohorts are established, attention will be given to determining the
most beneficial sequencing and scheduling of the coursework to meet the specific
needs of the cohort teachers. Since many graduate students are not familiar with using
Blackboard, ongoing attention will be given to mentoring students in its use.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Educational Curriculum and Instruction (Elementary Education) M.Ed. is a strong graduate program that provides master teachers and instructional leaders for K-6 schools. Courses and assessments are aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI). The development of cohort groups from neighboring school districts that are taught in a hybrid format and the development of fully online cohort groups resulted in an increase in enrollment as well as an enhancement of the quality of candidates’ knowledge and skills as indicated by the improved comprehensive examination results and an increase in the students’ perceptions of the usefulness and practicality of the coursework as indicated in exit interviews. The CISE M.Ed. program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit that was completed in 2012. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty consult in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
Assessment results are reviewed by faculty in monthly graduate faculty meetings as well as in monthly Professional Education Council (PEC) unit review meetings. Special attention is being given to the national initiative for teaching Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in the appropriate elementary education graduate courses with an emphasis on teaching reading and writing across the elementary education curriculum. Comprehensive examinations have been aligned with NBPTS and ACEI standards. Classes have been developed for effective online delivery and sequenced for cohort groups so that students can complete the M.Ed. program in a one-year period, resulting in better recruitment and retention of graduate students. Cohort groups are established as hybrid and fully on-line programs. The cohort initiative has aided in recruitment of new students and the improvement of teaching and learning at the graduate level.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Actions to align the M.Ed. program coursework and assessments to ACEI and NBPTS standards were accomplished in the past cycle. Classes were approved for online delivery and sequenced for cohort groups so that students could complete the program in a one-year period, resulting in better recruitment and retention of graduate students. Hybrid and online delivery of coursework has been enhanced to provide more effective collaboration among students and more effective teaching and learning.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the master's level, the mission of the Secondary Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as master educators in Grades 7-12, to serve as leaders in school districts and agencies, and to apply scientific research to improve teaching and learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge

Master's Candidates will articulate a content and theoretical knowledge base in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Examination

The Master’s Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific secondary education degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90 % of M.Ed. in Secondary Education candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive examination on the first attempt.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Collaborate with content faculty.
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
CISE faculty and specific content faculty will collaborate to mentor M.Ed./MAT Secondary Education candidates and to ensure that...

Provide orientation to the portfolio.
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
CISE faculty to designate an initial M.Ed. course to provide orientation to the candidates for the portfolio.

Develop a plan for data collection and reporting for MAT portfolio.
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
CISE graduate faculty involved with the MAT/M.Ed. (Secondary Education) program will collaborate to provide a plan for collectin...

M 2: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the CISE clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain 1, Planning and Preparation; Domain 2, Assessment; Domain 3, Instruction; Domain 4, Learning Environment; and Domain 5, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes are used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Target (4); Acceptable (3); Emerging (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
90% of MAT candidates will rate (3) acceptable or (4) target on Domain I Indicator 1 of the TIAI to demonstrate articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
This performance assessment is administered only in the spring semester during the internship. Both Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast candidates are in the same online cohort group. Spring 2013 7/7 (100%) rated (4) target on D1-1 to demonstrate articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding articulating content and theoretical knowledge.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 1/6 (17%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge. 5/6 (83%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge. Total 6/6 (100%) rated 4 or higher on a 5-point scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge. There were two graduates in the fall 2012 but they did not complete exit surveys. There were 0 graduates in the spring 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Interview/Survey for all graduating M.Ed. students.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that all exit interviews are completed, the graduate advisor/staff will require that M.Ed. graduates complete the asse...

SLO 2: Articulate secondary education pedagogy
Master's Candidates will articulate a secondary education pedagogical knowledge base.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Examination
The Master’s Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and mastery of communication. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific secondary education degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. A candidate will achieve a score of 1-5 on each area with a score of 3 being required for passing each part.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
90 % of M.Ed. in Secondary Education candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive examination on the first attempt.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) passed the comprehensive examination on the first attempt. Spring 2013 0 candidates at this transition point.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Collaborate with content faculty.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
CISE faculty and specific content faculty will collaborate to mentor
M.Ed./MAT Secondary Education candidates and to ensure that...

**Provide orientation to the portfolio.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*  
CISE faculty to designate an initial M.Ed. course to provide orientation to the candidates for the portfolio.

**Develop a plan for data collection and reporting for MAT portfolio.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*  
CISE graduate faculty involved with the MAT/M.Ed. (Secondary Education) program will collaborate to provide a plan for collectin...

**M 2: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**  
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the CISE clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain 1, Planning and Preparation; Domain 2, Assessment; Domain 3, Instruction; Domain 4, Learning Environment; and Domain 5, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes are used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Target (4); Acceptable (3); Emerging (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**  
90% of MAT candidates will rate (3) acceptable or (4) target on Domain I Indicator 4 of the TIAI to demonstrate articulating secondary education pedagogy.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
This performance assessment is administered only in the spring semester during the internship. Both Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast candidates are in the same online cohort group. Spring 2013 7/7 (100%) rated (4) target on D1-I4 to demonstrate articulating secondary education pedagogy.

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**  
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**  
Ninety percent (90%) of candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding articulating secondary education pedagogy.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
Summer 2012 1/6 (17%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for articulating secondary education pedagogy. 5/6 (83%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating secondary education pedagogy. Total 6/6 (100%) rated 4 or higher on a 5-point scale for articulating secondary education pedagogy. There were two graduates in the fall 2012 but they did not complete exit surveys. There were 0 graduates in the spring 2013.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Interview/Survey for all graduating M.Ed. students.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that all exit interviews are completed, the graduate advisor/staff will require that M.Ed. graduates complete the asse...

SLO 3: Use research to improve teaching and learning
M.Ed./MAT candidates will use research to improve teaching and learning in the secondary schools.

Related Measures:

M 2: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the CISE clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain 1, Planning and Preparation; Domain 2, Assessment; Domain 3, Instruction; Domain 4, Learning Environment; and Domain 5, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes are used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Target (4); Acceptable (3); Emerging (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
90% of MAT candidates will rate (3) acceptable or (4) target on Domain I Indicator 6 of the TIAI to demonstrate research to improve teaching and learning.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
This performance assessment is administered only in the spring semester during the internship. Both Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast candidates are in the same online cohort group. Spring 2013 7/7 (100%) rated (4) target on D1-6 to demonstrate using research to improve teaching and learning.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master`s candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding using research to improve teaching and learning..

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 2/6 (33%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for using research to improve teaching and learning. 4/6 (67%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for
using research to improve teaching and learning. Total 6/6 (100%) rated 4 or higher on a 5-point scale for using research to improve teaching and learning. There were two graduates in the fall 2012 but they did not complete exit surveys. There were 0 graduates in the spring 2013.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Require Exit Interview/Survey for all graduating M.Ed. students.**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

To ensure that all exit interviews are completed, the graduate advisor/staff will require that M.Ed. graduates complete the asse...

---

**SLO 4:** Participate in professional development

Master's candidates will view professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

**Relevant Associations:**

NCATE

**Related Measures:**

**M 2:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument

The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the CISE clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain 1, Planning and Preparation; Domain 2, Assessment; Domain 3, Instruction; Domain 4, Learning Environment; and Domain 5, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes are used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Target (4); Acceptable (3); Emerging (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**

90% of MAT candidates will rate (3) acceptable or (4) target on Domain V Indicator 25 of the TIAI to demonstrate participating in professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

This performance assessment is administered only in the spring semester during the internship. Both Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast candidates are in the same online cohort group. Spring 2013 7/7 (100%) rated (4) target on DV-I25 to demonstrate participating in professional development.

**M 3:** Exit Interview/Survey

The exit interview/survey is a survey of the master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding participating in professional development.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 2/6 (33%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for participating in professional development. 4/6 (67%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for participating in professional development. Total 6/6 (100%) rated 4 or higher on a 5-point scale for participating in professional development. There were two graduates in the fall 2012 but they did not complete exit surveys. There were 0 graduates in the spring 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Interview/Survey for all graduating M.Ed. students.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that all exit interviews are completed, the graduate advisor/staff will require that M.Ed. graduates complete the asse...

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O/O 5:Obtain employment.
Secondary Education MAT/M.Ed. graduates will obtain employment in a secondary school upon graduation.

Related Measures:

M 4:Placement Data
CISE staff will determine employment of secondary education MAT/M.Ed. graduates from graduate survey and/or personal communication with graduates.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target:
Ninety percent of MAT/M.Ed. in secondary education graduates will obtain employment in a secondary school upon graduation.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) obtained employment in a secondary school. Fall 2012 2/2 (100%) obtained employment in a secondary school. Spring 2013 There were no graduates in spring 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

CISE Graduate Office to follow up on employment status.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that employment information is obtained, CISE graduate office staff will follow up by email or telephone to determine employment status of M.Ed./MAT graduates.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**revise current action statements for C&I-Sec(MEd)**
Revision of current action statements will take place with faculty of curriculum and instruction secondary ed program early fall 2006

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** early fall 2006
- **Responsible Person/Group:** department Chair and curr and inst faculty

**Collaborate with content faculty.**
CISE faculty and specific content faculty will collaborate to mentor M.Ed./MAT Secondary Education candidates and to ensure that assessment data is collected.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate secondary education pedagogy

- **Implementation Description:** Spring 09
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CISE Graduate Faculty and Content Faculty

**Provide orientation to the portfolio.**
CISE faculty to designate an initial M.Ed. course to provide orientation to the candidates for the portfolio.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate secondary education pedagogy

- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** CISE Graduate Faculty

**CISE Graduate Office to follow up on employment status.**
To ensure that employment information is obtained, CISE graduate office staff will follow up by email or telephone to determine employment status of M.Ed./MAT graduates.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Placement Data | Outcome/Objective: Obtain employment.

Implementation Description: CISE graduate office staff will email M.Ed. graduates to determine their employment status if it has not been previously reported.
Projected Completion Date: 12/13/2011

Develop a plan for data collection and reporting for MAT portfolio.
CISE graduate faculty involved with the MAT/M.Ed. (Secondary Education) program will collaborate to provide a plan for collecting and reporting portfolio data each semester.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Terminated
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate secondary education pedagogy

Implementation Description: CISE graduate faculty will meet at the beginning of the 2011 fall semester to develop a plan for collecting the data for the MAT portfolio.
Projected Completion Date: 12/13/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Marge Crowe and Dr. Perrin Lowrey

Require Exit Interview/Survey for all graduating M.Ed. students.
To ensure that all exit interviews are completed, the graduate advisor/staff will require that M.Ed. graduates complete the assessment before the graduation application is moved to the next level.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate secondary education pedagogy | Participate in professional development | Use research to improve teaching and learning

Implementation Description: Begin in fall 2011 to require the exit interview/survey to be completed by graduating M.Ed. students before sending the application for graduation forward.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Advisor/Staff

Update internship assessments to align with state teacher assessments.
The state of Mississippi has developed a new statewide teacher assessment instrument. This instrument will be used to evaluate MAT interns in their placements.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: This will begin in the fall of 2012. The rubrics have been distributed to internship supervisors.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessment data indicated strengths in both content and pedagogical knowledge with all outcomes being met. The CIS M.Ed./MAT program is a collaborative program with pedagogical courses being offered through CISE and content specialty areas being offered through the various content areas. This diversity of majors contributes to an interdisciplinary view of teaching and learning that adds strength to the MAT program. Exit interview data indicate strengths provided by dedicated faculty in this program across all specialty areas. Qualitative data from the exit interviews indicated that candidates were highly satisfied with the quality of the faculty and the support and mentorship that faculty provided for them throughout the program. Candidates also expressed appreciation for the flexibility of the program that allowed them to hold a full time teaching position while working on the MAT degree.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Assessments indicated that continued emphasis should be given to conducting and applying educational research and to participating in ongoing professional development. Exit interview data indicated that continued attention should be given to content area programs offering more choices for coursework in the specialty areas. Additionally, because MAT candidates hold teaching positions that are in areas that travel back to the campuses is not possible, attention needs to be given to offering more online classes during the regular school year.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Educational Curriculum and Instruction (Secondary Education) M.Ed. was previously merged with the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) in Secondary Education program. This enhanced program has resulted in an increase in numbers and a more streamlined program plan. It remains a strong program that provides master teachers and instructional leaders for 7-12 middle and secondary schools in various content areas. Coursework and assessments are aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). There were 20 candidates from six different content areas who were at various transition stages of the program in 2012-2013. The program is strengthened by the diverse content and experiential backgrounds of the candidates. The CISE MAT program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit that was completed in 2012. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty consult in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
CISE graduate faculty meet monthly to review program data and provide for continuous improvement. Comprehensive examination and portfolio results are reviewed and evaluated each semester. Program plans were reviewed and have been revised in the past cycle to transition from the M.Ed. and the MAT. New clinical elements and on-line graduate courses have been developed as continuous improvement initiatives.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Actions to redesign and merge the secondary education M.Ed. and MAT have resulted in a more accessible and efficient secondary education master's level degree program. Actions to develop alternate delivery of coursework have improved recruitment efforts. Assessments and data collection have been improved.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the K-6 Elementary Education (with 7-12 Endorsements) Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to provide the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable teacher candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-6 setting. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives and the ability to empower a community of learners.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate content knowledge.
Teacher candidates will demonstrate an elementary education content knowledge.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) MDE Process Standards

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis II: Elementary Education Content Knowledge
PRAXIS II: Elementary Education (0011), developed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS), is the required content knowledge standardized test for attaining Mississippi teacher licensure in Grades K-6. Praxis II: Elementary Education measures teacher candidates’ elementary education content knowledge, including reading and language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, arts, health, and physical education.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of K-6 teacher candidates will be successful on the PRAXIS II: Elementary Education content knowledge professional examination. This demonstrates the candidates’ attainment of the elementary education content knowledge required for state licensure. Both the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and NCATE require an 80% pass rate for state teacher education programs.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg Fall 2012 44/44 (100%) passed Spring 2013 54/54 (100%) passed Total 98/98 (100%) passed Gulf Coast Fall 2012 21/23 (91%) passed Spring 2013 29/32 (90%) passed Total 50/55 (91%) passed Teacher Assistant Program (TAP online) Fall 2012 8/11 (73%) passed Spring 2013 13/14 (93%) passed Total 21/25 (84%) passed OVERALL 169/178 (95%) passed *percentages are rounded
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Integrate the arts into didactic and clinical experiences.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
In reviewing data for ACEI, CISE faculty determined that a content area that needed more emphasis was the arts.

Review Praxis II subscores to determine content areas that may need emphasis.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
CISE faculty now have access to content subscores for individual teacher candidates for Praxis II: Elementary Education Content ...

M 3: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, development of higher order thinking skills and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric (Indicator A1 TCPE) for the criteria of demonstrating elementary education content knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 5/35 (14%) scored mastery (3) 30/35 (86%) scored exemplary (4) Total 35/35 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 12/24 (50%) scored mastery (3) 12/24 (50%) scored exemplary (4) Total 24/24 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Fall 2012 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 5/10 (50%) scored mastery (3) 5/10 (50%) scored exemplary (4) Total 10/10 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 8/57 (14%) scored mastery (3) 49/57 (86%) scored exemplary (4) Total 57/57 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 19/41 (46%) scored mastery (3) 22/41 (54%) scored exemplary (4) Total 41/41 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Spring 2013 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored
exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Integrate the arts into didactic and clinical experiences.**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

In reviewing data for ACEI, CISE faculty determined that a content area that needed more emphasis was the arts.

**Develop a plan for a year-long student teaching experience.**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

CISE faculty in conjunction with the Educational Field Experience office are collaborating to develop a plan to merge the CISE...

**SLO 2: Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.**

Teacher Candidates will demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.

**Relevant Associations:**

NCATE/Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) MDE Process Standards

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching**

PRAXIS II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT), developed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS), is the required pedagogical knowledge standardized test for attaining Mississippi elementary teacher licensure for Grades K-6. The PLT measures the candidates` abilities to apply pedagogical principles and to demonstrate professional knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

**Target:**

Ninety percent (90%) of K-6 teacher candidates will be successful on the PRAXIS II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT). The PLT measures candidates’ pedagogical and professional knowledge at a level required for state licensure. The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and NCATE require an 80% pass rate for teacher education programs.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Hattiesburg Fall 2012 43/44 (98%) passed Spring 2013 51/54 (94%) passed Total 94/98 (96%) passed Gulf Coast Fall 2012 23/23 (100%) passed Spring 2013 27/30 (90%) passed Total 50/53 (94%) passed Teacher Assistant Program (TAP online) Fall 2012 9/11 (82%) passed Spring 2013 10/14 (71%) passed Total 19/25 (76%) passed OVERALL 163/176 (93%) passed

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.
Integrate the arts into didactic and clinical experiences.  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

In reviewing data for ACEI, CISE faculty determined that a content area that needed more emphasis was the arts.

Review Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching to determine pedagogical areas that may need emphasis.  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

CISE faculty now have access to subscores on the Praxis II: PLT for individual teacher candidates. Ongoing analysis of subscore...

**M 3: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation**

The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, development of higher order thinking skills and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric (Indicator A2 TCPE) on the criteria of demonstrating pedagogical knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 6/35 (17%) scored mastery (3) 29/35 (83%) scored exemplary (4) Total 35/35 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE) Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 13/24 (54%) scored mastery (3) 11/24 (46%) scored exemplary (4) Total 24/24 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE) Fall 2012 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 6/10 (60%) scored mastery (3) 4/10 (40%) scored exemplary (4) Total 10/10 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE)  

Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 1/57 (2%) scored marginal (2) 9/57 (16%) scored mastery (3) 47/57 (82%) scored exemplary (4) Total 56/57 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE) Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 1/41 (2%) scored marginal (2) 21/41 (51%) scored mastery (3) 19/41 (46%) scored exemplary (4) Total 40/41 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE) Spring 2013 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE)
**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Develop a plan for a year-long student teaching experience.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

CISE faculty in conjunction with the Educational Field Experience office are collaborating to develop a plan to merge the CISE...

**SLO 3: Use assessment information for differentiated learning.**
Teacher Candidates will use assessment information to plan differentiated experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/Association for Childhood Education International/MDE Process Standards

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation**
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, development of higher order thinking skills and integration of technology into instruction.. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of (3)mastery or (4) exemplary on the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric (Indicator C-3 TCPE) on the criteria of using assessment information to plan differentiated learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 14/35 (40%) scored mastery (3) 21/35 (60%) scored exemplary (4) Total 35/35 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Indicator C-3 TCPE). Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 18/24 (75%) scored mastery (3) 6/24 (25%) scored exemplary (4) Total 24/24 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Indicator C-3 TCPE) Fall 2012 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 3/10 (30%) scored mastery (3) 7/10 (70%) scored exemplary (4) Total 10/10 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Indicator C-3 TCPE) Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 1/57 (2%) scored marginal (2) 27/57 (47%) scored mastery (3) 29/57 (51%) scored exemplary (4) Total 56/57 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary
(4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Indicator C-3 TCPE) Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 22/41 (54%) scored mastery (3) 19/41 (46%) scored exemplary (4) Total 41/41 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Indicator C-3 TCPE) Spring 2013 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Indicator C-3 TCPE)

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Team teach CISE 403 and CIR 412 to provide authentic experience for using assessment information to differentiate learning.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The instructors for CIR 412 and CIR 412L, Assessment and Instruction, and CISE 403, Evaluation of Students with Disabilities, w...

Develop a plan for a year-long student teaching experience.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

CISE faculty in conjunction with the Educational Field Experience office are collaborating to develop a plan to merge the CISE...

Provide professional development seminar during student teaching for differentiated learning.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Professional development seminars will be provided during the student teaching experience that reinforce how to use assessment...

M 4: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the TIAI rubric (Domain I Indicator 6) for the criteria of using assessment information for differentiated learning.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 1/36 (3%) scored unacceptable (1) 1/36 (3%) scored marginal (2) 7/36 (19%) scored mastery (3) 27/36 (75%) scored exemplary (4) Total 34/36 (94%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 4/22 (18%) scored marginal (2) 11/22 (50%) scored mastery (3) 7/22 (32%) scored exemplary (4) Total 18/22 (82%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Teacher Assistant Program (TAP) online 1/11 (9%) scored unacceptable (1) 2/11 (18%) scored marginal (2) 4/11 (36%) scored mastery (3) 4/11 (36%) scored exemplary (4) Total 8/11 (73%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 9/57 (16%) scored mastery (3) 48/57 (84%) scored exemplary (4) Total 57/57 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 3/41 (7%) scored marginal (2) 13/41 (32%) scored mastery (3) 25/41 (61%) scored exemplary (4) Total 38/41 (93%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Teacher Assistant Online Program (TAP) 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI).

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Team teach CISE 403 and CIR 412 to provide authentic experience for using assessment information to differentiate learning.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The instructors for CIR 412 and CIR 412L, Assessment and Instruction, and CISE 403, Evaluation of Students with Disabilities, w...

Develop a plan for a year-long student teaching experience.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012

CISE faculty in conjunction with the Educational Field Experience office are collaborating to develop a plan to merge the CISE...

Provide professional development seminar during student teaching for differentiated learning.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Professional development seminars will be provided during the student teaching experience that reinforce how to use assessment...

SLO 4: Integrate technology in instruction.
Teacher Candidates will impact student learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction.

Relevant Associations:
**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation**

The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, development of higher order thinking skills and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**

Ninety-five percent (95%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric (Indicator A-7 TCPE) on the criteria of integrating technological skills.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 7/35 (20%) scored mastery (3) 28/35 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 35/35 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A-7 TCPE). Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 8/24 (33%) scored mastery (3) 16/24 (67%) scored exemplary (4) Total 24/24 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A-7 TCPE). Fall 2012 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 3/10 (30%) scored mastery (3) 7/10 (70%) scored exemplary (4) Total 10/10 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A-7 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 3/57 (5%) scored mastery (3) 54/57 (95%) scored exemplary (4) Total 57/57 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A-7 TCPE). Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 1/41 (2%) scored marginal (2) 6/41 (15%) scored mastery (3) 34/41 (83%) scored exemplary (4) Total 40/41 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A-7 TCPE). Teacher Assistant Program (online) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Collaborate with K-6 faculty to assist teacher candidates in integrating interactive technology into lessons.**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Because K-6 school partners, through grants and through the USM Writing Project, have obtained cutting-edge technology for thei...
M 4: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument

The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**

Ninety-five percent (95%) of candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the TIAI rubric (Domain I Indicator 4) for the criteria of integrating technology into instruction.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**

- **Fall 2012 Hattiesburg** 4/36 (11%) scored mastery (3) 32/36 (89%) scored exemplary (4) Total 36/36 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI).
- **Fall 2012 Gulf Coast** 13/22 (59%) scored mastery (3) 9/22 (41%) scored exemplary (4) Total 22/22 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI).
- **Teacher Assistant Program (TAP) online** 3/11 (27%) scored marginal (2) 3/11 (27%) scored mastery (3) 5/11 (46%) scored exemplary (4) Total 8/11 (73%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI).
- **Spring 2013 Hattiesburg** 1/57 (1%) scored marginal (2) 2/57 (4%) scored mastery (3) 54/57 (98%) scored exemplary (4) Total 56/57 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI).
- **Spring 2013 Gulf Coast** 2/41 (5%) scored marginal (2) 12/41 (29%) scored mastery (3) 27/41 (66%) scored exemplary (4) Total 39/41 (95%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI).
- **Teacher Assistant Online Program (TAP)** 2/5 (40%) scored mastery 3/5 (60%) scored exemplary on Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Collaborate with K-6 faculty to assist teacher candidates in integrating interactive technology into lessons.**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

Because K-6 school partners, through grants and through the USM Writing Project, have obtained cutting-edge technology for the...
Relevant Associations:
ACEI NCATE

Related Measures:

**M 3: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation**
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, development of higher order thinking skills and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the teacher candidacy performance rubric (Indicator A-4 TCPE) for the criteria of using higher-order thinking skills in lessons.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 13/35 (37%) scored mastery 22/35 (63%) scored exemplary Total 35/35 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Indicator A 4 TCPE). Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 20/24 (85%) scored mastery (3) 4/24 (15%) scored exemplary (4) Total 24/24 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Indicator A 4 TCPE). Fall 2012 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 6/10 (60%) scored mastery (3) 4/10 (40%) scored exemplary (4) Total 10/10 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Indicator A 4 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 1/57 (2%) scored marginal (2) 12/57 (21%) scored mastery (3) 44/57 (77%) scored exemplary (4) Total 56/57 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Indicator A 4 TCPE). Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 2/41 (5%) scored marginal (2) 20/41 (49%) scored mastery (3) 19/41 (46%) scored exemplary (4) Total 39/41 (95%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Indicator A 4 TCPE). Spring 2013 Teacher Assistant Program (online) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Indicator A 4 TCPE).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Provide professional development seminar during student teaching for differentiated learning.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Professional development seminars will be provided during the student teaching experience that reinforce how to use assessment...

**M 4: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**

The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**

Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the TIAI rubric (Domain III Indicator 17) for the criteria of using higher-order questions in lessons.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**

Fall 2012 Hattiesburg 2/36 (5%) scored marginal (2) 19/36 (53%) scored mastery (3) 15/36 (42%) scored exemplary (4) Total 34/36 (94%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI). Fall 2012 Gulf Coast 3/22 (13%) scored marginal (2) 14/22 (64%) scored mastery (3) 5/22 (23%) scored exemplary (4) Total 19/22 (86%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI). Fall 2012 Teacher Assistant Program (TAP) online 2/11 (18%) scored marginal (2) 5/11 (46%) scored mastery (3) 4/11 (36%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/11 (82%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg 2/57 (4%) scored marginal (2) 19/57 (33%) scored mastery (3) 36/57 (63%) scored exemplary (4) Total 55/57 (96%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI). Spring 2013 Gulf Coast 2/41 (5%) scored marginal (2) 25/41 (61%) scored mastery (3) 14/41 (34%) scored exemplary (4) Total 39/41 (95%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI). Teacher Assistant Online Program (TAP) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on developing higher-order thinking skills (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Include use of higher order questions in lesson plans.
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

For each clinical experience (pre student teaching and student teaching) teacher candidates will be required to show higher or...

Provide professional development seminar during student teaching for differentiated learning.
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

Professional development seminars will be provided during the student teaching experience that reinforce how to use assessment...

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Improve assessment skills.**
Intermediate and Senior Block faculty will develop an interdisciplinary approach to assist candidates in the use of assessment to drive instruction.

*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
*Implementation Status: Finished*
*Priority: High*
*Implementation Description: ongoing*
*Responsible Person/Group: Intermediate and Senior Block Faculty*

**Collaborate with Instructional Technology faculty.**
Instructional Technology faculty have been reassigned to CISE. This will allow CISE faculty and IT faculty to better collaborate to provide opportunities for teacher candidates to integrate current technology into lesson plans.

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
*Implementation Status: Finished*
*Priority: High*
*Implementation Description: At the beginning of the fall 2011 semester, CISE will have meetings of CISE faculty and former IT faculty to review syllabi to determine how to better integrate current instructional technology into coursework.*
*Projected Completion Date: 08/28/2011*
*Responsible Person/Group: CIE faculty and Instructional Technology faculty*

**Collaborate with K-6 faculty to assist teacher candidates in integrating interactive technology into lessons.**
Because K-6 school partners, through grants and through the USM Writing Project, have obtained cutting-edge technology for their schools and have developed innovative technological lesson plans, the CISE faculty have determined that it would be beneficial to invite technology specialists from K-6 schools to provide hands-on technology workshop sessions for teacher candidates prior to student teaching. Additionally, instructional technology faculty will become part of the CISE faculty. This will allow for stronger collaboration between CISE elementary education faculty and instructional technology faculty who teach IT 365, which is required for elementary education...
majors.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology in instruction.
  Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology in instruction.

Implementation Description: Kim Walker, Ed.S, Clinical Coordinator for CISE and Director of the USM Writing Project, will coordinate inviting K-6 technology specialists to provide workshops for introductory and intermediate level cohort groups to assist teacher candidates in the use of technology in teaching and learning. CISE faculty will collaborate with IT faculty for IT 365.
Projected Completion Date: 05/14/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Introductory and Intermediate Co-hort Leaders and Clinical Coordinator CISE Elementary Education faculty and IT faculty teaching IT 365

Include use of higher order questions in lesson plans.
For each clinical experience (pre student teaching and student teaching) teacher candidates will be required to show higher order thinking questions and activities on lesson plans.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Develop higher-order thinking skills.

Implementation Description: Faculty for introductory, intermediate and senior cohort groups will collaborate to develop procedures in didactic and clinical coursework to provide teacher candidates with the knowledge and skills for developing higher order thinking in K-6 students.
Projected Completion Date: 05/13/2012
Responsible Person/Group: CISE Cohort Faculty

Integrate the arts into didactic and clinical experiences.
In reviewing data for ACEI, CISE faculty determined that a content area that needed more emphasis was the arts.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** Praxis II: Elementary Education Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate content knowledge.

**Measure:** Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.

**Measure:** Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate content knowledge.

**Implementation Description:** Workshops have been implemented to demonstrate to teacher candidates how to integrate the arts across the curriculum. This emphasis will continue throughout 2011-2012.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/13/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** Supervisor of clinical experiences, Kim Walker, in conjunction with faculty involved with the “whole school” arts initiative in local K-6 schools.

**Review Praxis II subscores to determine content areas that may need emphasis.**

CISE faculty now have access to content subscores for individual teacher candidates for Praxis II: Elementary Education Content Knowledge. Analysis of subscores will enable faculty to determine if there are elementary education content areas that need further emphasis.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Praxis II: Elementary Education Content Knowledge | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate content knowledge.

**Implementation Description:** Upon receipt of Praxis II subscores for fall 2012 and spring 2013, CISE faculty will analyze the results to determine which content areas need further emphasis.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/14/2014

**Responsible Person/Group:** CISE faculty and CISE assessment coordinator.

**Additional Resources Requested:** NCATE office personnel.

**Review Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching to determine pedagogical areas that may need emphasis.**

CISE faculty now have access to subscores on the Praxis II: PLT for individual teacher candidates. Ongoing analysis of subscores will enable faculty to determine if there are categories of pedagogy that need further emphasis in coursework and/or clinical experiences.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011

**Implementation Status:** In-Progress

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/14/2014
Responsible Person/Group: CISE faculty and assessment coordinator.
Additional Resources Requested: NCATE office personnel.
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Team teach CISE 403 and CIR 412 to provide authentic experience for using assessment information to differentiate learning.
The instructors for CIR 412 and CIR 412L, Assessment and Instruction, and CISE 403, Evaluation of Students with Disabilities, will team-teach the two courses in the senior cohort to provide authentic experiences in using assessment to differentiate instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Use assessment information for differentiated learning.
  Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Use assessment information for differentiated learning.

Implementation Description: Instructors will plan and team teach courses in the senior level blocks to ensure that teacher candidates can demonstrate using assessment to differentiate instruction prior to student teaching.
Projected Completion Date: 12/13/2011
Responsible Person/Group: Instructors for CIR 412L and CISE 403

Collaborate with Instructional Technology faculty to assist elementary education faculty in integrating technology.
Instructional Technology faculty will collaborate with elementary education faculty in CISE to integrate cutting-edge technology into clinical experiences.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: IT faculty will continue "Tech Knows" workshops prior to CISE faculty meetings to provide professional development in cutting edge instructional technology.
Projected Completion Date: 07/29/2013
Responsible Person/Group: IT faculty

Develop a plan for a year-long student teaching experience.
CISE faculty in conjunction with the Educational Field Experience office are collaborating to develop a plan to merge the CISE senior block experiences with the semester student teaching experience to allow for a student teaching experience that encompasses a full year in K-6 partnering schools.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate content knowledge. | Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge. | Use assessment information for differentiated learning.

**Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | **Outcome/Objective:** Use assessment information for differentiated learning.

**Implementation Description:** Research for this project will be conducted in the schools involving USM didactic and clinical instructors and K-6 faculty beginning in the fall 2012. Additionally, planning meetings will be held to begin the implementation of the full-year clinical experience in fall 2014.

**Projected Completion Date:** 11/30/2014

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Janet Boyce, CISE elementary education faculty, Educational Field Experience staff

**Incorporate national common core state standards into coursework.**

Beginning in 2011-2012, CISE faculty have attended professional development sessions and worked in content area groups to develop plans to incorporate common core standards into all appropriate syllabi and coursework. This process is ongoing and will continue throughout 2012-2013.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Finished

**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** CISE didactic and clinical faculty will collaborate to ensure common core standards are included in appropriate coursework and clinical experiences.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/29/2013

**Responsible Person/Group:** CISE faculty and K-6 faculty

**Provide professional development seminar during student teaching for differentiated learning.**

Professional development seminars will be provided during the student teaching experience that reinforce how to use assessment information to differentiate learning and provide instruction in higher order thinking in relation to national common core standards.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop higher-order thinking skills. | Use assessment information for differentiated learning.

**Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop higher-order thinking skills. | Use assessment information for differentiated learning.

**Implementation Description:** Office of Field Experiences faculty and staff will collaborate with CISE elementary education faculty to provide professional development for using assessment information for differentiated learning.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/14/2014
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Elementary Education (K-6) BS programs on the Hattiesburg campus, the Gulf Coast campus, and the Teacher Assistant Program (TAP- online) showed strengths in performance measures of program objectives in 2012-2013, with all outcome targets being met or partially met. Pass-fail results for the two licensure examinations, Praxis II: Elementary Education Content and Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching, revealed a 100% pass rate for the Hattiesburg campus in both fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters for both examinations and an average pass rate for all three programs of 95% for Elementary Education Content. The average pass rate for all three programs was 93% for Principles of Learning and Teaching. Both content and pedagogy licensure examination results for all three programs on both examinations greatly exceeded the 80% pass rate required by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and by NCATE. The results obtained from the intensive performance measures required by the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), which is the Specialty Professional Association (SPA) that confers national recognition to the CISE elementary education program, indicated that outcomes were being met at the exemplary or mastery level for most measures with improvements from previous results on using assessment information for differentiated instruction and using higher order thinking skills. Additionally, CISE elementary education coursework, pre-student teaching clinical experiences and student teaching are aligned with both SPA standards and national Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS) to ensure that state and national objectives are met. Overall results from 2012-2013 measures indicate that both state and national outcomes are being attained. Performance assessments indicated mastery of content and pedagogical skills with continued progress being made on the integration of current technology into teaching and learning.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Critical thinking and other higher order thinking skills are areas that require ongoing attention, including the development of teacher candidates' higher order thinking skills as well as the development of their knowledge and skills to teach higher order thinking skills to K-6 students. With the advent of the national Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS) and the accompanying new assessments, continued attention will be required for the outcomes of using assessment for differentiated learning and for the teaching and assessment of higher order thinking and literacy skills across the curriculum. Also, because of the rapid advances made in instructional technology, ongoing attention is required for the outcome of integration of current technology across the curriculum.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The K-6 elementary education program in Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education (CISE), a program that is historically within the original mission of USM and one of the largest programs on both the Hattiesburg and the Gulf Coast campuses, strives to be a model teacher education program for the state and the region, and is committed to the outstanding preparation of K-6 teachers. In the fall of 2012, the CISE elementary education program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) for seven years. Likewise, The Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Specialty Professional Association (SPA) granted full national recognition to the CISE Elementary Education Program for seven years.
Additionally, the USM teacher education programs met the Process and Performance Standards of the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE). The Teacher Assistant Program (TAP), the innovative CISE online program for currently-employed K-6 assistant teachers who wish to attain a B.S. degree and teacher licensure, continues to be a beneficial recruiting tool as well as a service to K-6 schools throughout the state. The entire elementary education program (at both campuses and online) is based on the premise of an active "community of learners" with the teacher candidates, faculty, staff, community members, and school district personnel working together in a partnership to create a dynamic learning community. Through a planned sequential program built on evidence-based didactic course work aligned with authentic clinical experiences and state and national standards, teacher education candidates internalize and value the educational knowledge, skills and dispositions to inform, inspire and transform self and others including the K-6 students in the classroom. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. In regard to service, CISE faculty serve on departmental committees, college committees, and university committees and councils. External to the university, CISE faculty serve as consultants in K-12 schools, serve on state advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
In Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education (CISE), elementary education continuous improvement initiatives are aligned with the national Common Core-State Standards (CCSS), the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards for elementary education, and the International Reading Association (IRA) standards for reading instruction. The newly-developed national Common Core State Standards (CCSS) have been mapped to elementary education didactic and clinical courses. CISE faculty have been involved in ongoing professional development in relation to the incorporation of the CCSS standards into coursework. CCSS best practices are reviewed and analyzed based upon the knowledge provided by sound educational research. Faculty members provide a variety of experiences that inform elementary education majors about the latest classroom pedagogical innovations and future technology trends. Opportunities to use new technology, such as interactive white boards and other cutting-edge technology, are built into the clinical component of the program as students incorporate delivery formats of the K-6 clinical classrooms into their lesson designs. Collaboration among CISE elementary and special education faculty and instructional technology faculty provides elementary education majors with the opportunity to see effective instruction through co-teaching in inclusion classrooms and provides the opportunity to use cutting edge instructional technology. The variety of research studies and personnel preparation grants directed by CISE faculty inform elementary education majors about societal needs and provide students with evidence-based methodology to ensure best practices are used for teaching and learning. One of the major assessments for elementary education, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) has undergone significant revision at the state level in the past two years by representatives from each IHL that provides teacher education. The resulting instrument is closely aligned with the new teacher assessment instrument, the Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric (MSTAR) that will be used to evaluate all practicing teachers within the state. Beginning in the spring semester of 2013, the new instrument was used throughout the CISE elementary education program to prepare teacher candidates to be more effective teachers during student teaching and in their full time positions following graduation. Review of the spring results from the revised TIAI revealed that CISE elementary education teacher candidates made significant progress in meeting state and national outcomes. Ongoing attention to the two licensure examinations Praxis II: Elementary Education Content and Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching resulted in a 100% pass rate for the Hattiesburg
campus in both fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters with an overall pass rate of 95% for Elementary Education Content and an overall pass rate for Principles of Learning and Teaching of 93%. For the past three years, CISE elementary education faculty have reviewed research involving moving to a full year student teaching program. A field study began in the spring of 2013 to increase the amount of time in clinical experiences. A volunteer group of student teachers were assigned to the field study that began student teaching on the opening day of each semester and required student teachers to fully participate in all of the school activities until the public school semester ended. The public school partners involved in the field study worked closely with the university didactic and clinical faculty to provide exemplary field experiences. Schools provide meeting space for clinical students to work with university supervisors on lesson preparation and post-lesson conferencing to further support the field experiences. Preliminary data from the field study reveal that teacher candidates are benefitting from this enhanced student teaching experience. The field study will continue throughout 2013-2014. Additional field experiences have been added to the introductory cohort, and performance assessments for each cohort have been revised to better evaluate knowledge, skills, and dispositions prior to teacher candidacy. Didactic and clinical faculty members meet regularly as a team to discuss the knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidates as they progress through the cohort groups. Particular attention is given to professional dispositions during the field experiences so that candidates will be better prepared for the teacher internship. Formative assessments administered throughout the program are reviewed for individual candidates who are provided guidance and instruction throughout the program to ensure that each candidate obtains the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be an effective practitioner.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

As a means to "close the loop" on actions to better integrate didactic and clinical coursework, CISE cohort faculty participate in a "Super Clinical" week each semester. During that week, CISE cohort didactic faculty participate with the CISE clinical faculty, the K-6 mentor teachers, and the teacher candidates at the clinical sites throughout the week. This action has proven to be effective in improving teacher candidate outcomes prior to student teaching. An outcome of the positive results of the "Super Clinical" week was that CISE faculty decided to develop a plan to partner with K-6 schools to develop a full year of student teaching experiences. This plan resulted in a field study beginning in the spring of 2013 that was stated in the action plan and will be continued in 2013-2014 to further close the loop. Resequencing of courses to include classroom management coursework during the more intense clinical experiences of the senior block resulted in improved candidate outcomes for classroom management. Additionally, CISE faculty elementary education faculty have participated in professional development workshops to share and learn about cutting-edge instructional technology and to learn how to incorporate the national common core standards into didactic and clinical courses.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the B.A. program in English licensure is to develop in its graduates essential competencies in a broad range of literary, creative and rhetorical studies that will prepare them for professional careers as teachers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Thesis and Argument
Students will demonstrate that they learned to develop a thesis statement in the introduction of the paper and are able to defend it in the course of the essay.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE

Related Measures:

M 1: Writing Intensive Papers—Thesis and Argument
Random, anonymous individual papers collected by instructors from English 340, English 400, and a sample of 400-level Writing Intensive classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point scoring rubric. The rubric is composed of four subcategories, including Outcome 1--Thesis and Argument, with criteria for evaluating students’ ability to clearly state and amply develop a thesis and to effectively support thesis with appropriate textual evidence.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Connected Document
- Revised (2010) Undergraduate Rubric

Target:
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 85.71% (6 out of 7 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-thesis and argument. Gulf Park: 100% (5 out of 5 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-thesis and argument.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Student Learning Outcomes disseminated to students

*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*

In order to increase student self-awareness of the writing process, assessed learning outcomes will be distributed to students. ...

Undergraduate Assessment Committee

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Commi...

M 7: Exit Survey of Students in Capstone Course

All students in ENG 400: Senior Seminar, the capstone course for the English BA and BA with licensure programs, complete an exit survey through which they will self-assess their abilities to develop successful thesis statements and arguments, analyze literary works, demonstrate successful writing skills, conduct research, and make successful oral presentations.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**

- *Undergraduate Exit Survey*

**Target:**
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5.

SLO 2: Analysis

Students will demonstrate a clear understanding of the primary texts, a familiarity with the genre and period from which a text comes, and an ability to use literary terminology.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE

**Related Measures:**

M 2: Writing Intensive Papers--Analysis

Random, anonymous individual papers collected by instructors from English 340, English 400, and a sample of 400-level Writing Intensive classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point scoring rubric. The rubric is composed of four subcategories, including Outcome 2--Analysis, with criteria for evaluating students' ability to demonstrate a clear understanding of literary texts, to situate literary texts in their appropriate historical and generic contexts, and to make effective use of literary terms in developing an argument.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
Revised (2010) Undergraduate Rubric

Target:
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 85.71% (6 out of 7 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-analysis. Gulf Park: 100% (5 out of 5 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-analysis.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Learning Outcomes disseminated to students
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
In order to increase student self-awareness of the writing process, assessed learning outcomes will be distributed to students. ...

Undergraduate Assessment Committee
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Commi...

M 7: Exit Survey of Students in Capstone Course
All students in ENG 400: Senior Seminar, the capstone course for the English BA and BA with licensure programs, complete an exit survey through which they will self-assess their abilities to develop successful thesis statements and arguments, analyze literary works, demonstrate successful writing skills, conduct research, and make successful oral presentations.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Connected Document
• Undergraduate Exit Survey

Target:
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5.

SLO 3: Writing Skills
Students will demonstrate writing skills at the stylistic, structural, and grammatical levels.
Relevant Associations:
NCATE

Related Measures:

**M 3: Writing Intensive Papers—Writing Skills**
Random, anonymous individual papers collected by instructors from English 340, English 400, and a sample of 400-level Writing Intensive classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point scoring rubric. The rubric is composed of four subcategories, including Outcome 3—Writing Skills, with criteria for evaluating students' ability to demonstrate competence in the proper use of written language conventions, and to achieve coherence and fluency at sentence, paragraph, and essay levels.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**
- Revised (2010) Undergraduate Rubric

**Target:**
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 85.71% (6 out of 7 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-writing skills. Gulf Park: 100% (5 out of 5 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-writing skills.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Learning Outcomes disseminated to students**
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
In order to increase student self-awareness of the writing process, assessed learning outcomes will be distributed to students. ...

**Undergraduate Assessment Committee**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Commi...

**M 7: Exit Survey of Students in Capstone Course**
All students in ENG 400: Senior Seminar, the capstone course for the English BA and BA with licensure programs, complete an exit survey through which they will self-assess their abilities to develop successful thesis statements and arguments, analyze literary works, demonstrate successful writing skills, conduct research, and make successful oral presentations.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
**Connected Document**  
*Undergraduate Exit Survey*

**Target:**
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5.

**SLO 4: Research Skills**
Students will practice discipline-appropriate methods of research including evaluation and use of electronic sources. Sub-categories in this area include proficiency in locating material, documenting sources, and distinguishing between writer and source so as to avoid plagiarism.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Writing Intensive Papers--Research Skills**
Random, anonymous individual papers collected by instructors from English 340, English 400, and a sample of 400-level Writing Intensive classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point scoring rubric. The rubric is composed of four subcategories, including Outcome 4--Research Skills, with criteria for evaluating students' proficiency in locating appropriate print and/or electronic sources, ability to cite and document sources appropriately, and ability to integrate source material effectively.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Connected Document**  
*Revised (2010) Undergraduate Rubric*

**Target:**
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 85.71% (6 out of 7 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-research skills. Gulf Park: 100% (5 out of 5 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better on writing-intensive papers-research skills.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Learning Outcomes disseminated to students**
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*
In order to increase student self-awareness of the writing process, assessed learning outcomes will be distributed to students. ...

**Undergraduate Assessment Committee**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Commi...

**M 7: Exit Survey of Students in Capstone Course**  
All students in ENG 400: Senior Seminar, the capstone course for the English BA and BA with licensure programs, complete an exit survey through which they will self-assess their abilities to develop successful thesis statements and arguments, analyze literary works, demonstrate successful writing skills, conduct research, and make successful oral presentations.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**  
- *Undergraduate Exit Survey*

**Target:**  
75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5.

**SLO 5: Oral Communication Skills**  
Students will demonstrate advanced discipline-appropriate skills and effective writing and speaking skills.

**Relevant Associations:**  
NCATE

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Capstone Course Oral Presentation**  
English 400 oral presentations will be assessed using a departmentally-approved 5-point scoring rubric. The grading rubric is composed of three categories: professional presentation, coherence, and analysis.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**  
75% of students will achieve an average score of 3 ("competent") or better out of 5 overall.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**  
Hattiesburg: 0% of presentations (0 out of 2) scored a total of 9 or better.
out of 15. Gulf Park: No licensure students were included in the random sample of oral presentations by English undergraduates at Gulf Park.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Student Learning Outcomes disseminated to students**  
*Established in Cycle: 2007-2008*  
In order to increase student self-awareness of the writing process, assessed learning outcomes will be distributed to students. ...

**Undergraduate Assessment Committee**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Commi...

**Oral Presentation Rubric and Assignment Design**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
Faculty will be informed about the oral presentation rubric and urged to design assignments that require the demonstration of sk...

**M 7: Exit Survey of Students in Capstone Course**

All students in ENG 400: Senior Seminar, the capstone course for the English BA and BA with licensure programs, complete an exit survey through which they will self-assess their abilities to develop successful thesis statements and arguments, analyze literary works, demonstrate successful writing skills, conduct research, and make successful oral presentations.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**

- *Undergraduate Exit Survey*

**Target:**

75% of students will achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5.

**SLO 6: Professional Disposition**

Students will demonstrate a professional demeanor in the classroom.

**Relevant Associations:**

NCATE

**Related Measures:**

- **M 6: Mentor Teacher Evaluation**
Mentor teachers evaluate teacher candidates in 18 categories, on a scale of 1-4 (with one as "unacceptable" and four as "distinguished"), for a possible score of 72 points.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
90% of students will score 54 or better (an average of 3 in 18 categories).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (13 out of 13 students from fall and spring combined) scored a total of 54 or better out of 72 (18 dispositions receiving a score of 1-4) for Part I of student teaching (ENG 494), and 100% of students (13 out of 13 students from fall and spring combined) scored a total of 54 or better out of 72 for Part II of student teaching. Gulf Park: 100% of students (6 out of 6 students from fall and spring combined) scored a total of 54 or better out of 72 (18 dispositions receiving a score of 1-4) for Part I of student teaching (ENG 494), and 100% of students (6 out of 6 students from fall and spring combined) scored a total of 54 or better out of 72 for Part II of student teaching.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Undergraduate Assessment Committee**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Commi...

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Student Learning Outcomes disseminated to students**
In order to increase student self-awareness of the writing process, assessed learning outcomes will be distributed to students. In addition, each student will be provided with copies of the grading rubrics used to measure competency.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Capstone Course Oral Presentation | **Outcome/Objective:** Oral Communication Skills
- **Measure:** Writing Intensive Papers--Analysis | **Outcome/Objective:** Analysis
- **Measure:** Writing Intensive Papers--Research Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills
- **Measure:** Writing Intensive Papers--Thesis and Argument | **Outcome/Objective:** Thesis and Argument
- **Measure:** Writing Intensive Papers--Writing Skills | **Outcome/Objective:** Writing
Skills

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Assessment Committee

**Undergraduate Assessment Committee**
The UG assessment committee will review all findings and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Undergraduate Committee about how to improve student performance in relation to existing Student Learning Outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Capstone Course Oral Presentation | **Outcome/Objective**: Oral Communication Skills
- Measure: Mentor Teacher Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective**: Professional Disposition
- Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Analysis | **Outcome/Objective**: Analysis
- Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Research Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Research Skills
- Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Thesis and Argument | **Outcome/Objective**: Thesis and Argument
- Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Writing Skills | **Outcome/Objective**: Writing Skills

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/14/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Undergraduate Committee

**Licensure Research and Writing Skills**
Task licensure workgroup with developing strategies for improving the writing and research skills of English licensure students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** Minor modifications were made to English licensure course syllabi and faculty addressed unmet targets. All targets were met for the program in the 2012-2013 cycle except for oral communication skills.

**Responsible Person/Group:** licensure workgroup

**Oral Presentation Rubric and Assignment Design**
Faculty will be informed about the oral presentation rubric and urged to design assignments that require the demonstration of skills assessed by the rubric, or the department will redesign the rubric to assess a broad range of speaking assignments.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Capstone Course Oral Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Oral Communication Skills

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Hattiesburg licensure program met targets for both measures on four out of five of the designated learning outcomes: thesis/argument, analysis, writing skill, and research skills. 85.71 of essays met the target in these categories. Only one essay out of seven failed to meet targets. English licensure students are held to higher academic standards in GEC courses than English BA students, and licensure students meet targets at higher rates. English licensure students from the Gulf Park campus scored even higher, with 100% of the sample meeting targets in these four categories. In the category of professional dispositions, 100% of licensure students from both campuses met the target for the first student teaching experience, and 100% of students from both sites met the target for the second student teaching experience. In most cases, by the time licensure students are permitted to student teach, they have been both prepared and selected for the proper dispositions. The exit survey used as the second measure for all outcomes indicates that all targets were met for both sites, with 100% of students scoring themselves as at least competent in all categories. This second, indirect measure indicates that students see the program as successful. The 2012-2013 academic year was the third in which the new English licensure curriculum was implemented to address unmet targets in previous years. The department added ENG 401 (composition study for teachers), ENG 402 (literature study for teachers), and ENG 403 (language study for teachers), and these curricular changes have clearly led to sustained improvements. The licensure program will work to maintain this success.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
The only outcome for which English licensure students did not meet outcomes was in the category of oral presentations. In the previous year, 100% of licensure students met targets in this category, and the low scores in the category of speaking skills can be explained in part by the inconsistency of assignments that did not require students to demonstrate the skills being assessed. Faculty development is needed to ensure that speaking assignments are clearer, more consistent, and better aligned with the oral presentation rubric. For instance, one class of presentations involved students discussing their anticipated final project before they completed it, and presentations from another class were more creative than critical. The departmental rubric is designed to assess critical, research-based presentations, so these presentations did not score high according to the rubric.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
As of June 2013 the Department of English has --about 100 English licensure majors on the Hattiesburg and Gulf Park campuses, as well as 35 full-time faculty members, three of whom focus on English education. Only one faculty member on the Gulf Park campus serves the licensure program. Overall, the English department offers a comprehensive program with dedicated faculty and courses in all primary fields of
literary studies. We offer about 30 300- and 400-level courses each semester, several of which have been designed specifically for English licensure students. The 2012-2013 academic year was the third in which the new English licensure curriculum was implemented. In addition to the core English major requirements, English licensure students complete a three-course sequence, take a teaching practicum involving extensive classroom observation time, and spend two eight-week sessions as student teachers. ENG 401 (composition study for teachers) focuses on theories of writing and composition pedagogy, ENG 402 (literature study for teachers) focuses on methods of teaching literature in the secondary school, and ENG 403 (language study for teachers) focuses on language and grammar and theories of language instruction. ENG 491 (practicum) was redesigned. In prior incarnations it did some of the work of the 401-402-403 sequence in addition to serving as a practicum. With some course content now covered by the new sequence, students log a full 60 hours of classroom observation over the course of a semester. ENG 494 (student teaching, middle school) and 495 (student teaching, high school) each provide eight-week rotations in middle- and high-school English classrooms. This new program provides students with a cohesive, focused course of study that prepares them in both content and pedagogy.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

Targets were met on both measures for all learning outcomes associated with the licensure program on the Hattiesburg and Coast campus except for oral presentation skills. The Undergraduate Assessment Committee will nevertheless meet to discuss the assessment results and how to maintain the success of the licensure program. Faculty will be informed about the oral presentation rubric and urged to design assignments that require the demonstration of skills assessed by the rubric, or the department will redesign the rubric to assess a broad range of speaking assignments.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

Minor modifications were made to English licensure course syllabi and faculty addressed unmet targets for previous cycles. As a result, all targets were met for the program in the 2012-2013 cycle except for oral communication skills. One action plan, to address research and writing skills, can now be marked as finished.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the program for students completing a major in Foreign Languages with a concentration in Spanish is to have a breadth of knowledge of the Spanish language and culture, including Hispanic cultures, and to participate actively and in socio-culturally appropriate ways in a variety of communicative tasks (in the domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing). Moreover, we are committed to students becoming well-read and informed of a diversity of thought in a pluralistic global society as a result of comparative analyses between cultures. To this end, students will become articulate, creative and critical thinkers. Specialized knowledge of Spanish and the Spanish speaking world in concert with strong linguistic abilities are suitable to the pursuit of a career and life in our complex, ever-changing world.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Oral Production

Oral Production: The student will be able to participate actively in most informal and a limited number of formal conversations on activities related to school, home, leisure and work. They will demonstrate the ability to narrate and describe in all major time frames (past, present and future).

Related Measures:

M 2: Oral Presentation Rubric

Based on an in-class oral presentation, French majors will be evaluated on their oral presentational skills using a 40-point rubric.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:

80% of our graduating seniors will achieve an overall score of 30 or higher out of 40 on the oral presentation rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met

4 of 5 graduating licensure students (80%) scored 30 or higher on oral presentation rubric.

M 4: Four Skills Rubric: Oral Proficiency

The four skills rubric measures student proficiency in oral communication, listening comprehension, writing, and reading on a scale ranging from 100 to 650.

Target:

80% of graduating seniors will receive a score of 400 or better on the departmental Four Skills Rubric in Oral Proficiency.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
3/5 (60%) graduating licensure students received 400 or higher on oral proficiency.

M 5: ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview
Student oral proficiency measured through a one-on-one oral interview and is rated based on the ACTFL OPI scale, with gradations as follows: Novice Low, Novice High, Intermediate Low, Intermediate Mid, Intermediate High, Advanced Low, Advanced Mid, Advanced High, Superior.

Target:
100% will achieve at least an Advanced Low rating at the completion of their Spanish degree.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
3/5 (60%) of graduating licensure students scored AL on first OPI attempt.

SLO 2: Written Production
Written Production: The students will be able to write routine social correspondence and join sentences in simple discourse of at least several paragraphs in length on familiar topics. Good control of morphology and the most frequently used syntactic structures.

Related Measures:

M 1: Research paper: Formal Composition Skills
Students will submit a final research paper which will be evaluated on both Discourse, Mechanics, Organization, and documentation (12 points) and Cultural/Historical/Literary awareness and integration of course concepts (8 points) for a total of 20 possible points.

Target:
80% of graduating majors will achieve an advanced level of formal written expression as evidenced by a score of 18 or higher out of 24 points.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
3/5 (60%) of licensure candidates scored 18 or higher on the composition rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Spanish curriculum revision
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The Spanish curriculum committee adopted a new advisement plan which establishes SPA 305 Writing in Spanish (WI) as a foundation...

M 7: Four Skills Rubric: Writing
The four skills rubric measures student proficiency in oral communication, listening comprehension, writing, and reading on a scale ranging from 100 to 650.

Target:
80% of graduating seniors will receive a score of 400 or better on the departmental Four Skills Rubric in writing and composition skills.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
3/5 (60%) of graduating licensure students scored 400 or higher in writing skills.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Spanish curriculum revision
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Spanish curricular guide revised to encourage students to take SPA 305, the writing intensive course as a foundational course be...

Spanish curriculum revision
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Spanish faculty implemented new advisement plan to require SPA 305 Writing in Spanish (WI) as a foundational course before upper...

SLO 3: Understanding Written Discourse
The students will be able to read prose on a variety of topics. Examples of texts include short stories, short novels, newspaper and magazine articles, personal correspondence, and technical writing particularly if presented with a clear underlying structure.

Related Measures:

M 8: Four Skills Rubric: Reading
The four skills rubric measures student proficiency in oral communication, listening comprehension, writing, and reading on a scale ranging from 100 to 650.

Target:
80% of graduating seniors will receive a score of 400 or better on the departmental Four Skills Rubric in reading and analysis of written texts.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
4/5 (80%) of graduating licensure students scored 400 or higher in reading comprehension.

M 11: Research Paper: Reading Skills
Research Paper: Reading Skills. Capstone instructor evaluates FL licensure majors on comprehension, analysis, and integration of target language sources into research on a four-point scale.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
At least 80% of FL licensure students will score at least 3 out of 4 in their ability to understand, analyze and integrate written TL sources into their research

SLO 4: Understanding of spoken discourse.
Students will be able to understand main ideas and most details of connected discourse on a variety of topics in most informal and a limited number of formal conversations on
activities related to school, home, leisure, and work. The will be able to understand such discourse in all major time frames (past, present, and future).

**Related Measures:**

M 3: Four Skills Rubric: Listening Comprehension
The four skills rubric measures student proficiency in oral communication, listening comprehension, writing, and reading on a scale ranging from 100 to 650.

**Target:**
80% of graduating seniors will receive a score of 400 or better on the departmental Four Skills Rubric in listening comprehension.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
4/5 (80%) of graduating licensure students scored 400 or higher in listening comprehension.

SLO 5: Cultural Awareness
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices, products and perspectives of the cultures of the Hispanic world.

**Related Measures:**

M 9: Research Paper: Cultural Awareness
Students will submit a final research paper which will be evaluated on both Discourse, Mechanics, Organization, and documentation (12 points) and Cultural/Historical/Literary awareness and integration of course concepts (8 points) for a total of 20 possible points.

**Target:**
80% of graduating majors will achieve a satisfactory level of cross-cultural awareness as evidenced by a score of 6 or higher out of eight points.

M 10: Oral Presentation Rubric: Sociocultural Awareness
Oral Presentation Rubric: Sociocultural Awareness. Capstone instructor rates the socio-cultural awareness evidenced in one of the oral presentations given during the capstone course on a scale of one to four.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
At least 80% of FL licensure students will score at least 3 out of 4 in sociocultural awareness on the oral presentation rubric

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Encourage semester/year study abroad for majors**
Because only about 50% of our graduating seniors without extensive outside-of-class experience in the language are achieving the Advanced level proficiency needed to pass the Praxis II (and be licensed in the state of MS), DFLL advisors have added a semester of study abroad to the four year program of studies for non-native speaker licensure candidates.
Established in Cycle: 2007-2008  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: already enacted  
Responsible Person/Group: licensure advisors

**require style tutorial for 400 level courses**
Upper-level students will be required to complete APA style tutorial.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Spring 2009  
Responsible Person/Group: Spanish faculty

**require practice OPI interviews for licensure candidates**
require (and set up) practice OPI interviews for licensure candidates

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Completed first practice OPI interviews with this year's candidates  
Projected Completion Date: 11/30/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: licensure adviser, OPI certified faculty

**Spanish curriculum revision**
Spanish curricular guide revised to encourage students to take SPA 305, the writing intensive course as a foundational course before 400-level enrollment.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Four Skills Rubric: Writing  |  Outcome/Objective: Written Production

Implementation Description: Spring 2013  
Responsible Person/Group: Spanish faculty

**Spanish curriculum revision**
Spanish faculty implemented new advisement plan to require SPA 305 Writing in Spanish (WI) as a foundational course before upper-level coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Four Skills Rubric: Writing  |  Outcome/Objective: Written Production

Implementation Description:  fall 2013
Responsible Person/Group:  Spanish faculty

Spanish curriculum revision
The Spanish curriculum committee adopted a new advisement plan which establishes SPA 305 Writing in Spanish (WI) as a foundational course to be taken before higher-level offerings.

Established in Cycle:  2012-2013
Implementation Status:  Planned
Priority:  High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research paper: Formal Composition Skills  |  Outcome/Objective: Written Production
Implementation Description:  To be implemented fall 2013
Responsible Person/Group:  Spanish faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Because of the small number of FL- licensure majors (4 graduating seniors this year), student performance percentages are not a reliable indicator of program/curricular quality or overall student success rates in this program. That said, the results for this group highlight the continued need for advisement efforts and action plans we put into place in prior years: Both students who followed their advisor's counsel and completed a semester abroad passed both the ACTFL OPI and the Praxis II, which is required for licensure in the state of Mississippi. Both students who declined this experience failed to meet the minimum benchmarks for these exams. On the positive side, this year's cohort is the largest group of FL-licensure students for the past five years. In the past, transfer students, native speakers, and students with GPAs under 3.25 tended to drop out of the program prior to its completion. Therefore, the growth of this program, the retention of less-academically-talented students, and the consistent, highly-engaged advisement needed for these students to make it through these rigorous course and assessment sequences is a success for the program. Mississippi is a critical needs state for Foreign Language Licensure and our graduates are the most highly prepared new Spanish teachers in the state. (This is because we offer the state's only nationally recognized program by ACTFL/NCATE, the accrediting body for this profession. Most MS Spanish teachers are licensed through less rigorous alternate route or endorsement credentials).

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Because of the small number of FL- licensure majors (4 graduating seniors this year), student performance percentages are not a reliable indicator of program/curricular quality or overall student success rates in this program. That said, the results for this group highlight the continued need for advisement efforts and action plans we put into place in prior years: Both students who followed their advisor's counsel and completed a semester abroad passed both the ACTFL OPI and the Praxis II, which is required for
licensure in the state of Mississippi. Both students who declined this experience failed to meet the minimum benchmarks for these exams. Another area of concern (both with licensure students and general Spanish majors) is writing ability. You will see in the action plan that the Spanish curriculum committee implemented new advisement guidelines to establish SPA 305 Writing in Spanish as a foundational course to be taken prior to upper-level study. Upper-level courses will require not only writing assignments totalling 5,000 words but at least one research paper/project. Continuing past action plans, these courses will also include style guideline tutorials.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**
The FL-licensure program is growing, with 16 current majors and 4 graduating seniors this year. While still small, this is the largest cohort we have seen. We believe these larger numbers are due to strong advisement (including year-round engagement with advisees), a clear four-year plan of studies, better communication with community-college transfer students, and the excellent employment prospects of this major. (We have 100% placement). With better retention of average students who in past years might have dropped out of the program, we are also seeing more academic challenges: students who struggle to meet minimum GPA standards, do not heed advice to study abroad, disregard the academic plan set out by their advisor, do not have the organizational/professional skills to complete all the associated testing and reporting requirements (Praxis I, BTLE, Gold Card, ACTFL OPI, Praxis II, uploading materials to TK20), or experience difficulties in the real-world situation of their field placements. We will continue to implement the advisement policies placed into effect to enhance student success rates: including a semester abroad in advisement plans, requiring the ACTFL OPI prior to graduation, and following up with students throughout their studies (not just during advisement week). In addition, we will implement the new curricular plan which prepares students earlier with foundational Spanish-language writing skills starting fall 2014. Other planned program enhancements for 2013-2014 include --a joint meeting with USM and MSU foreign language education faculty and the MDE personnel responsible for setting state licensure requirements to discuss the appropriateness of the the Praxis II as a measure for foreign language teacher preparedness. --individualized curricular guidelines for native and heritage speakers of Spanish --quality oversight of semester abroad experiences to ensure that the students we send are able to be successful in this context --rotation of student teacher supervision/coordination so that more faculty become familiar with licensure requirements and program responsibilities

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**
See discussion of action plans in annual report

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**
This year's results clearly show the need for a semester abroad experience in this degree plan. As in past years, every student who completed a semester abroad achieved passing scores on the Praxis II and scored at least AL on the ACTFL OPI, whereas the students who refused to participate in study abroad did not meet these minimum benchmarks for licensure. The action plan to require the ACTFL OPI was also validated by these results, as the OPI score continues to be a strong indicator for Praxis II success as well as important practice for that exam.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the B.A. program in history with licensure in social studies, 7-12 is to develop the writing and speaking skills of future teachers; to nurture their expertise in the discipline of history as well as in the various social sciences; to enhance their knowledge of and appreciation for diverse peoples and places across time and space; to familiarize them with a wide array of effective teaching methods and resources; to encourage them to utilize various forms of technology to enhance their classroom instruction, assessment, and management; to help them develop the professional dispositions; and to aid them in mastering the classroom management skills which will enable them to fulfill their mission as educators.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Competency in social studies and history content
Students will demonstrate competency in required social studies and history content knowledge and research skills, which will prepare them to teach the state-mandated curriculum for grades 7-12.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE, NCSS Related Measures • Praxis II: Social Studies Content Examination
• Mentor Teacher In-Class Evaluation Rubric • Evaluation of History/Social Studies Content Evaluation

Related Measures:

M 10: Praxis II: Social Studies Content Examination
Students must complete the Praxis II content area examination in order to receive their teaching licenses.

Target:
90% of students will pass the Praxis II examination.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
100% of students will receive a passing grade of 143 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. (Please note that the pass rate on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination was raised from 143 to 150 by the MDE in September 2012.) Findings: Hattiesburg Fall 2012: 85% (6 of 7) of Hattiesburg student teachers received a passing score of 150 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. Scores ranged from 144 to 175. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 66% (2 of 3) of Gulf Park students in this student teaching cohort received a passing score of 150 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. The scores ranged from 141 to 175. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 87% (7 of 8) of Hattiesburg student teachers received a passing score of 150 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. Scores ranged from 170 to 140. Findings: Gulf Park
Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students in this student teaching cohort received a passing score of 150 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. The scores ranged from . For 2012-2013, 89% of Hattiesburg student teachers (13 of 15) received passing scores on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination; 83% of Gulf Park student teachers (5 of 6) received passing scores on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Closer monitoring of coursework chosen
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Faculty advising students in the licensure program need to be more fully aware of the type of curriculum that our licensure cand...

M 11: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009)

Both the mentor teacher and University supervisor observe each student teacher and complete a formal, written evaluation developed by the University's Office of Educational Field Experiences (formerly the TCAT In-Class Evaluation, changed in Fall 2009 to the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument.) During the observation period, the student teacher will be teaching a lesson from his or her Teaching Unit Portfolio, which is a capstone assignment for the program. Students must score 70% or better in order to pass the evaluation. The skills assessed by the in-class evaluation includes the following: knowledge of content and the ability to express it clearly and in an age-appropriate way; the ability to use correct oral and written expression in all school-related activities; the ability to establish a safe and orderly classroom environment; and the ability to appropriately assess student progress and make improvements based upon assessment data.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
100% of History Education students will pass their TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) in-class evaluations with a score of 70% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences mandated the use of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) in place of the TCAT In-Class Evaluation in fall 2009. Please see below for changes in spring 2010. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences required the use of the In-Class Evaluation in place of the TIAI in Spring 2010. The TIAI is now only used as a summative evaluation at the end of the student teaching experience. Therefore, In-Class Evaluation scores are reported here, not TIAI. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg
students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 82/104. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. 100% (2 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their Mentor Teacher. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 85/104 to 73/104; the mentor teacher's scores ranged from 101/104 to 93/104. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 100/104 to 80/104. 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 93/104 to 74/104. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (94%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 101/104 to 99/104. 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 91/104 to 83/104. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores. 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Closer monitoring of coursework chosen

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Faculty advising students in the licensure program need to be more fully aware of the type of curriculum that our licensure cand...

M 12:History/Social Studies Content Evaluation

Students are expected to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge as well as the ability to use it effectively in a secondary classroom by scoring 70% or better on this summative evaluation. Evidence taken into consideration for scoring includes in-class observations by mentor teachers and supervisors, weekly lesson plans, videotapes of teaching, sample lesson plans in professional portfolios, and teaching unit portfolios.

Target:

100% of history education students will pass the History/Social Studies Content Evaluation, used by University Supervisor during student teaching, with a score of 70% or better.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 140/200 (70%) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 194/200 to 171/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 180/200 to 150/200. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 143/200. Gulf Park: Spring 2010: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 189/200 to 167/200. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overal rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 13: Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone)
Student teachers must complete a comprehensive teaching unit which covers a period of at least ten teaching days. They must include lesson plans, class descriptions, assessments, bibliographies, and many other materials pertinent to the unit. To pass this assignment, students must score 70% or better.

Target:
100% of history education students will score 70% or better on their Teaching Unit Portfolios.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (140 of a possible 200 points) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 188/200 to 168/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 184/200 to 140/200. Findings: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 152/200. Spring 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 186/200 to 152/200. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Closer monitoring of coursework chosen
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
Faculty advising students in the licensure program need to be more fully aware of the type of curriculum that our licensure cand...
received 70% or better (159 of 228 possible points) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 215/228 to 179/228. Gulf Park: 100% of the Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received 70% or better (159 of 228 possible points) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 216/228 to 199/228. Hattiesburg: 87% of the Hattiesburg students (7 of 8) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment's Oral Communication Indicators. Scores ranged from 2/4 to 3/4. Gulf Park: 100% of the Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received 75% or better (2 of 2) on the assessment's Oral Communication Indicators. Scores ranged from 3/4 to 4/4

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Earlier remediation of deficiencies**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

As soon as they express a desire to enter the program in History licensure, students need to be monitored for their progress or ...

**M 11: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009)**

Both the mentor teacher and University supervisor observe each student teacher and complete a formal, written evaluation developed by the University's Office of Educational Field Experiences (formerly the TCAT In-Class Evaluation, changed in Fall 2009 to the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument). During the observation period, the student teacher will be teaching a lesson from his or her Teaching Unit Portfolio, which is a capstone assignment for the program. Students must score 70% or better in order to pass the evaluation. The skills assessed by the in-class evaluation includes the following: knowledge of content and the ability to express it clearly and in an age-appropriate way; the ability to use correct oral and written expression in all school-related activities; the ability to establish a safe and orderly classroom environment; and the ability to appropriately assess student progress and make improvements based upon assessment data.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**

100% of History Education students will pas their TIAI In-Class Evaluations with a score of 70% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences mandated the use of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) in place of the TCAT In-Class Evaluation in fall 2009. Please see below for changes in spring 2010. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences required the use of the In-Class Evaluation in place of the TIAI in Spring 2010. The TIAI is now only used as a summative evaluation at the end of the student teaching.
experience. Therefore, In-Class Evaluation scores are reported here, not TIAI. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 82/104. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. 100% (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their Mentor Teacher. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 85/104 to 73/104; the mentor teacher’s scores ranged from 101/104 to 93/104. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 100/104 to 80/104. 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 93/104 to 74/104. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (94%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 101/104 to 99/104. 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 91/104 to 83/104. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor’s scores. 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor’s scores.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Earlier remediation of deficiencies**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

As soon as they express a desire to enter the program in History licensure, students need to be monitored for their progress or ...

**M 12:History/Social Studies Content Evaluation**

Students are expected to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge as well as the ability to use it effectively in a secondary classroom by scoring 70% or better on this summative evaluation. Evidence taken into consideration for scoring includes in-class observations by mentor teachers and supervisors, weekly lesson plans, videotapes of teaching, sample lesson plans in professional portfolios, and teaching unit portfolios.
Target:
100% of history education students will pass the History/Social Studies Content Evaluation, used by University Supervisor during student teaching, with a score of 70% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 140/200 (70%) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 194/200 to 171/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 180/200 to 150/200. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 143/200. Gulf Park: Spring 2010: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 189/200 to 167/200 (97%). For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Earlier remediation of deficiencies
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
As soon as they express a desire to enter the program in History licensure, students need to be monitored for their progress or ...

M 13:Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone)
Student teachers must complete a comprehensive teaching unit which covers a period of at least ten teaching days. They must include lesson plans, class descriptions, assessments, bibliographies, and many other materials pertinent to the unit. To pass this assignment, students must score 70% or better.

Target:
100% of history education students will score 70% or better on their Teaching Unit Portfolios.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (140 of a possible 200 points) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 188/200 to 168/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 184/200 to 140/200. Findings: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 152/200. Spring 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 156/200 (70%). Scores ranged from 186/200 to 152/200. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or
greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Earlier remediation of deficiencies
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
As soon as they express a desire to enter the program in History licensure, students need to be monitored for their progress or ...

SLO 3: Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics
Students will demonstrate possession of the dispositions, attitudes, and ethics needed by classroom teachers, including knowledge of and appreciation for diversity of both Western and non-Western cultures, past and present.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE, NCSS Related Measures: • Exit Survey • Professional Portfolio Diversity Statement Rubric • History/Social Studies Content Evaluation used by University Supervisor • Dispositions Evaluation used by University Supervisor

Related Measures:

M 2: Exit survey
At the end of student teaching, all students complete an anonymous written exit survey which requires them to examine their progress in the History Education Program and to analyze how well the program prepared them for a teaching career. The survey includes questions directly asking students if they think they (a) possess the disposition and ethics needed by classroom teachers and (b) are competent in classroom management and discipline techniques.

Target:
70% or more of students surveyed will indicate that they are satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% (7 of 7) of students surveyed indicated they believed that they were satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom. Fall 2012: Gulf Park: 100% (3 of 3) students indicated they believed that they were satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom. Spring 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% of students (8 of 8) surveyed indicated they were satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom. Spring 2013: Gulf Park: 100% (3 of 3) students surveyed indicated they were satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom. For 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg students surveyed indicated they were satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and
the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom. For 2011-2012, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park students surveyed indicated they were satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Earlier remediation of and consultation
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The Department needs to work with colleagues who teach the required pedagogy courses in order to identify, advises, and remediat...

Action Plan for Exit Survey Results
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
The problem with this assessment appears to be in the administration of the survey. This survey is given on-line at the end of ...

M 3: Professional Portfolio Diversity Statement Rubric
As part of their professional portfolio assignment, which is a collection of their best work and which is due on the last day of student teaching, students will write a 2-3 page essay in which they detail why they think diversity in the classroom is important and how they will present social studies and history content to a diverse group of learners.

Target:
100% of students will score 70% or better on this assignment.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Fall 2012 Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (14/20) or greater. Target: not met
Findings: Hattiesburg Fall 2012: 85% (6 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14 of 20 possible points) or greater. Scores ranged from 20/20 to 13/20. One student earned a score of 13. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 66% (2 of 3) students received an overall rubric score of 70%. The scores ranged from 16/20 to 13/20. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14 of 20 possible points) or greater. Scores ranged from 19/20 to 14/20. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 70% or better. Scores ranged from 16/20 to 14/20. For the year 2012-2013, 93% (14/15) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14/20 points) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 5/6 (83%) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14/20 points) or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Earlier remediation of and consultation
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
The Department needs to work with colleagues who teach the required
pedagogy courses in order to identify, advises, and remediat...

**Action Plan for Cultural Diversity Statement in Professional Portfolio**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

In Fall 2010, the History Department has offered two new courses for licensure students that should improve the results in this ...

**New content-pedagogy classes (HIS 487, HIS 110, HIS 111)**

*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*

A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Cultural diversity issues, as...

**M 4: Dispositions Evaluation used by Univ Supervisor**

The university supervisor will score each student on a variety of ethical and attitudinal indicators, based on first-hand observations of classroom behavior, email and phone conversations with students, post-evaluation conferences with students, conversations with the mentor teacher, weekly journal reflections prepared by each student teacher, information offered by administrators, and other documentation.

**Target:**

100% of students will score 70% or better on this evaluation.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (35 of 50 possible points) or greater on the Dispositions Evaluation used by the University Supervisor during teacher candidacy. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 35/50 (70%) or greater. The scores ranged from 50/50 (97%) to 44/50 (100%). Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 35/50 (70%) or greater. The scores ranged from 48/50 to 41/50. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 35/50 (70%) or greater. Scores ranged from 49/50 to 38/50. Gulf Park: Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 35/50 (70%) or greater. Students scored from 48/50 to 46/50. For 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg students met the target; 100% of Gulf Park students (6 of 6) met the target.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Earlier remediation of and consultation**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

The Department needs to work with colleagues who teach the required pedagogy courses in order to identify, advises, and remediat...

**SLO 4: Competence in classroom management and discipline**

Students will demonstrate a mastery of classroom management and discipline techniques needed by teachers at the secondary level.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE, NCSS Related Measures: •Classroom Management/Discipline Plan
developed in HIS 488 •University Supervisor In-Class Evaluation Rubric •Mentor Teacher In-Class Evaluation Rubric •Exit Surveys

Related Measures:

M 2: Exit survey
At the end of student teaching, all students complete an anonymous written exit survey which requires them to examine their progress in the History Education Program and to analyze how well the program prepared them for a teaching career. The survey includes questions directly asking students if they think they (a) possess the disposition and ethics needed by classroom teachers and (b) are competent in classroom management and discipline techniques.

Target:
70% or more of students surveyed will indicate that they are satisfied with their mastery of content knowledge in history and the social studies, their pedagogical skills and knowledge, and their preparation for managing a classroom.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of student teachers will indicate that they are satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom. Fall 2012: Hattiesburg: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom. Gulf Park: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom. Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom. Gulf Park: 100% (3 of 3) Gulf Park students indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom. Findings for 2012-2013: 100% of Hattiesburg students (15 of 15) indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom. 100% of Gulf Park students (6 of 6) indicated that they were satisfied with their preparation for managing a classroom.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

More experiences with 7-12 teachers
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Candidates need more observation of classroom situations, more interaction with master teachers and school administrators, and m...

Action Plan for Classroom Management
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Action Plan: A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Classroom manage...

Action Plan for Improvement of Classroom Management Skills
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
The History Department has added a new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies, that will include a segment on classro...

M 5: Classroom Management/Discipline Plan
During their methods of teaching social studies course (HIS 488), students will prepare a comprehensive classroom management and discipline plan. The assignments will be scored completely based on this competence.

**Target:**
100% of students will score 70% or better on this assignment.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (47 out of 68 possible points) or greater on the Classroom Management/Discipline Plan. (Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences changed the point value of the assignment from a possible 60 points to 68 points in Fall 2012.) Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 61/68 to 52/68. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 64/68 to 57/68. Findings: Hattiesburg; Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 67/68 to 53/68. Gulf Park: Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 64/68 to 55/68. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47/68 (70%) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47/68 (70%) or greater.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**More experiences with 7-12 teachers**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Candidates need more observation of classroom situations, more interaction with master teachers and school administrators, and m...

**M 11:Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009)**

Both the mentor teacher and University supervisor observe each student teacher and complete a formal, written evaluation developed by the University’s Office of Educational Field Experiences (formerly the TCAT In-Class Evaluation, changed in Fall 2009 to the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument.) During the observation period, the student teacher will be teaching a lesson from his or her Teaching Unit Portfolio, which is a capstone assignment for the program. Students must score 70% or better in order to pass the evaluation. The skills assessed by the in-class evaluation includes the following: knowledge of content and the ability to express it clearly and in an age-appropriate way; the ability to use correct oral and written expression in all school-related activities; the ability to establish a safe and orderly classroom environment; and the ability to appropriately assess student progress and make improvements based upon assessment data.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
100% of History Education students will pass their TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) in-class evaluations with a score of 70% or better.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences mandated the use of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) in place of the TCAT In-Class Evaluation in fall 2009. Please see below for changes in spring 2010. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences required the use of the In-Class Evaluation in place of the TIAI in Spring 2010. The TIAI is now only used as a summative evaluation at the end of the student teaching experience. Therefore, In-Class Evaluation scores are reported here, not TIAI. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 82/104.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 82/104.

Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. 100% (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their Mentor Teacher. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 85/104 to 73/104; the mentor teacher's scores ranged from 101/104 to 93/104.

Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 100/104 to 99/104. 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 93/104 to 74/104. 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (94%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 101/104 to 99/104. 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 91/104 to 83/104. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores. 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
More experiences with 7-12 teachers

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Candidates need more observation of classroom situations, more interaction with master teachers and school administrators, and m...

M 12: History/Social Studies Content Evaluation

Students are expected to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge as well as the ability to use it effectively in a secondary classroom by scoring 70% or better on this summative evaluation. Evidence taken into consideration for scoring includes in-class observations by mentor teachers and supervisors, weekly lesson plans, videotapes of teaching, sample lesson plans in professional portfolios, and teaching unit portfolios.

Target:
100% of history education students will pass the Reflective Analysis of Classroom Management Plan, used by University Supervisor during student teaching, with a score of 70% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (47 out of 68 possible points) or greater on the Classroom Management/Discipline Plan. (Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences changed the point value of the assignment from a possible 60 points to 68 points in Fall 2012.) Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 61/68 to 52/68. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 64/68 to 57/68. Findings: Hattiesburg; Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 67/68 to 53/68. Gulf Park: Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 64/68 to 55/68. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47/68 (70%) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47/68 (70%) or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

More experiences with 7-12 teachers

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Candidates need more observation of classroom situations, more interaction with master teachers and school administrators, and m...

SLO 5: Competence in teaching & assessing social science

Students will demonstrate competence not only in effective use of a variety of teaching methods but will show that they can accurately and fairly assess student knowledge and skills.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE, NCSS Related Measures: •Assessment of Student Learning Rubric used by the University Supervisor •Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination •Mentor Teacher In-Class Evaluation Rubric •University Supervisor In-Class Evaluation Rubric
Related Measures:

**M 6: Assessment of Student Learning Rubric**
After teaching their Unit Portfolios, students must gather test data, analyze it, and assess how well they taught the unit. They compare pretest and post-test scores for a sample of the class, then analyze the results. They must also reflect on how they could improve results in the future.

**Target:**
100% of students will score 70% or better on this assignment.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (140 of 200 possible points) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 71% (5 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 140 or greater. The scores ranged from 180/200 to 110/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 66% (2 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 140 or greater. Scores ranged from 180/200 to 100/200. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2013: 75% (6 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 140 or greater. Scores ranged from 190/200 to 90/200. Gulf Park: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 140/200. Scores ranged from 180/200 to 150/200. For the year 2012-2013, 70% (11 of 15) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 140/200 or 70%. For the year 2012-2013, 82% of Gulf Park students (5 of 6) received an overall rubric score of 140/200 or 70%.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Add new content-area methods class**
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*
In Fall 2010, the Department hopes to add a new course which will be taken before HIS 488: Methods of Teaching Social Studies. T...

**Action Plan for Assessment of Student Learning**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
In Fall 2010, the History Department began offered HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education. This course will require...

**Increased emphasis on the importance of and use of both formative and summative assessments in the social studies classroom**
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*
For Fall 2010, a new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies, will include assignments and instruction on the purpose ...

**M 7: Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Exam**
Students must complete the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination in order to receive their teaching licenses. This examination assesses pedagogical knowledge of those who hope to teach at the secondary level.

**Target:**
100% of students will receive a passing score on the Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Target: 100% of students will receive a passing grade of 157 or higher on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. (Please note that the MDE raised the passing score to 157 in September 2012.)
Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg student teachers received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. The scores ranged from 176 to 160. Gulf Park Fall 2013: 100% of the Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. Scores ranged from 175 to 162. Spring 2013: 75% (6 of 8) of Hattiesburg student teachers received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. Scores ranged from 176 to 148. Gulf Park Spring 2013: 66% (2 of 3) of Gulf Park student teachers received a passing score on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. Scores ranged from 171 to 144. Findings: For 2012-2013, 88% of Hattiesburg student teachers (13 of 15) received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. 83% of Gulf Park student teachers (5 of 6) received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Add new content-area methods class
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In Fall 2010, the Department hopes to add a new course which will be taken before HIS 488: Methods of Teaching Social Studies. T...

Closer monitoring of coursework chosen
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Faculty advising students in the licensure program need to be more fully aware of the type of curriculum that our licensure cand...

M 11: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009)
Both the mentor teacher and University supervisor observe each student teacher and complete a formal, written evaluation developed by the University's Office of Educational Field Experiences (formerly the TCAT In-Class Evaluation, changed in Fall 2009 to the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument..) During the observation period, the student teacher will be teaching a lesson from his or her Teaching Unit Portfolio, which is a capstone assignment for the program. Students must score 70% or better in order to pass the evaluation. The skills assessed by the in-class evaluation includes the following: knowledge of content and the ability to express it clearly and in an age-appropriate way; the ability to use correct oral and written expression in all school-related activities; the ability to establish a safe and orderly classroom environment; and the ability to appropriately assess student progress and make improvements based upon assessment data.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
100% of History Education students will pass their TIAI (Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument) in-class evaluations with a score of 70% or better.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences mandated the use of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) in place of the TCAT In-Class Evaluation in fall 2009. Please see below for changes in spring 2010. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences required the use of the In-Class Evaluation in place of the TIAI in Spring 2010. The TIAI is now only used as a summative evaluation at the end of the student teaching experience. Therefore, In-Class Evaluation scores are reported here, not TIAI. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their Mentor Teacher. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 85/104 to 73/104; the mentor teacher's scores ranged from 101/104 to 93/104. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 100/104 to 80/104. 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 93/104 to 74/104. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. 100% (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 80/104 to 101/104; the mentor teacher's scores ranged from 93/104 to 101/104. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (94%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 101/104 to 99/104. 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 91/104 to 83/104. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores. 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores.
of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences mandated the use of the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) in place of the TCAT In-Class Evaluation in fall 2009. Please see below for changes in spring 2010. Please note that the Office of Educational Field Experiences required the use of the In-Class Evaluation in place of the TIAI in Spring 2010. The TIAI is now only used as a summative evaluation at the end of the student teaching experience. Therefore, In-Class Evaluation scores are reported here, not TIAI. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) or greater on the in-class evaluation conducted by the University Supervisor. 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of 104 possible points) on the in-class evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 104/104 to 87/104. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. 100% (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their Mentor Teacher. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 85/104 to 73/104; the mentor teacher's scores ranged from 101/104 to 93/104. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 100/104 to 82/104. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. 100% (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their Mentor Teacher. The University Supervisor's scores ranged from 93/104 to 74/104. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (94%) on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. Scores ranged from 101/104 to 99/104. 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. Scores ranged from 91/104 to 83/104. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores. 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. This includes both the mentor teacher and University Supervisor's scores.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Add new content-area methods class**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

In Fall 2010, the Department hopes to add a new course which will be taken before HIS 488: Methods of Teaching Social Studies. T...
M 12: History/Social Studies Content Evaluation
Students are expected to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge as well as the ability to use it effectively in a secondary classroom by scoring 70% or better on this summative evaluation. Evidence taken into consideration for scoring includes in-class observations by mentor teachers and supervisors, weekly lesson plans, videotapes of teaching, sample lesson plans in professional portfolios, and teaching unit portfolios.

**Target:**
100% of history education students will pass the History/Social Studies Content Evaluation, used by University Supervisor during student teaching, with a score of 70% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 140/200 (70%) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 194/200 to 171/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 180/200 to 150/200. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 143/200. Gulf Park: Spring 2010: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 189/200 to 167/200. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Add new content-area methods class
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In Fall 2010, the Department hopes to add a new course which will be taken before HIS 488: Methods of Teaching Social Studies. T...

M 13: Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone)
Student teachers must complete a comprehensive teaching unit which covers a period of at least ten teaching days. They must include lesson plans, class descriptions, assessments, bibliographies, and many other materials pertinent to the unit. To pass this assignment, students must score 70% or better.

**Target:**
100% of history education students will score 70% or better on their Teaching Unit Portfolios.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (140 of a possible 200 points) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 188/200 to 168/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received
an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 184/200 to 140/200. Findings: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 152/200. Spring 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 156/200 (70%). Scores ranged from 186/200 to 152/200. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Add new content-area methods class
Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
In Fall 2010, the Department hopes to add a new course which will be taken before HIS 488: Methods of Teaching Social Studies. T...

SLO 6: Knowledge of and appropriate use of technology
Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively use a wide range of technology in the social studies classroom.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE, NCSS Related Measures • Basic Technology Literacy Examination, required for admission into Teacher Education Program • Teaching Unit Portfolio developed during student teaching • PowerPoint Presentation Rubric

Related Measures:

M 8: PowerPoint Presentation Rubric
Students must complete and use content-based PowerPoint presentations in the classroom during student teaching.

Target:
100% of students will earn a score of 70% or better on their presentations.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg students (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 16/20 to 20/20. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 14/20 to 20/20. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg students (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 20/20 to 14/20. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 18/20 to 20/20. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg students, received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park students, received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**More opportunities to use technology**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Teacher education candidates need more training in technology as well as opportunities to see master teachers use the technologi...

**M 9:BTLE**  
To achieve admittance into the teacher education program at the University, students must pass the BTLE, which is a measure of basic technology skills and knowledge.

**Target:**  
100% of students will pass the BTLE.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
100% will receive a passing score on the BTLE. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% (7 of 7) of Hattiesburg students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2013: 100% (8 of 8) of Hattiesburg students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination. Gulf Park: Spring 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**More opportunities to use technology**  
*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*  
Teacher education candidates need more training in technology as well as opportunities to see master teachers use the technologi...

**New course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education to be required in fall 2010**  
*Established in Cycle: 2009-2010*  
A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Classroom management issues, ...

**M 13:Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone)**  
Student teachers must complete a comprehensive teaching unit which covers a period of at least ten teaching days. They must include lesson plans, class descriptions, assessments, bibliographies, and many other materials pertinent to the unit. To pass this assignment, students must score 70% or better.

**Target:**  
100% of history education students will score 70% or better on their Teaching Unit Portfolios.
**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (140 of a possible 200 points) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2012: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (7 of 7) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 188/200 to 168/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2012: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 184/200 to 140/200. Findings: Spring 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (8 of 8) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 192/200 to 152/200. Spring 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 186/200 to 152/200. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (15 of 15) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (6 of 6) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**More opportunities to use technology**

*Established in Cycle: 2008-2009*

Teacher education candidates need more training in technology as well as opportunities to see master teachers use the technology...

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Dispositions**

The departmental advisors (Professional Education Faculty) will intervene to counsel students who display severe dispositional problems in classes preceding HIS 488.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>already implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Professional Educational Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethical Code**

As of the spring 2006 semester, history education students are required to sign codes of ethics to be filed in the History Department. They will be fully informed of expectations concerning dispositions and attitudes before they begin HIS 488.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established in Cycle:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Status:</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Description:</td>
<td>already implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Person/Group:</td>
<td>Professional Education Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exit Survey**

The department will survey students regularly, using results as an important means to evaluate where improvements can be made to the program.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Professional Education Faculty

History Writing Lab
The department has established a History Writing Lab to encourage the development of students’ writing and research skills. Faculty turn in copies of writing assignments to the HWL so that the tutors can offer individualized assistance to students in various history courses.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: already implemented
Responsible Person/Group: Undergraduate Studies Committee

Mentor Survey
The Licensure Coordinator will seek regular input, through formal surveys and informal conservations, from mentor teachers about the weaknesses of teacher candidates and about ways to improve the licensure program.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Licensure Coordinator

Monitor Student Performance
The department will continue to closely monitor undergraduate progress towards the gold card (e.g., the completion of the teacher education core) as well as performance in required history, social studies and education courses.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Professional Education Faculty

Non-Western Coursework
The department has made a one-year appointment to a specialist in Asian history, which will greatly aid the history education majors who take the required non-Western elective. It is essential, however, that the department hire a full-time Asian historian, an issue that the department will address at the beginning of the fall semester. The department has also hired a modern Latin American historian, which will similarly enhance opportunities for students to take courses in Latin American history.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: First faculty meeting of the fall semester
Responsible Person/Group: Department as a whole
Additional ResourcesRequested: The university must commit the necessary faculty lines and resources for the department to hire a tenure-track Asianist.

**Pedagogical Training**
Student teaching and methods practicum assignments will be streamlined so that more attention can be paid to the more critical elements of lesson planning and instruction.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Departmental faculty teaching HIS 488 and HIS 490/491

**Praxis I**
The department will continue to monitor closely Praxis I scores.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Licensure Coordinator

**Praxis II**
The Licensure Coordinator will encourage teacher candidates to take the Praxis II examination.

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Licensure Coordinator
Additional Resources Requested: Praxis II data for 2005-2006 will be reported in the Institutional Report next year.

**Technology Skills**
More technology training is needed by candidates in the program. Technology training occurs in HIS 300 and HIS 488 as well as in the required education courses. History faculty will continue to emphasize technology training, especially the use of instructional technology (in HIS 488)

Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: ongoing
Responsible Person/Group: Departmental faculty teaching HIS 300 and HIS 488

**Earlier instruction in assessment**
Earlier practical instruction in not only assessing but analyzing results is needed before student teaching

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History education faculty and colleagues in other departments  
**Additional Resources Requested:** History education faculty need to discuss how more instruction in assessment and analysis of assessment results can be incorporated into the program.

**Identify and remediate early problems**  
Students with disposition problems need to be identified early, mentored by faculty, and put on a formal remediation plan in extreme cases.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History education faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Will need to meet with colleagues to determine

**Recommend early remediation for deficiencies**  
Students with written/spoken communication deficiencies should be remediated long before student teaching. Advisors, instructors of teaching methods classes need an organized, efficient way to formally recommend remediation measures for history education candidates.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History faculty and advisors  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Methods instructor and student teaching supervisor need to meet to determine these.

**Recommend early remediation-content deficiencies**  
Teachers have commented to the student teaching supervisor that students need more background knowledge in political and diplomatic history rather than social history in the field of U.S. History. Advisors of history education students will need to be more aware of what the students will be expected to know when they enter the classroom, especially in world and U.S. history.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History faculty and advisors  
**Additional Resources Requested:** We need to meet as a department or at least
reconstitute our now defunct departmental teacher education committee to address what resources would be most helpful to our students.

**Training needed for Promethean Boards**
Instructors in HIS 488 and HIS 490/491 need to obtain additional training in technology, especially in the use of the Promethean Board. Use of the equipment needs to be modelled by the instructors in the program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History education faculty  
**Additional Resources Requested:** Training sessions in Promethean Board; regular access of faculty to rooms with the equipment.

**Work to add a generic practicum to secondary prog.**
Student teachers at the secondary level need more practicum and observation hours before they reach HIS 488 and student teaching.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History Education faculty in conjunction with colleagues in other departments  
**Additional Resources Requested:** A practicum associated with CIS 313 (the general teaching methods course) would help our students gain more practical knowledge of classroom management.

**Add new content-area methods class**
In Fall 2010, the Department hopes to add a new course which will be taken before HIS 488: Methods of Teaching Social Studies. Tentatively titled Current Issues in Social Studies, the course will require students to not only learn of new developments in the fields of Social Studies education but to develop lesson plans, interact with master teachers and administrators, and explore a variety of resources in order to develop their teaching and assessment skills. History education faculty also need to work more closely with colleagues in the education college in order to find ways to help our candidates become effective teachers and assessors.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Assessment of Student Learning Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in teaching & assessing social science
- **Measure:** History/Social Studies Content Evaluation  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in teaching & assessing social science
- **Measure:** Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Exam  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in teaching & assessing social science
- **Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that
replaced TCAT in Fall 2009) | **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in teaching & assessing social science

**Measure:** Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone) | **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in teaching & assessing social science

**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible

**Responsible Person/Group:** History education faculty and colleagues in other departments

**Additional Resources Requested:** New course in content-area methods

Reconstitute the now-defunct Teacher Education Committee

Meet and consult with education faculty

**Closer monitoring of coursework chosen**

Faculty advising students in the licensure program need to be more fully aware of the type of curriculum that our licensure candidates will have to teach in the secondary schools and steer them towards history electives in U.S. history, European history, and the social sciences that will enable them to build the knowledge base that they need to be successful in the classroom. Colleagues in other departments need to be more aware of the importance not only of the Praxis II content examination, but more importantly, of the importance of rigorous coursework in the courses required of History licensure students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure:** History/Social Studies Content Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in social studies and history content
- **Measure:** Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Exam | **Outcome/Objective:** Competence in teaching & assessing social science
- **Measure:** Praxis II: Social Studies Content Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in social studies and history content
- **Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009) | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in social studies and history content
- **Measure:** Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone) | **Outcome/Objective:** Competency in social studies and history content

**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible

**Responsible Person/Group:** History faculty and colleagues in other departments

**Additional Resources Requested:** Access to Praxis II content area modules would greatly help our instructors gain knowledge of the assessments, which are required by the state for all teachers.

**Earlier remediation of and consultation**

The Department needs to work with colleagues who teach the required pedagogy courses in order to identify, advises, and remediate candidates who have problems with dispositions, attitudes, and ethics. The addition of a new content-area methods course in Fall 2010 will provide additional opportunities for History Education faculty to work with these students before they begin their teaching practica and student teaching.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Dispositions Evaluation used by Univ Supervisor  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics
- **Measure:** Exit survey  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics
- **Measure:** Professional Portfolio Diversity Statement Rubric  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics

**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History education faculty and colleagues in other departments

**Additional Resources Requested:**  
The Department needs to reconstitute the now defunct TEacher Education Committee to provide a springboard for ideas as well as a vehicle to work with problematic students in the program in a consistent, organized way.

**Earlier remediation of deficiencies**  
As soon as they express a desire to enter the program in History licensure, students need to be monitored for their progress or lack of progress in this area.

**Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** History/Social Studies Content Evaluation  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of writing and speaking skills
- **Measure:** Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation, overall scores and Oral Communication indicators.  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of writing and speaking skills
- **Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of writing and speaking skills
- **Measure:** Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone)  
  **Outcome/Objective:** Mastery of writing and speaking skills

**Implementation Description:** As soon as possible  
**Responsible Person/Group:** History education faculty and colleagues in other departments

**Additional Resources Requested:**  
Efforts need to be redoubled to make students aware of resources and programs that will help them overcome deficiencies in writing and speaking

**More experiences with 7-12 teachers**  
Candidates need more observation of classroom situations, more interaction with master teachers and school administrators, and more practicum time. State-mandated increases in field experiences should prove helpful; these changes are in the planning stages. An additional course in content area methods should provide more opportunities to observe in area classrooms, observe the techniques of master teachers, and to develop a usable classroom management plan. History education faculty need to work more closely with the CIS 313: Principles of Teaching High School
and CIS 302: Classroom Management instructor on how to dovetail assignments and school experiences in order to more effectively and efficiently serve the students’ needs in this area.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Classroom Management/Discipline Plan | Outcome/Objective: Competence in classroom management and discipline  
Measure: Exit survey | Outcome/Objective: Competence in classroom management and discipline  
Measure: History/Social Studies Content Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Competence in classroom management and discipline  
Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (in-class evaluation that replaced TCAT in Fall 2009) | Outcome/Objective: Competence in classroom management and discipline

Implementation Description: As soon as possible.  
Responsible Person/Group: History education faculty and colleagues in other departments  
Additional Resources Requested: More consultation with education faculty; resurrect the defunct Teacher Education Committee.

More opportunities to use technology
Teacher education candidates need more training in technology as well as opportunities to see master teachers use the technologies in classroom situations. A new content-area methods course which hopefully will be approved for Fall 2010 will give candidates the chance to see master teachers demonstrate how to effectively use technology in teaching, record-keeping, and assessment. History education faculty also need to work more closely with both department colleagues and those in the college of education in order to explore ways to deepen candidates’ technology competencies.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: BTLE | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of and appropriate use of technology  
Measure: PowerPoint Presentation Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of and appropriate use of technology  
Measure: Teaching Unit Portfolio Rubric (Capstone) | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of and appropriate use of technology

Implementation Description: As soon as possible  
Responsible Person/Group: History education faculty and colleagues in other departments  
Additional Resources Requested: New course in content-area methods  
Reconstitute now-defunct Teacher Education Committee  
Work more closely with colleagues in the education college
Action Plan for Assessment of Student Learning
In Fall 2010, the History Department began offered HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education. This course will require students to write original lesson plans which include a variety of assessments. The course will also involve guest speakers who are experts in the state’s U.S. History assessment for high school students. Students will be familiarized with rubric development and principles of assessment applicable to their futures as social studies teachers. During student teaching, interns will receive more instruction in pre and post-testing, as well as in analysis of results, during the professional development seminars.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Assessment of Student Learning Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Competence in teaching & assessing social science

Action Plan for Classroom Management
Action Plan: A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Classroom management issues, as well as guest speakers from local schools, will be part of the course content. Scores improved considerably from Fall 2009 to Spring 2010, probably due to the increased emphasis on including "real world" educators as speakers. More emphasis will be placed upon classroom management the professional development seminars offered during student teaching (HIS 490.491.)

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit survey | Outcome/Objective: Competence in classroom management and discipline

Action Plan for Cultural Diversity Statement in Professional Portfolio
In Fall 2010, the History Department has offered two new courses for licensure students that should improve the results in this area. The first, HIS 110: Enrichment Experiences in World History, is a one-hour course which requires students to seek out a variety of experiences on campus and in the community that relate to world history. They will observe in local classrooms, tutor, visit museums, attend cultural events, interview teachers and professors, and attend seminars both on and off campus. They will write reflective journals which not only detail what the experience taught them about history, but will relate their experiences to their future profession. These experiences are already proving to be eye-opening for many students in terms of the diversity of their communities. The second, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, requires students to complete weekly readings on various topics germane to the preparation of social studies teachers. Many of these will involve issues of diversity in the classroom and in the content matter. Students will also have to observe in local classrooms; they will write reflective critiques of each classroom. Among other things,
they will have to analyze how each teacher deals with diversity in his or her classroom. Students will be required to compile a portfolio of five lesson plans designed for a diverse set of students. Finally, classroom presentations will focus on classroom diversity and how to use a variety of strategies to reach a wide range of students in Social Studies classrooms. this will include strategies for English Language Learners, bilingual students, gifted students, students with special needs, and students with a variety of learning styles. In Spring 2011, the Department will offer HIS 111: Enrichment Experiences in U.S. History. The course is designed to be very similar to HIS 110, but will focus on U.S., Mississippi, and local history. Along with the types of experiences described in the discussion of HIS 110, students will be encouraged to observe city council meetings, jury trials, political rallies, sessions of the legislature, and other events that help them gain a better understanding of civics as well as U.S. history. In the course of these observations, students will write reflective journals which analyze their experiences. By the end of the course, students will have gained a better understanding of how democracy rests upon the efforts of a diverse society. During student teaching (HIS 490/491), more emphasis will be placed upon meeting the needs of English Language Learners during the Professional Development Seminar.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Professional Portfolio Diversity Statement Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics

**Action Plan for Exit Survey Results**  
The problem with this assessment appears to be in the administration of the survey. This survey is given on-line at the end of student teaching. Some students send it back; some do not. Beginning in Fall 2010, students will come back to campus to fill out a hard copy and to discuss program improvements as a group. This should ensure a 100% return rate. The surveys that are returned show a very high rate of satisfaction; the problem appears to be in the reliance on the willingness of students to do additional paperwork at the end of the term.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Exit survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics

**Action Plan for Improvement of Classroom Management Skills**  
The History Department has added a new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies, that will include a segment on classroom management. The students will be required to read and discuss Harry and Rosemary Wong’s First Days of School: How to Be An Effective Teacher. This book, which is required for first-year teachers in several local school districts, provides very specific, research-based, teacher-tested strategies
for managing classrooms. Also, the course will use school administrators and teachers as guest speakers. They will provide current information about the expectations of school districts in terms of classroom management. Finally, a minimum of five hours of observation of master teachers in local secondary social studies classrooms will be required. Students will be required to write reflective essays which focus not only teaching methods, but classroom management techniques in each classroom. This course will be taken prior to the content methods/practicum course (HIS 488: Methods of Teaching in Social Studies.) The course is being taught for the first time this fall and will be offered again in the spring. (It will not be offered in the summer.) Additional emphasis will be placed upon classroom management during the professional development seminars offered during HIS 490/491: Student Teaching in Social Studies. This will include readings and guest speakers who are skilled classroom managers.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Exit survey | Outcome/Objective: Competence in classroom management and discipline

Increased emphasis on the importance of and use of both formative and summative assessments in the social studies classroom
For Fall 2010, a new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies, will include assignments and instruction on the purpose of assessment, types of assessment, and various ways to implement these in the social studies classroom. In student teaching (HIS 490/491), students will receive more instruction on how to complete the major assessment project required in that course.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
    Measure: Assessment of Student Learning Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Competence in teaching & assessing social science

Implementation Description: In HIS 487, students will be required to read current research on assessment and how to interpret results. Classroom teachers will also share expertise on state assessments as guest speakers. Students will also develop a variety of formal and informal assessments as part of their class portfolio. Student teachers will attend additional professional development sessions on assessments to be used in their classrooms.

Projected Completion Date: 12/04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor for HIS 487 and HIS 490/491
Additional Resources Requested: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

New content-pedagogy classes (HIS 487, HIS 110, HIS 111)
A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Cultural diversity issues, as well as guest speakers from local schools, will be
part of the course content. Also, two one-hour courses, HIS 110: Experiences in World History and HIS 111: Experiences in U.S. History, will require students to document a wide range of experiences in academic, classroom, and cultural settings. In their journals, they will describe at least 15 hours of experiences that relate not only to their content areas but to the real world of teaching. Part of the journal requirement will be to relate their experiences to cultural diversity issues.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Professional Portfolio Diversity Statement Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Possession of appropriate dispositions and ethics

Implementation Description: HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education will be required in Fall 2010. Classroom management issues and will be part of the course content. Two 1-hour courses, HIS 110: Experiences in World History and HIS 111: Experiences in U.S. History, will require them to document experiences in academic, classroom, and cultural settings. In journals, they will describe at least 15 hours of experiences relating to their content areas, particularly relating to cultural diversity.

Projected Completion Date: 12/04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor of HIS 487, HIS 110 and 111.
Additional Resources Requested: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

New course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education to be required in fall 2010
A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Classroom management issues, as well as guest speakers from local schools, will be part of the course content. Students will also be required to read and present recent research on classroom management as it relates to the social studies classroom. Also, a new state-imposed evaluation for student teachers, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), will be used to increase awareness among the students of the importance of classroom management. Scores improved considerably from Fall 2009 to Spring 2010, probably due to the increased emphasis on including "real world" educators as speakers during the Professional Development Seminars during the student teaching semester. This practice will be continued.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: BTLE | Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of and appropriate use of technology

Implementation Description: A new course, HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies Education, will be required in Fall 2010. Classroom management issues, as well as guest speakers from local schools, will be part of the course content. Students will also be required to read and present recent research on classroom management as it relates to the social studies classroom. A new state-imposed evaluation, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), will be used to increase
awareness among interns.

Projected Completion Date: 12/04/2010
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor for HIS 487, HIS 490/491.
Additional Resources Requested: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**Action plan to help students improve their classroom diversity plans**

During Professional Development seminars held during student teaching, candidates will be required to provide a rough draft of their diversity plans so that the instructor can dialogue with them on ways to improve them. In HIS 487: Current Issues in Social Studies, students will be assigned outside readings on diversity topics and will be introduced to guest speakers who are currently teaching in highly diverse classrooms. Finally, more emphasis will be placed on meeting the needs of diverse students in the final lesson plan project in that class.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: See above.
Projected Completion Date: 12/01/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Instructor for HIS 487 and HIS 490/491.
Additional Resources Requested: none—most resources are readily available on-line and in the campus library.

**earlier disposition reporting**

Some students are not well-suited to the classroom. Instructors of licensure students will be encouraged to report dispositions issues earlier in the students' careers.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Responsible Person/Group: undergraduate director/ social studies licensure coordinator
Additional Resources Requested: none

**Plan for helping students successfully pass Praxis II Content Exam on the first try**

When one of our students fails the content area exam, it is usually by one or two points. During advisement, our Department will provide information about measures to reduce test anxiety. We are currently allowing students to take the practice Praxis II exam in Social Studies. However, this is usually done at the end of the term and not enough feedback is given to them. In Fall 2012, HIS 487 students will take the practice test earlier so that they can be more aware of areas of weakness in the content. We will offer these students a chance to sit in on HIS 101 and other basic subjects so that they can increase their content knowledge base. We will also refocus our advising efforts to make sure that students are taking courses that reflect the nature of curriculum that they will teach in 7-12 classrooms.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: See above
Plan to help students improve quality of teaching PowerPoints
In HIS 487, an original Power Point is now required as part of the end of semester lesson plan project. In Fall 2012, students will be required to turn in a rough draft of the PowerPoint at midterm so that the instructor can offer feedback in a more timely manner before student teaching. (The quality of the work in general has been good, but students have been careless about bibliographies and listing state and national standards taught.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The BA Licensure program is working well as is evidenced by the high marks in almost every area of measurement.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
New grading and scoring standards on the Praxis II exam will need to be incorporated into the department's licensure classes and its future assessment plans.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The History Department is healthy, providing a rigorous, fair, and compassionate learning environment on both campus for all our students, including the History B.A., History/Social Studies Licensure B.A., International Studies B.A., M.A. and M.S., and Ph.D. The department's profile is continuing to change, with a particularly positive turn with three new tenure-track faculty members starting on the Hattiesburg campus and one on the Gulf Coast, the latter enabling for the first time in years a viable M.A. program on the Coast. The very strong academic and teaching qualifications of our new hires is a tribute to the department's strength, and also marks our escape from years of less-qualified one-year appointments as we have mounted searches for permanent hires. Assessment shows clearly the department's strengths at all levels. 1) Students overwhelmingly recognize that we are a friendly and helpful department. The data is clearest in our undergraduate exit surveys, where 25 out of 35 respondents (71%) ranked student-teacher relations in the department as "excellent," 8 of 35 (23%) as good, and the lowest response was "satisfactory" 2 of 35, 6%). Similarly, 29 out of 35 respondents (83%) ranked the advising the department provides as "excellent," while only one student ranked us as "satisfactory" and none as "poor." 2) ALL faculty members in the department were listed as "best instructor" on at least one exit survey, with students commenting enthusiastically on their knowledge, rigor, care for students,
and kindness. 3) We have effective mechanisms in place to bring our students up to an acceptable level for graduation, with oversight at all levels for both undergraduates and graduate students. 4) Our Social Studies Licensure program is outstanding. The main weakness that appeared in assessment is also plain in the day-to-day life of the department: several major fields of history remain uncovered by the department for want of faculty members able to teach them. Our first need in the coming year will be to hire a Medievalist and a historian of 19th Century Europe to cover the loss of Dr. Jestice and Bowersox. Our big gap in American history is the need for an American frontier historian, as we lost that position after Greg O'Brien left us five years ago. And the department has always suffered from the crying lack of an early modern Europeanist, leaving a major gap in our European history offerings. We have also been without an Asianist for years, which has an impact on the program at all levels (Licensure students need non-western history, International Studies students find it impossible to choose Asia as their emphasis area, and graduate students are deprived of a very employable minor field). Currently, too large a proportion of faculty time is being spent on GEC and service courses, leaving a limited selection of upper-division courses available for both undergraduates and grad students.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

The most important "continuous improvement initiative" is to provide better remediation for students who fail the Praxis II exam on their first attempt, as well as the addition of a component to licensure courses to help students master powerpoint.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

There is nothing to report in this category this year.
Mission / Purpose

To provide the appropriate pedagogical and content knowledge so that graduates are able to design and deliver quality physical education in K-12 schools.

The curriculum for the Human Performance (K-12 Physical Education) Bachelor of Science degree program is designed and delivered to meet the 2008 National Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards developed by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge
Students know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals (NASPE Standard 1).

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge (0091)
The Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge (0091) is an exam administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS). This 120 multiple-choice question exam covers the following categories: I. Content Knowledge and Student Growth and Development II. Management, Motivation, and Communication III. Planning, Instruction, and Student Assessment IV. Collaboration, Reflection, and Technology Student must take this exam as a degree requirement. A score of 145 is required by the Mississippi Department of Education for certification in K-12 physical education. Of the 21 states requiring this exam, the average required score is 148 (http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/PRAXIS/pdf/09706passingscores.pdf). The average performance range on the exam (2011-2012) was 150-161 (N=14427) (http://www.ets.org/s/praxis/pdf/uyps_1112.pdf).

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
Students obtain the passing score (145) established by the Mississippi Department of Education on the Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge (0091) Exam.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
Of the 5 program completers who took the Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge (0091) Exam in 2012-13, 80% (4 out of 5 students) received a passing score of 145 or higher. Please note that the passing score has change on the test since the target for this outcome was created.

M 2: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test
The Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) test measures general pedagogical knowledge. Physical education students must take one of the exams (grades K-6, 5-9, or 7-12) as a degree requirement. The test are administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and are a combination of multiple-choice and short constructed-response prompts based on case studies. In order to obtain certification in K-12 physical education from the Mississippi Department of Education, the following scores are required: K-6 = 160; 5-9 = 160; 7-12 = 157. The average performance range (8/1/08-6/30/11) was K-6 = 168-182; 5-9 = 165=178; 7-12 = 166-180.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**
100% of student taking the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) obtain a passing score.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
Of the 5 program completers who have taken the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT), 60% (3 out of 5 students) received a passing score.

**SLO 2: Skill and Fitness Based Competence**
Students are physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skill necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness as delineated in the NASPE K-12 Standards (NASPE Standard 2).

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: FITNESSGRAM Assessment**
Element 2.2 of the NASPE standards indicates that students will "achieve and maintain an health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program. Student in the degree program will complete the FITNESSGRAM assessment in one or more courses in the curriculum. It is desired that students achieve a fitness level that is described by the FITNESSGRAM as "average" or better on the test battery.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
100% of students completing the FITNESSGRAM assessment will achieve a minimal fitness level description of "average" as described on the FITNESSGRAM report.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
Of the six student participating in FITNESSGRAM testing, 50% (3 of 6 students) demonstrated a fitness level described as "average" for overall fitness on the FITNESSGRAM report. The remaining 3 students (50%) demonstrated a fitness level described at "fair" on the FITNESSGRAM report.

**M 4: BOT-2**
The Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency (2nd ed) (BOT-2) is designed to measure various motor skills in individuals aged 4 through 21. Students take this motor skill test as a part of a required course in the degree plan. Composite scores are given for: fine manual control, manual control, body control, and strength and agility. A Total Motor Composite is also calculated. Until sufficient data is collected
to develop norms, data will be compared to the normative data for an individual of 21 years.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
100% of students who complete the BOT-2 will demonstrate skill competence by achieving scores equivalent to "Above Average" for a 21-year-old participant on all areas.

**SLO 3: Planning and Implementation**
Students plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: HPR 490: TIAI-Planning & Preparation**
As a part of the evaluation process in HPR 490: Student Teaching in Elementary Physical Education, lesson planning and delivery is assessed using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI). The first nine items (TIAI, 2011) are criteria related to planning and preparation. Each item has four indicators that contribute 0-3 points to an overall score. The nine criteria and accompanying indicators related to planning and preparation are: 1.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
In the second assessment cycle, students in HPR 490 (Student Teaching in Elementary Physical Education) will earn minimum scores of 2 (acceptable) for all criteria related to planning and preparation (Items 1-9 on 2011 version).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Mean scores for items related to Planning and Preparation ranged from 2.00 to 4.00.

**M 6: HPR 491: TIAI-Planning and Preparation**

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target:**
In the second assessment cycle, students in HPR 491 (Student Teaching in Secondary Physical Education) will earn minimum scores of 2 (acceptable) for all criteria related to planning and preparation (Items 1-9 on 2011 version).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Mean scores for items related to Planning and Preparation ranged from 2.00 to 4.00.

**SLO 4: Instructional Delivery and Management**
Students use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.

**Related Measures:**
M 7: HPR 490/491: TIAI-Teaching for Learning
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
Students in HPR 490/491 (Student Teaching in Elementary/Secondary Physical Education) will earn minimum scores of 2 (acceptable) for all criteria related to teaching for learning (Items 16-23 on 2011 version).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Mean scores for items related to Teaching for Learning range from 3.86 to 4.00.

M 8: HPR 490/491: TIAI-Management of the Learning Environment
Items 24-29
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
Students in HPR 490/491 (Student Teaching in Elementary/Secondary Physical Education) will earn minimum scores of 2 (acceptable) for all criteria related to management of the learning environment (Items 24-29 on 2011 version).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Mean scores from items related to Management of the Learning Environment ranged from 3.86 to 4.00.

SLO 5: Impact on Student Learning
Students utilize assessments and reflection to foster K-12 student learning and inform instructional decisions.

Related Measures:

M 9: HPR 490: TIAI-Assessment of Student Learning
Items 30-34
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
Students in HPR 490 (Student Teaching in Elementary Physical Education) will earn minimum scores of 2 (acceptable) for all criteria related to assessment of student learning (Items 30-34 on 2011 version).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Mean scores for items related to Assessment of Student Learning range from 2.33 to 4.00.

M 10: HPR 491: Assessment Project
Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target:
Students in HPR 491 will earn a mean score of 3.00 or better on all categories of the TC Assessment Project Rubric.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Cognitive and Affective Assessments
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Students will complete mini-assessments using cognitive and affective assessments in HPR 462L (Methods in Teaching Physical Edu...

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Cognitive and Affective Assessments
Students will complete mini-assessments using cognitive and affective assessments in HPR 462L (Methods in Teaching Physical Education Lab) which is a required course prior to HPR 491.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: HPR 491: Assessment Project | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning

Projected Completion Date: 12/06/2012

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessment show that students continue to be strong in their ability to plan and delivery physical education lessons in the K12 setting. Students are also strong in their performance on standardized tests required for teacher certification in the state of Mississippi. Scores on the Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge as well as the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) show that students possess the content knowledge deemed necessary to teach in the K12 setting.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Attention to the following areas is needed: 1. Assessment of Learning Outcomes 2. Ability to utilize various instructional models Students continue to score low on items related to the assessment of learning outcomes in the K12 setting. Students see very little modeling of assessment in physical education because of the lack of accountability in K12 physical education. The program plans to increase exposure to assessment techniques and require students to complete an assessment project prior to the student teaching experience. During their teaching experience in HPR 462L, students will assess students, decide upon the appropriate student learning outcomes, deliver a unit, and the re-assess to determine if student learning took place. This familiarity with the
assessment process should aid students in utilizing assessment in student teaching and throughout their careers. Data also show that students have no variance in the type of instructional model/teaching style chose for instruction. Direct instruction appears to be the style of choice which is quite typical of young teachers. The teaching experience in HPR 462L will also be utilized to provide structure guidance in delivering lessons with other teaching styles. Both of these areas are very important to the success of a teaching in a K12 school. Thus, we have targeted these two aspects of the teaching/learning process for improvement over the next academic year.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The curriculum in the B.S. in Human Performance: Physical Education (Licensure) program has remained relatively stable over the past few years. The data continues to demonstrate success is most student learning outcomes. The weakness that have been targeted as areas for improvement are: (1) assessment and (2) implementation of a variety of teaching styles. Program faculty have made plans to implement instruction and modeling in a laboratory class (HPR 462L) to provide students with focused learning experiences in these areas prior to student teaching. Overall, students continue to succeed in obtaining passing scores on teacher certification exams. The data also demonstrates student strength in planning and delivery of physical education lessons in the K12 school setting.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
The continuous improvement initiatives will be implemented in HPR 462L in the fall 2013 semester. These initiatives are: 1. Focus on assessment of student learning outcomes. Students in HPR 462L will conduct assessments prior to teaching a group of students at the DuBard School. The lessons taught will be determined by the strengths and weaknesses found through assessments. Students will engage in formative and summative assessments throughout the teaching unit in order to guide their teaching practice and determine if student learning is taking place. 2. Variation of teaching styles. Direct instruction appears to be the teaching style of choice of the physical education majors. Because the teaching style is related to the outcomes of the lessons, students should develop the ability to use a variety of teaching styles. While planning lessons in HPR 462L, students will develop and deliver lessons using multiple teaching styles in order to hone these skills.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Tracking of the action plan will take place through the use of rubrics used to evaluate students in HPR 462L. In addition to these rubrics, students' reflections on planning and teaching will be used to assess the implementation of the action plan.
Mission / Purpose

The Master of Science in Human Performance: Physical Education provides physical educators with advanced knowledge in order to improve the quality of instruction and student learning in K12 physical education. The program is focused on producing graduates who are consumers of research on teaching and learning in physical education and can apply this knowledge in their respective physical education classrooms.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Knowledge of Content
Student has a depth of understanding of both movement and pedagogy and can explain how they relate to learning and teaching in physical education.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Comprehensive Exam
Students will complete a written comprehensive exam during their final semester of enrollment.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
100% of students will receiving a "Pass" decision on their written comprehensive examination.

M 2: Oral Comprehensive Examination
Upon completion of the written comprehensive examination, students will schedule an oral comprehensive exam date with their comprehensive exam committee.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
100% of students will receive a "Pass" on the oral portion of the comprehensive examination.

SLO 2: Systematic Intentional Inquiry
Student has a thorough understanding of multiple modes of inquiry and can critique, synthesize and apply research findings to learning and teaching in physical education.

Related Measures:

M 3: Responsible Conduct of Research Training
All graduate students must complete the RCR training modules required by the Graduate School and their departments the first semester they are enrolled in graduate school. The RCR policy and training information are found on the
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
100% of students will receive a passing score on the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) Training module.

M 4: Action Research Project
As a course assignment, students will complete an action research project within a K-12 physical education environment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
100% of students will score an 80% or better on the scoring rubric used to evaluate the action research project.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The course containing this project was not offered in the 2012-2013 academic year. The course sequence for the program indicates that it will be offered in Spring 2015.

SLO 3: Professional Practice in Planning
Student demonstrates, through planning and/or instruction, accurate and sufficient content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge appropriate for the specific learners, context and long- and short-term outcomes/goals.

Related Measures:

M 5: Unit Plan
Students will complete a 4 week unit plan for K-12 physical education which demonstrates understanding of both physical education content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge through the planning of developmentally appropriate activities utilizing a variety of pedagogical skills. The unit plan will include a rationale for both content and instructional choices.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
100% of students will score 80% or better on the scoring rubric used to evaluate the K-12 Physical Education Unit Plan.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The course containing this assignment was not offered in the 2012-2013 academic year. This assignment will be completed in HPR 742 in the summer 2013 term.

M 6: Assessment of Instruction
Physical education lesson delivery will be assessed using the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target:
100% of students will earn average scores of 3 or better on the TIAI.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students (2/2) earned average scores of 3 or better on the TIAI.

**SLO 4: Effectiveness of Instruction**
The student is able to systematically analyze the effectiveness of instruction on learner and engagement.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Opportunity to Respond**
Students will be able to use a systematic observation instrument to determine the opportunities to respond (OTR) of K-12 physical education students and use this information to improve instruction to increase OTR. Students will complete a lesson plan, an initial observation and a reflection. Students will utilize this information to deliver additional lesson and code these subsequent lessons to determine if OTR increased.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
100% of students will be able to increase OTR following the utilization of a systematic observation tool.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students (2/2) were able to increase OTR following the utilization of a systematic observation tool.

**M 8: Time On Task**
Students will be able to utilize systematic observation to determine the time on task during K-12 physical education lessons. Students will initially determine the time spent in management, instruction, activity, etc. and composed a reflection based on this data. An follow-up lesson will be designed, delivered and analyzed to determine if time on task is impacted.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
100% of students will improve time on task following the utilization of a systematic observation to reflect on teaching.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students (2/2) improve time on task following the utilization of a systematic observation to reflect on teaching. Students were able to effectively reflect, in writing and through verbal description, on the process of improving time of task.

**SLO 5: Professional Leadership**
Students are continuous, collaborative learners who further their own professional development and use their abilities to contribute to the profession.

**Related Measures:**
M 9: Communication of Results of Inquiry
Evidence will be collected from current resume/vita of students to assess that the student "conducts inquiry into professional knowledge and practice and communicates results of inquiry to the profession and community." (Element 3a)

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Each student will present evidence of a minimum of 1 presentation, article, newsletter or other form of professional development in an updated resume/vita (per academic year).

M 10: Mentor
Students will submit documentation to provide evidence of mentoring others in the K-12 school system.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Students will submit evidence of at least one mentor role per academic year.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Action Plan: Human Performance (Physical Education) M.S.
Revisions to the Human Performance: Physical Education M.S. program include the addition of an action research project and the inclusion of projects to be completed in the K-12 physical education environment. The National Association for Sport and Physical Education's (NASPE) Advanced Standards for Physical Education (2008) present standards that would require the graduate student to deliver physical education lesson in order to meet the standards. The increased used of technology within the graduate program should enable students to present evidence of meeting these standards through new assessments within the required coursework.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Action Plan: Changing Formats
In the 2013-14 academic year the M.S. in Human Performance: Physical Education degree program will be launched as a fully online program. The target audience for the new delivery format is practicing physical educators in K12 schools. It is hoped that students can apply the content knowledge from coursework directly to their respective physical education classrooms. This will produce opportunities for more authentic assessment and measures of K12 student learning in physical education. While many of the student learning outcomes in the WEAVE report will remain the same, some modification may be needed to match the assignments in the new format. While the coursework remains largely the same, the opportunity for greater application in the classroom may change the format of some course assignments. This review of the appropriate measures will take place early in the fall as a new faculty member comes aboard the program.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/29/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Nancy Speed, Rob Doan

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Students have completed exceptional work on their comprehensive exams and have excelled in both the written and oral portions of the exam. Improvement in student writing and presentation skills across the program has been noted by faculty as well as by the students themselves. Students have been successful in completing assignments related to the delivery of physical education lessons as well as the subsequent analysis and reflection of the lessons.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
In general, students do not participate in activities beyond their coursework and day-to-day job responsibilities that would demonstrate professional leadership. Student need to be exposed to opportunities to make a contribution to the profession and become educated on the valued of such experiences.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
Students perform well on both the oral and written portion of the comprehensive exam. The program faculty are very please with the verbal and written skills demonstrated by program completers. Students also demonstrate the ability to plan, analyze and reflect upon lessons taught in physical education. The weakest aspect of student learning is the ability/opportunity to engage in professional leadership opportunities. Many of the students have full-time teaching jobs and are taking classes which limits the time available to engage in such activities. Overall, the performance of the students in the program is exceptional. It is hoped that the conversion to a completely online format will provide greater opportunities for students to implement assignments in the school to increase student engagement and learning in physical education.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
Area for Improvement: 1. Increasing opportunities for professional leadership 2. Increase authentic assessment in course assignments With the change to an online format it is hoped that practicing physical education (the target audience) will have greater opportunities within their respective schools to engage in professional leadership opportunities. Most students have previously enrolled in 9-12 semester hours of coursework each semester making time for additional activities quite scarce. The sequencing of the online program allows students to take 6 hours/semester for 6 consecutive semesters. This format should allow more time for engagement in leadership opportunities. Additionally, the target is audience is professionals who teach physical education daily. This aspect of the student population should change the measures obtained for the professional leadership student learning outcome. The target audience of K12 physical educators will allow students to apply knowledge directly in their respective physical education classroom. This will allow for more authentic
assessment of how physical educators are able to plan and deliver lessons. The course projects can be applied to the real-world rather than being contrived works in pretend environments.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

Action plan will be tracked through the continued use of the rubrics and collection of information described in the WEAVE reports. Modifications to any rubrics and/or measures will be made by September 30 in order to be implemented as courses are offered in the planned course sequence.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Instructional Technology Business Technology Education (BTE) Emphasis Undergraduate Program is to prepare students to teach in secondary and/or postsecondary education programs that equip individuals with knowledge, skills, attitudes, and work habits essential for initial employment in the technological environment of today's business world and/or success in the college environment. Through the BTE program, students will obtain a broad general education, develop a conceptual understanding of business and technology and their applications to society, and demonstrate a thorough working knowledge of the best professional education practices.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate content knowledge
Teacher candidates will demonstrate business education content knowledge.

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis II: Business Education Content Knowledge
PRAXIS II: Business Education (0101), developed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS), is the required content knowledge standardized test for attaining Mississippi teacher licensure in Grades K-7-12. Praxis II: Business Education measures teacher candidates’ business education content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of BTE teacher candidates will score 80% or better on the PRAXIS II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. This demonstrates the candidates’ attainment of the business education content knowledge required for state licensure. Both the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and NCATE require an 80% pass rate for state teacher education programs.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Spring 2013 - No IT/BTE teacher candidates registered for the Praxis II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2012 - 100% (3/3) of BTE teacher candidates scored 80% or better on the Praxis II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. This demonstrates the candidates’ attainment of the business education content knowledge required for state licensure. Both the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and NCATE require an 80% pass rate for state teacher education programs. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2012 -
No students enrolled in the BTE program registered for the Praxis II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

**M 6: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE)**

The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A), Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, communication skills, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 1 (A), Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the application of skills in a field-based experience. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**

Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric for the criteria of demonstrating business education content knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Spring 2013 - One hundred percent (100%) (3/3) students scored mastery or exemplary on demonstrating business education content knowledge on Indicator 1 of the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE). Program offered in Hattiesburg only. Fall 2012 - One hundred percent (100%) (3/3) students scored mastery or exemplary on demonstrating business education content knowledge on Indicator 1 of the TCPE. Program offered in Hattiesburg only. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester. Program offered in Hattiesburg only.

**SLO 2: Apply skills in a field-based experience**

Integrate and apply skills through a field-based experience in secondary business technology education.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instruments**

Teacher candidate assessment instruments used by the mentor teacher (indirect) and the university supervisor (direct) scored using grading rubrics to include all evaluation forms from the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and professional portfolio.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**Target:**

Ninety percent (90%) will score an overall rubric score of 80% or greater.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Spring 2013 - 100% (3/3) students enrolled in IT 493 (student teaching) scored 80% or higher on the teacher candidate assessment instruments administered by the cooperating teacher (indirect) and the university supervisor (direct) scored using grading rubrics to include all evaluation forms from the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and professional portfolio during student teaching. Program offered only on Hattiesburg campus. Fall 2012 - Course (IT 493) not taught this semester. Program offered only on Hattiesburg campus. Summer 2012 - Course (IT 493) not taught this semester. Program offered only on Hattiesburg campus.

M 6: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE)
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, communication skills, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 1 (A), Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the application of skills in a field-based experience. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a score of 171 or higher [mastery (3) or exemplary (4)] on all three sections of the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Spring 2013 - Hattiesburg only - One hundred percent (100%) (3/3) teacher candidates received a score of 171 or higher [mastery (3) or exemplary (4)] on all three sections of the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric administered during student teaching, IT 493. Course not offered on Gulf Coast. Fall 2012 - Course not offered this semester. Course not offered on Gulf Coast. Summer 2011 - Course not offered this semester. Course not offered on Gulf Coast.

SLO 3: Demonstrate communication skills
Demonstrate written and oral communication skills appropriate for future business technology educators.

Related Measures:

M 5: Microteaching
After developing a microteaching unit to include integrating technology, developing learning activities that enhance teaching and learning, using multiple teaching strategies student will present lesson to class scored using a grading rubric to include the following categories: anticipatory set, states the objectives, shows evidence of preparation, provides instructional input, demonstrates knowledge of subject matter, checks for comprehension, provides guided practice, provides independent practice, achieves closure, exhibits good personal qualities
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% will score an overall rubric score of 80% or greater.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Spring 2013 - Course not taught this semester. Program offered only in Hattiesburg. Fall 2012 - 100% (3/3) students scored 80% or greater on the scoring rubric demonstrating effective communication skills in their microteaching in IT 456. Program only offered in Hattiesburg. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester. Program only offered in Hattiesburg.

**M 6: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE)**
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, communication skills, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 1 (A), Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the application of skills in a field-based experience. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of students will score mastery or exemplary on Indicator 23 of the TCPE.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Spring 2013 - 100% (3/3) students scored 80% or greater on Indicator 23, "Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication", of the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation. Program offered only in Hattiesburg. Fall 2012 - 100% (3/3 students scored 80% or greater on Indicator 23, "Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication", of the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation. Program offered only in Hattiesburg. Summer 2012 - Course not offered this semester. Program offered only in Hattiesburg.

**SLO 4: Apply teaching/learning theories**
Apply teaching/learning theories to develop pedagogical strategies, techniques for integrating technology into instruction, assessment and evaluative strategies, and classroom management techniques.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)**
PRAXIS II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT 0524), developed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS), is the required pedagogical knowledge standardized test for attaining Mississippi teacher licensure for Grades
7-12. The PLT measures the candidates' abilities to apply pedagogical principles and to demonstrate professional knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will be successful on the PRAXIS II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT). The PLT measures candidates’ pedagogical and professional knowledge at a level required for state licensure. The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and NCATE require an 80% pass rate for teacher education programs.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Spring 2013 - No BTE teacher candidates registered for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT). (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2012 - 100% (3/3) BTE teacher candidates scored 80% or better on the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT). The PLT measures candidates’ pedagogical and professional knowledge at a level required for state licensure. The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and NCATE require an 80% pass rate for teacher education programs. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2012 - No BTE teacher candidates registered for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT). (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

**M 4: Student-Centered Lesson Plans**
Students will develop student-centered lesson plans scored using a grading rubric to include the following categories: objectives, procedures, materials, evaluation, anticipatory set, technology, cooperative learning, multiple teaching strategies, and closure

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% will score an overall rubric score of 80% or greater.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met**
Spring 2013 - 100% (3/3) students enrolled in IT 493 scored 80% or greater on the rubric for writing student-centered lesson plans to include objectives, procedures, materials, evaluation, anticipatory set, technology, cooperative learning, multiple teaching strategies, and closure. These findings are from first and second student teaching experiences in IT 493. Program offered only in Hattiesburg. Fall 2012 - 67% (2/3) students scored 80% or greater on the rubric for writing student-centered lesson plans. These findings are from writing lesson plans in the methods course (IT 456), not the student teaching experience, and for many students was the first time they had written extensive lesson plans. Program offered only in Hattiesburg. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Individualized Attention During Student Teaching**
*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*
Individualized attention will be given to the student who needs greater practice in writing student-centered lesson plans. This...

M 5: Microteaching
After developing a microteaching unit to include integrating technology, developing learning activities that enhance teaching and learning, using multiple teaching strategies student will present lesson to class scored using a grading rubric to include the following categories: anticipatory set, states the objectives, shows evidence of preparation, provides instructional input, demonstrates knowledge of subject matter, checks for comprehension, provides guided practice, provides independent practice, achieves closure, exhibits good personal qualities.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% will score an overall rubric score of 80% or greater.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Spring 2013 - Course not offered Spring 2013. Program offered in Hattiesburg only. Fall 2012 - 67% (2/3) students scored 80% or greater on the scoring rubric for their microteaching. One student scored a 70% out of 100% with the other students scoring 91% and 96%. This program is offered in Hattiesburg only. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester. This program is offered in Hattiesburg only.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Student Teaching Evaluations
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Individualized attention will be given to the student who needs more practice in applying teaching/learning theories.

M 6: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE)
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, communication skills, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 1 (A), Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the application of skills in a field-based experience. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the teacher candidacy performance evaluation rubric for the criteria of demonstrating pedagogical knowledge.
**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Spring 2013 - Hattiesburg only - One hundred percent (100%) (3/3) of teacher candidates received a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the four indicators of the pedagogy section in the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation rubric for the criteria of demonstrating pedagogical knowledge. Course not offered on Gulf Coast. Fall 2012 - Course not offered this semester. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester. Course not offered on Gulf Coast.

**SLO 5: Integrate technology in instruction**
Teacher candidates will impact student learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Microteaching**
After developing a microteaching unit to include integrating technology, developing learning activities that enhance teaching and learning, using multiple teaching strategies student will present lesson to class scored using a grading rubric to include the following categories: anticipatory set, states the objectives, shows evidence of preparation, provides instructional input, demonstrates knowledge of subject matter, checks for comprehension, provides guided practice, provides independent practice, achieves closure, exhibits good personal qualities

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% will score an overall rubric score of 80% or greater.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Spring 2013 - Course not offered. Program only offered in Hattiesburg. Fall 2012 - 100% (3/3) students scored 80% or greater on the scoring rubric demonstrating the integration of technology in instruction for microteaching. Program only offered in Hattiesburg. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester. Program only offered in Hattiesburg.

**M 6: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE)**
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, communication skills, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 1 (A), Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the application of skills in a field-based experience. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of students will score mastery or exemplary on Indicator
26 of the TCPE, Candidate impacts learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Spring 2013 - 100% (3/3) students scored 80% or greater on Indicator 26 of the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) instrument, "Candidate impacts learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction." Program only offered in Hattiesburg. Fall 2012 - 100% (3/3) students scored 80% or greater on Indicator 26 of the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) instrument, "Candidate impacts learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction." Program only offered in Hattiesburg. Summer 2012 - Course not taught this semester. Program only offered in Hattiesburg.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Communication with Online Students**
An effort will be made to communicate with students enrolled in online courses to encourage their participation in completing and submitting assignments. If the instructor determines that the student is not submitting assignments, the instructor will contact the student to discuss his or her options which are to improve their assignments, complete submission process, and/or review tutorials regarding online courses.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2008-2009
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Two weeks after course begins.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Online Instructor

**Individualized Attention During Student Teaching**
Individualized attention will be given to the student who needs greater practice in writing student-centered lesson plans. This instruction will be given throughout the student teaching experience Spring 2014.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Student-Centered Lesson Plans | **Outcome/Objective:** Apply teaching/learning theories

- **Projected Completion Date:** 04/30/2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** D. Fisher

**Student Teaching Evaluations**
Individualized attention will be given to the student who needs more practice in applying teaching/learning theories. Evaluation will occur multiple times during the student teaching field experiences, Spring 2014.
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Business technology education students wrote unit plans using Depth of Knowledge (DOK) which prepared them for better lesson plan writing experiences during student teaching. The individual attention given to students who needed extra help writing student-centered lesson plans prove successful in the development of long lesson plans. All students passed their Praxis II and PLT exams. The students are continually successful in their student teaching experiences. Students are prepared to enter their first year of teaching and are sought after by districts needing business education teachers. In addition, editing the assessments for the business technology teacher education program will provide more meaningful data for future analysis. In 2013-2014, one of the student learning outcomes will change to focus on student achievement to include graduation, course completion, state licensing exams, student portfolios, and job placement rates.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Adding the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) as a measure for student learning outcomes will bring more awareness to this instrument during the methods courses which will give students a model of the expectations for their student teaching experience. The TCPE results for students show that more emphasis should be placed on the assessment section of their lesson plans. Students need more practice in writing and designing meaningful assessment, analyzing the results of the assessment, using the assessment to guide their teaching, and creating rubrics to use for their students. The rubrics for two-three portfolio assignments located in tk20 are inefficient. These assignments are required during the student teaching experiences; the rubrics will be modified by university supervisors and the educational field experience co-director for secondary education students. In addition to the current assessments, I will add the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) for the 2013-2014 year. The TIAI will be used by all teacher preparation programs in the State of Mississippi and has been aligned with M-Star, which is the Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Instructional Technology (Business Technology Education Emphasis-BTE) is historically within the original mission of The University of Southern Mississippi. The BTE program licenses students to teach business education in secondary schools grades 7-12. The BTE program at Southern Miss is one of two teacher preparation...
programs in the State of Mississippi and is committed to the outstanding preparation of future business teachers. The program is based on the premise of an active "community of learners" with the teacher candidates, faculty, staff, community members, and school district personnel working together to create a dynamic learning community. Through a planned sequential program built on evidence-based didactic course work aligned with authentic clinical experiences and state and national standards, teacher education candidates internalize and value the educational knowledge, skills and dispositions to inform, inspire and transform self and others including the 7-12 students in the classroom. Students completing the BTE program receive a well-designed, comprehensive education that will assist them in leading constructive lives and in achieving their personal and professional goals within the context of an ever-changing, technological society. These goals were and continue to be achieved through modeling for and striving to develop in our students strong theoretical, technical, and practical competence; appropriate professional behavior; appreciation for diversity; high standards of ethical behavior; and a commitment to lifelong learning. The BTE program provides unique educational opportunities to a specific population of students who wish to obtain a quality education that will lead to the pursuit of successful careers. BTE faculty are active researchers, serve as officers on state, regional, and national professional organizations. The BTE faculty improved the plan of study by implementing necessary changes to the BTE curriculum. The changes in the BTE curriculum reflect updated technology to bring the program more in line with what business education teachers are teaching in secondary settings as revealed in the Mississippi Department of Education frameworks. This change will make the best use of current and future resources as well as strengthen the curriculum and prepare future business teachers for the 7-12 Mississippi classroom. By participating in the redesign of the business education curriculum frameworks from the Mississippi Department of Education, students graduating from the BTE teacher preparation program are licensed to teach all academic business and career-technical business courses offered throughout the state.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
Faculty provide a variety of experiences that inform current and best practice in the field. Particular attention is given to professional dispositions during the field experiences so that candidates will be better prepared for the teacher internship. Formative assessments administered throughout the program are reviewed for individual candidates who are provided guidance and instruction throughout the program to ensure that each candidate obtains the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be an effective practitioner. One continuous improvement initiative is to work individually with students who need extra instruction in the writing of student-centered lesson plans in the methods course. The extra one-on-one time will help the students to develop the skills needed to write high quality lesson plans before they enter the student teaching experience.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Two action plans established in 2011-2012, were updated and extended through May 1, 2014. All other action plans are inactive. IT/BTE faculty meet regularly to review student dispositions and to develop remedial plans for those teacher candidates who require additional mentoring. Additionally methods course content is reviewed as well as the sequencing of coursework. In 2012-13, faculty met regularly to review the IT/BTE Plan of Study. The IT/BTE Plan of Study has been revised to align with the changes made to the Mississippi Department of Education business education frameworks.
Mission / Purpose

The School of Library and Information Science is committed to preparing its students for careers as library and information science professionals by offering a curriculum that is grounded in the traditional knowledge and skill areas of library and information science as well as focused on the diverse challenges of the future. The program embraces the philosophy that library and other information professionals must be prepared to participate in leadership roles for their profession and communities of service, be able to adapt to dynamic work environments and engage in life-long learning. The preparation of such individuals involves two fundamental elements; preparing candidates with the necessary intellectual and technical abilities to serve in the field of library and information science, and providing candidates with the appropriate perspectives of ethical responsibility and respect for diversity.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Knowledge of and Commitment to ethical practices
To foster and promote among master's degree candidates a knowledge of and commitment to ethical practice on the part of library and information professionals.

Related Measures:

M 1: Interpreting the Library Bill of Rights
Discuss and defend the articles of the Library Bill of Rights. Students write a scholarly essay with a minimum of 1500 words after reviewing the Library Bill of Rights and associated interpretations provided by the ALA. The students focus on evaluation of library collections, censorship and Recommendations for Challenged Materials. They must then locate an actual challenge or attempt to censor library materials (or restrict access) and explain how each of these sections relates to the challenge, or should have related to the challenge. The report is assessed using the writing rubric and assesses content based on the presence and quality of 1) An overview of the situation and material that was challenged (based on the documentation) and of the ALA stance on the issues (based upon the web pages and the documentation). 2) The completeness of the discussion of the implications for collection development or access with attention to a) if the challenge stands, and b) if the challenge fails. The last element assessed is the discussion of the implications for the larger community, schools, families, etc. a) if the challenge stands, and b) if the challenge fails. [LIS 511]

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
85% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking on the rubrics for interpreting the Library Bill of Rights.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
95% (42/44) students (combined, summer, fall and spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent. - Five licensure students: all met the target. - Thirty-seven non-licensure students met the target: 2 students did not turn in papers.

M 2: Develop balanced collection policies: group project

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
95% of students (groups) should achieve satisfactory ranking according to the rubrics for the collection development policies.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
OVERALL TARGET for 2012-2013 (combined summer, fall, spring) was NOT MET with 87% (48/55) students achieving satisfactory or excellent. There were 2 licensure students and both of them achieved excellent rating. Forty-six (out of 53) non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory. This assignment was taught as a group project although students were also evaluated individually.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Collection Development Policy
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that the group project assignment is an inappropriate cho...

SLO 2: Knowledge of the basic tenets of reference, collection development and cataloging
Master's degree candidates demonstrate knowledge of the basic tenets of reference through participation in the resolution of patrons' information problems, recognition of collection development/management of materials and information, management of libraries and other information agencies, and apply basic concepts and practices of cataloging. Candidates identify basic library and information science problems in the context of the mission of their parent institution and demonstrate creativity and initiative in their solution.

Related Measures:
M 3: Application of the information process: reference support
Demonstrate the role of the library and of the librarian in the information process:
Students analyze hypothetical reference questions, identify key concepts for searching reference materials, identify possible useful sources, and evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of that information.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 NOT MET 88% (56/64) students (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric. Two out of four licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory. Fifty-six out of sixty non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revised target percentage
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The curriculum committee has recommended that assessments from the introductory courses (LIS 501, 505 and 511) have uniform targ...

M 4: Procedures and policy for collections
Identify and develop procedures and policies for analyzing needs and providing a collection and services to meet those needs.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of the students achieve satisfactory rankings against the community analysis rubric. Students analyze a community setting to develop the information necessary to establish appropriate service and collection policies and write a community analysis report. The community analysis requires 1) a description of the library, 2) details of the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the library patrons and of the community it serves, 3) specific details of any focused service or community needs, 4) explanation of the sources of the data collected.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 NOT MET 87% (48/55) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory ranking against the rubric. One out of two licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory. Forty-seven out of fifty-three non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Procedures and Policy for Collections  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

The course materials and assessments will be reviewed again by the curriculum committee. The course has been taught by a numbe...

**M 5: Cataloging: Organization and services**  
Demonstrate ability to organize materials and services so that they are readily accessible to the public being served by a library or information center.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric  

**Target:**  
80% of students will achieve satisfactory performance of organizational activities related to the assignment rubrics

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 MET: 94% (51/54) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubrics. Eight out of eight licensure students achieved a rating of excellent or satisfactory. Forty-two out of forty-five non-licensure students achieved a rating of excellent or satisfactory.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**  
For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Cataloging: Organization and Services  
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013**

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that as an introductory course (one of the first three: L...

**M 12: Reference Interview Process**  
Students model the reference interview process including selecting resources and finding answers through video roleplaying. Source of Evidence(s); Written assignment(s), scored by a rubric; students are evaluated on a rubric in three ways-group, self, and instructor.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group  

**Target:**  
90% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**  
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 MET 97% (62/64)(combined summer, fall, spring) students achieved satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric. Three out of four licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.. Fifty-nine out of sixty non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory. One non-licensure student missed the sessions and did not receive credit in Fall 2012.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Reference Interview Process
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The target percentage will be revised to 85% to be in line with other target percentages for assessments associated with first t...

SLO 3: Professionalism
Master's degree candidates understand and appreciate the importance of professional organizations, continuing education, the evolution of libraries, and the library profession in the context of social and cultural diversities.

Related Measures:

M 6: Management of libraries and other information centers
Recognize, develop, evaluate, and discuss the elements of management theory, including goal setting, budget and fiscal management, collection management, program planning, implementation, and evaluation. Through professional readings and written analysis students will develop an understanding of the philosophy and principles of contemporary management theories, specifically their relevance to the management of libraries and other information centers.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
90% of students will achieve satisfactory ratings against the rubrics for written analyses of articles from the professional management literature.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 MET 92% (59/64) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubric. Seven out of seven licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ratings. Fifty-two out of fifty-seven non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ratings.

M 7: Professional concepts
Students examine and discuss the impact of the Library Bill of Rights and its significance to the past, present and future of library and information science to define a political image of librarianship in relation to censorship, filtering, the freedom of information and services to communities. Assessment considers the completeness of the discussion of the concept definition related to censorship and The Library Bill of Rights; issues including filtering, freedom of information access, and service to communities will be addressed.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
85% of students' analysis of the impact of the Library Bill of Rights on librarianship will rank satisfactory on the rubrics.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
OVERALL TARGET for 2012-2013 was met 95% (42/44) (combined summer, fall spring) students achieved satisfactory or excellent. Five
licensure students: all met the target Thirty-seven out of thirty-nine licensure students met the target

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Professional Concepts**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2012-2013

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that ONLY an introductory course (one of the first three:…

**SLO 4: Research foundations**

Master’s degree candidates demonstrate an understanding of scientific research, its role in building a knowledge base in library and information science, and demonstrate knowledge about research methods applicable to library and information studies and the ability to identify and apply appropriate research methodology to specific problems in library and information science.

**Related Measures:**

**M 8: Essential research**

Students demonstrate an ability to identify and apply appropriate research methodology to specific problems in library and information science.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

85% of students achieve satisfactory ranking against the research proposal rubric.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 MET 94% (51/54) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking. Three out of four licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking. Forty-eight out of fifty non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Essential Research**  
*Established in Cycle:* 2012-2013

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that ONLY an introductory course (one of the first three:…

**M 9: Master’s research project**

Students demonstrate an understanding of the process and role of research in the field of library and information science through the completion of a quality research document appropriate to the field. The process includes submission of a proposal beyond the research proposal for the LIS 668 Research Methods course, and
requires all the elements of a research article. Evaluation of the capstone Master's Project is by a student selected committee against the proposal and project rubric, and the student's own proposal design. Rubrics are scaled as good (clarity in presentation and compliance with good research approach), requires improvement (less clarity in presentation and compliance with good research approach), or unacceptable (unacceptable presentation, lack of good research approach).

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
95% of students achieve satisfactory against the rubric for the Master's Project as determined by at least two faculty evaluators.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 NOT MET 94% (49/52) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubrics. All 3 licensure students were rated satisfactory or excellent. Of the 49 non-licensure students, 3 were rated needs improvement—one in Spring 2013 and two in Fall 2012. In all three cases students did not incorporate feedback on their drafts that would have brought them into the satisfactory range.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Master's Research Project**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

Working with the instructor, the Curriculum Committee will verify that the timeline was appropriate for allowing students time...

**SLO 5: Technology literacy**
Candidates develop an awareness of the effects of technology on all library and information centers' operations and participate in technology applications to advance their skills and experiences.

**Related Measures:**

**M 10: Technology and organizations**
Candidates analyze new developments in information technologies and the ways in which these impact provision and usage of information on the part of professionals and patrons and demonstrate an understanding of the effects of technology on communication and organizational structures.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
90% of students should achieve a satisfactory rating based on the rubrics for analysis and reporting on professional reading and research activities in LIS 605 Library Management and LIS 651 Introduction to Information Science assignments. Assessment requires students demonstrate an ability to analyze, evaluate, and compare published reports of research studies in
library and information science and in disciplines other than library and information science.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
OVERALL TARGET 2012-2013 MET 94% (118/126) (combined summer, fall, spring) students achieved satisfactory Target for LIS 651 was MET: 95% (59/62) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubric. Five licensure students were rated as excellent or satisfactory. Fifty-four out of fifty-seven non-licensure students were rated as excellent or satisfactory. Target for 605 was MET: 92% (59/64) (combined summer, fall spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubric. All 7 licensure students were excellent or satisfactory. Fifty-four out of fifty-seven non-licensure students were excellent or satisfactory.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

re-evaluate course syllabi for clarity of instruction and rubric construction
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
LIS 651 Introduction to Information Science involves multiple topics including readings and assignments covering the historical ...

Technology and Organizations
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

In the Fall of 2012, a new technology elective requirement was put into place with students required to take one of three poss...

M 11: Technology tool assessment
Students utilize a variety of essential technologies to develop technology literacy appropriate to the library information science field.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory technological literacy through their use of a variety of current technologies, such as search engines, websites/webquests, pathfinders, blogs, wikis, task software such as Catalogers Desktop, ClassWeb, WebDewey, RDA toolkit, Lexis-Nexis, Credo, DIALOG, presentation software, wordprocessors, spreadsheets and other course identified software.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Not implemented this cycle.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Addressing an implementation failure
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
No data was collected from the courses specific to technology use during
this cycle. Faculty are currently identifying specific ...

**Technology Tool Assessment**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

It was decided on by the Curriculum Assessment Committee that this measure as it was written was too difficult to assess since...

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Addressing an implementation failure**

No data was collected from the courses specific to technology use during this cycle. Faculty are currently identifying specific technology tasks to be assessed. Faculty have also requested a modification to the MLIS program to require one of the five electives be selected from one of three very technology focused courses, LIS 516 Media Utilization, LIS 557 Computers in Libraries, LIS 558 Internet Resources for Librarianship. Specific technology tasks in the core courses will also be identified and a clarification of assessments designed.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

**Measure:** Technology tool assessment  
**Outcome/Objective:** Technology literacy

**Implementation Description:** The revised rubrics and clarification of technology assessment points are to be in place before the beginning of Spring 2012 semester.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 01/14/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty, Curriculum Committee, Director  
**Additional Resources Requested:** none  
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

**re-evaluate course syllabi for clarity of instruction and rubric construction**

LIS 651 Introduction to Information Science involves multiple topics including readings and assignments covering the historical development of technology and its impact on library and information science. Students read, analyze related historical research in the areas of communications, electronics, computer science and other allied disciplines that contribute to the modern library and information science center and its mission. Students also create literature reviews, and research proposals based on these readings. Faculty have determined the course needs to be re-evaluated to determine whether the content is too concentrated for one course, or if the instructions and rubrics are insufficient to support the students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Technology and organizations | Outcome/Objective: Technology literacy

Implementation Description: curriculum committee will review the syllabus and all documents of the last reporting cycle to determine the appropriate course of action. At the same time student progress in the current offering will be very carefully monitored for symptoms of correctable issues.

Projected Completion Date: 08/14/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum Committee and LIS 651 teaching faculty
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

**move assessment to less dense course, review presentation for topic**
The Library Bill of Rights assignment/assessment will be moved to Information: Libraries in Society (LIS 636). Faculty felt that the number of assessment points in LIS 511 created an unbalanced situation. Moving the assignment and spending more time reviewing writing and instructions should improve performance. Faculty will also examine the presentation of the basic materials for the topic to ensure there is sufficient support for this student activity.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: faculty will be reviewing the presentations associated with the assignment and redesigning the assignment for placement in another course.
Projected Completion Date: 05/08/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum committee, LIS 511 instructor, and LIS 636 Instructor
Additional Resources Requested: none

**review course and assessments**
Another assessment from LIS 511 Collection development that did not meet target in Spring 2012. The course materials and assessments will be reviewed.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: curriculum committee, LIS 511 instructor will review the course materials for spring 2012 and compare them to previously used materials to determine if there was a change or omission. The assessment itself will be reviewed.
Projected Completion Date: 08/13/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum committee and the LIS 511 instructor

**review design and implementation**
The plan for implementation of documenting the specified assessments failed. The assessment and process will have to be designed and implemented.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Curriculum committee and faculty will have to
redesign and plan implementation of same to provide this technology assessment.

**Responsive Person/Group:** Curriculum committee and whole faculty

**Cataloging: Organization and Services**

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that as an introductory course (one of the first three: LIS 501, LIS 505, and LIS 511), the target will be amended to 85% for the standardization in the first three class. It was felt that many new students struggle with adjusting to the online format, understanding class expectations, and time management; however, 80% was deemed to be too low after review.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Cataloging: Organization and services
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of the basic tenets of reference, collection development and cataloging

**Implementation Description:** Target will be amended.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2014
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee
**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Collection Development Policy**

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that the group project assignment is an inappropriate choice for assessment. The committee felt that some students’ grades would be negatively impacted by poor group members and in other cases, some students do more of the work (and in turn get more of the learning). The community analysis found in M4 is more appropriate as an individual project and as an in-depth research project.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Develop balanced collection policies: group project
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of and Commitment to ethical practices

**Implementation Description:** This assessment measure will be deleted for the next cycle. No replacement is planned at this time.

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2014
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee
**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Essntial Research**

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that ONLY an introductory course (one of the first three: LIS 501, LIS 505, and LIS 511) will have the target of 85%. For standardization, all other courses will have a target of 90% (excluding the Master's Project with a target of 95% as the final class). This reflects our expectation that students must reach higher standards as they progress throughout their coursework, and it was felt that students should be better prepared after the first
three classes for conducting research, time management, and understanding expectations.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Essential research  |  *Outcome/Objective:* Research foundations

**Implementation Description:** Amend target  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Master's Research Project**
Working with the instructor, the Curriculum Committee will verify that the timeline was appropriate for allowing students time to incorporate draft feedback in consideration with other graduation requirement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Master's research project  |  *Outcome/Objective:* Research foundations

**Implementation Description:** Review timeline for draft feedback and incorporation.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Procedures and Policy for Collections**
The course materials and assessments will be reviewed again by the curriculum committee. The course has been taught by a number of different faculty members; when new members teach it, an emphasis on the assessments being consistent will be stressed. Additionally, it has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that as an introductory course (one of the first three: LIS 501, LIS 505, and LIS 511), the target will be amended to 85% for the standardization in the first three classes. It was felt that many new students struggle with adjusting to the online format, understanding class expectations, and time management.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
*Measure:* Procedures and policy for collections  |  *Outcome/Objective:* Knowledge of the basic tenets of reference, collection development and cataloging

**Implementation Description:** Target will be amended. Discussion regarding faculty standardization in assessment will be carried out.
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum Committee  
Additional Resources Requested: None

**Professional Concepts**

It has been determined by the Curriculum Assessment Committee review that ONLY an introductory course (one of the first three: LIS 501, LIS 505, and LIS 511) will have the target will of 85%. For standardization, all other courses will have a target of 90% (excluding the Master’s Project with a target of 95% as the final class). It was felt that students should be better prepared after the first three classes for conducting research, time management, and understanding expectations.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Professional concepts  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Professionalism

Implementation Description: Amend target  
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum Committee  
Additional Resources Requested: None

**Reference Interview Process**

Target percentage for assessment will be revised to 85% to be consistent with target percentages for other assessments associated with the first three classes in the program -- LIS 501, 505 and 511.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Implementation Description: Revise target percentage  
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum Committee  
Additional Resources Requested: None

Reference Interview Process

The target percentage will be revised to 85% to be in line with other target percentages for assessments associated with first three classes in the program -- LIS 501, 505 and 511.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Reference Interview Process  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Knowledge of the basic tenets of reference, collection development and cataloging

Implementation Description: Revise target percentage to 85%  
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2014
Revised target percentage
The curriculum committee has recommended that assessments from the introductory courses (LIS 501, 505 and 511) have uniform targets percentages of 85%. The target on this assessment will be changed to 85% for the next year. It is felt that students entering the program are grappling with new material and foreign concepts and need time to get their bearings. After seeing the results of the Summer and Fall, the instructor surveyed the students and rearranged the presentation order of material covered in this assessment. There was improvement in Spring 2013. Future courses will be monitored to see if the improvement is consistent.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Application of the information process: reference support |
  Outcome/Objective: Knowledge of the basic tenets of reference, collection development and cataloging

Implementation Description: Target will be adjusted. Assessment will be monitored to see if improvement continues.
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum committee and instructor
Additional Resources Requested: None

Technology and Organizations
In the Fall of 2012, a new technology elective requirement was put into place with students required to take one of three possible courses as one of their electives. Assessment will be moved to LIS 557, LIS 558, and LIS 516. In each course a common assignment involving a type of Web page design has been identified and a common rubric will be distributed. These technology focused classes are more suited for fitting the student learning outcome. Additionally, the previously used classes did not address the "spirit" of M10.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Technology and organizations | Outcome/Objective: Technology literacy

Implementation Description: Assessment will be moved to a different course.
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum Committee
Additional Resources Requested: None

Technology Tool Assessment
It was decided on by the Curriculum Assessment Committee that this measure as it was written was too difficult to assess since the listed components were found in
multiple courses. Instead, M11 will be deleted since M10 in its new structure will address technology implementation and assessment.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Technology tool assessment  
**Outcome/Objective:** Technology literacy

**Implementation Description:** Measure will be deleted.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Video Reference Interview**
The target percentage will be revised to 85% to be in line with other target percentages for assessments associated with first three classes in the program -- LIS 501, 505 and 511.

**Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2014

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**
For the most part the students are demonstrating superior skills and comprehension of the tools of the field in their upper level courses. In light of their struggles in LIS 501, 505, and 511—the three introductory courses, it was determined that the performance target would be lowered to 85% for standardization and to help students as they learn how to balance coursework and jobs, life, etc. In several cases, although the target was met, it was determined that as upper level course assessments should be raised and standardized to 90%. Long-term reporting shows that overall this increase is warranted for assessments M5, M7, and M8. One assessment M2 was removed since it was deemed inappropriate by the Curriculum Assessment committee to rate a group project and M11 was removed as it was deemed impractical to assess. Overall, moving M1 from LIS 511 to LIS 636 indicates progress in student improvement. There was a new assessment (M12) created in response to last year's plan, and students were overall very successful in meeting the target. Additionally, M10 was moved to be assessed LIS 557, LIS 558, and LIS 516 using a common assignment.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
The introductory courses will be given standardized performance targets of 85% for the next cycle and whether they meet the new target will be monitored over the next several cycles. Additionally, as courses are often rotated among faculty, when a new faculty member teaches a course, it will be emphasized what the assessment for the course is and that the rubric and assessments be consistent. For M3, the instructor
rearranged the presentation order of material, and there has been improvement in Spring 2013 and future cycles will be monitored to see if the improvement continues. In the M9, the assessment target was not met, but only by one percentage point. It was suggested by the Curriculum Assessment Committee that the timeline of the coursework be re-evaluated to allow students adequate time to incorporate feedback. The Curriculum Assessment Committee will evaluate and potentially change M7 since it is now very similar to M1 and is located in the same course. Additionally, overall each measure will be re-evaluated to assess how and if we are meeting the outcome objectives as stated. Overall, there may be significant re-evaluation of the objectives and measures.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Master's of Library and Information Science program is accredited by the American Library Association, and is the only such program in the state of Mississippi, as well as one of only 62 ALA accredited Master's programs in North America. The School of Library and Information Science at The University of Southern Mississippi is one of only 22 American Library Association accredited programs that offer a fully online master's degree. The MLIS program produces professionals for all areas of the library/information fields; academic, public, school, archives, and special libraries all hire our graduates. Students from across the nation, including Hawaii and Alaska, participate in our MLIS program; we also have provided classes for students residing in Peru, Belize, India, England, Germany, Japan, the Virgin Islands, as well as other countries. We offer an online supplemental school library media specialist endorsement non-degree program that also attracts students from other states and other countries. During four of the last five years, the MLIS has been the most frequently awarded master's degree at The University of Southern Mississippi, and was the second most frequent the other year. Student enrollment averages between 140 and 150. Our graduates have gone on to earn doctoral degrees in programs at Urbana-Champaign Illinois, Rutgers, Simmons, University of Mississippi, Alabama, and others. The School has sponsored and directed the Fay B. Kaigler Children's Book Festival for the last 46 years. The festival attracts national attention and participants to the university for the Southern Mississippi Silver Medallion awarded annually for the last 44 years. The 2010 winner was illustrator David Wiesner, the 2011 winner was author T.A. Barron, the 2012 winner was author and poet Jane Yolen and the 2013 winner was author Jon Scieszka; all are recipients of multiple literary awards. They joined a long list of authors, illustrators and storytellers honored to receive the Medallion. Also in 2012, the Erza Jack Keats Book Awards were moved from the New York Public Library to the Festival for annual presentation. The festival is one of the features of The University of Southern Mississippi that is nationally recognized in conjunction with the de Grummond Children's Literature Collection. The School of Library and Information Science has been a leader in the development and offering of online courses since offering the first online courses in 1995. The MLIS was the first approved online Master's degree program at The University of Southern Mississippi (2002). SLIS faculty members have participated in the pilots for WebCT, Horizon Wimba, Live Classroom, Collaborate Live Classroom, and Podcasting and continue to be active in testing new technology appropriate for our field. Our courses now include aspects of Web and Library 2.0, social media, wikis, blogs, globs, social networking, and the evolving information technologies. The field of library and information science is a dynamic and evolving collection of many disciplines. Our students are prepared to work and excel in diverse venues, limited only by the imagination of the student. Our faculty have expertise in public, school, special and academic libraries as well as archives, museums, telecommunications, information science theory, digitization, records management,
distance education and much more. During 2013 we have had students receive prestigious internships at the Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C., the Smithsonian, and the National Park Service archives. The School of Library and Information Science engages in an ongoing self-review of all aspects of the program. As an American Library Association accredited program we report on our enrollments, student composition, activities, and budgets annually, and prepare a biennial overview report. We are conscious of the character and quality of our program as a component of retaining accreditation and presenting The University of Southern Mississippi in the best light. We underwent our seven year accreditation review in February 2012 and received the full 7 year continuing accreditation until 2019. ALA accreditation is essentially a continuous process, but the seven year review involves a focused campus visit by an assessment team composed of practitioners, educators and administrators in our disciplines. The standards of our accreditation cover the I Mission, Goals and Objectives of the program, II Curriculum, III Faculty, IV Students, V Administrative and Financial Support, and finally VI the Physical Resources and Facilities.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
The entire assessment process must be handled as a continuous improvement initiative. We are striving to align all of our assessments with our mission, goals and objectives as linked to the American Library Association's core competencies. We had hoped to accomplish this alignment in this cycle, but it will take several cycles to fully implement that redesign. Significant progress has been made, but we are still aligning courses and competencies. Additionally, one new faculty member was added during this past cycle and one new faculty member will be joining us in the next cycle. Each brings a new area of expertise which will allow SLIS to offer new courses and highlight their talent. A new internal PR committee was formed and created new materials for advertising the MLIS. In hopes of attracting more dual degree students, the requirements for the dual degree programs were updated. A concerted effort has been made to promote the successes of our students through national and international venues in order to raise our profile.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Since library and information science has very dynamic evolving technology systems and structures, e.g., Second Life, blogs, wikis, gaming, etc., we need to continuously monitor and appropriately increase technology engagement in the courses for the students. The Curriculum Committee has recently reviewed the technology implemented in each course and has selected a common assignment in three courses to serve as the assessment for M10. The Curriculum Committee will be reviewing the assignments in every course this next cycle to identify if there are more appropriate courses and assessments to use as measures as well as to improve the quality of the program by avoiding duplication. Additionally, as technology has been integrated into all courses, faculty will share information about new and exciting technologies incorporated in courses at the first faculty meeting in the Fall and Spring semesters. Students work with all forms of technology and social networking in order to be cognizant of their impact on society in general and the library community in particular. Students now use blogs, wikis, and review gaming as a teaching tool, and participate through the online courseware, Blackboard, in a wide number of technological tools: chat rooms, Wimba, podcasts,vodcasts, etc. The SLIS faculty has participated in multiple LEC technology trainings on Blackboard in order to incorporate tools in the most successful manner.
Mission / Purpose

The primary mission of the undergraduate mathematics licensure program is to
• Develop mathematical thinking and communication skills
• Communicate the breadth and interconnections of the mathematical sciences
• Require study in depth
• Use technology for problem solving and to promote understanding
• Impart an appreciation of the history of mathematics and its applications, including recent work.
• Prepare students to be effective secondary school teachers.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Understand and apply calculus
Students should understand theory and applications of calculus.

Relevant Associations:

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio
Each student has a Mathematics Student Portfolio compiled by the faculty. The Mathematics Student Portfolio contains work by the student that demonstrates proof skills, problem solving, use of technology, writing skills, depth of knowledge, and knowledge of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

Target:
80% of the graduates will have Mathematics Student Portfolios with: a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 1 (proofs), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 2 (problem solving), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 3 (technology), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 4 (writing), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 5 (depth), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 6 (breath and interconnections), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

SLO 2: Understand and construct proofs
Students will learn the fundamental logic needed for deductive reasoning and will construct proofs of elementary theorems using quantifiers, indirect and direct proofs, and mathematical induction.
Relevant Associations:

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio
Each student has a Mathematics Student Portfolio complied by the faculty. The Mathematics Student Portfolio contains work by the student that demonstrates proof skills, problem solving, use of technology, writing skills, depth of knowledge, and knowledge of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

Target:
80% of the graduates will have Mathematics Student Portfolios with: a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 1 (proofs), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

M 5: Alumni Survey
Every fall a survey will be sent to those alumni who graduated three-years, seven-years, fifteen-years, or twenty-one years ago.

Target:
80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 2 (proofs).

SLO 3: Be aware of breadth and interconnections
Students should possess an understanding of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their deep interconnecting principles; an awareness of the abstract nature of theoretical mathematics and the ability to write proofs; and an in depth understanding of at least one subject in mathematics.

Relevant Associations:

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio
Each student has a Mathematics Student Portfolio complied by the faculty. The Mathematics Student Portfolio contains work by the student that demonstrates proof skills, problem solving, use of technology, writing skills, depth of knowledge, and knowledge of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

Target:
80% of the graduates will have Mathematics Student Portfolios with: a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 1 (proofs), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

M 2: Capstone Course
A graduate’s performance in the capstone course will be deemed satisfactory.

Target:
80% pass rate in the capstone course with a grade of C or better. A grade of C indicates that the student has successfully completed the two student
teaching experiences and demonstrated concomitant understanding of classroom management skills and knowledge of mathematical pedagogy.

**M 3: End-Program Test**
All mathematics licensure majors will take a departmentally designed examination that will test their knowledge of geometry, abstract algebra, probability, and history of mathematics.

**Target:**
50% of the students taking the End-Program Test will score at least 50% as determined by a departmentally developed rubric.

**M 5: Alumni Survey**
Every fall a survey will be sent to those alumni who graduated three-years, seven-years, fifteen-years, or twenty-one years ago.

**Target:**
80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 1 (breath and interconnections).

**SLO 4: Be mathematically conversant**
Students should be mathematically conversant.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**
Each student has a Mathematics Student Portfolio compiled by the faculty. The Mathematics Student Portfolio contains work by the student that demonstrates proof skills, problem solving, use of technology, writing skills, depth of knowledge, and knowledge of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

**Target:**
80% of the graduates will have Mathematics Student Portfolios with: a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 1 (proofs), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 2 (problem solving), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 3 (technology), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 4 (writing), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 5 (depth), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 6 (breath and interconnections), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

**M 2: Capstone Course**
A graduate’s performance in the capstone course will be deemed satisfactory.

**Target:**
80% pass rate in the capstone course with a grade of C or better. A grade of C indicates that the student has successfully completed the two student teaching experiences and demonstrated concomitant understanding of classroom management skills and knowledge of mathematical pedagogy.

**M 3: End-Program Test**
All mathematics licensure majors will take a departmentally designed examination that will test their knowledge of geometry, abstract algebra, probability, and history of mathematics.

**Target:**
50% of the students taking the End-Program Test will score at least 50% as determined by a departmentally developed rubric.

**M 5: Alumni Survey**
Every fall a survey will be sent to those alumni who graduated three-years, seven-years, fifteen-years, or twenty-one years ago.

**Target:**
80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 3 (communication).

**SLO 5: Write computer program and use technology to solve mathematical problems**
Students should be able to write computer programs in a high level language using appropriate data structure to solve mathematical problems. Students should be able to create and document algorithms. Students should be able to use the computer for simulation and visualization of mathematical ideas and processes.

**Relevant Associations:**

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Portfolio**
Each student has a Mathematics Student Portfolio compiled by the faculty. The Mathematics Student Portfolio contains work by the student that demonstrates proof skills, problem solving, use of technology, writing skills, depth of knowledge, and knowledge of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

**Target:**
80% of the graduates will have Mathematics Student Portfolios with: a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 3 (technology), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

**M 5: Alumni Survey**
Every fall a survey will be sent to those alumni who graduated three-years, seven-years, fifteen-years, or twenty-one years ago.

**Target:**
The alumni Survey does not address the question about computer programming or technology. This target has been deleted from this assessment.

**SLO 6: Prepare for employment or graduate study**
The program prepares students to be effective secondary school teachers and/or to be prepared for graduate school.

**Relevant Associations:**
Related Measures:

M 2: Capstone Course
A graduate’s performance in the capstone course will be deemed satisfactory.

Target:
80% pass rate in the capstone course with a grade of C or better. A grade of C indicates that the student has successfully completed the two student teaching experiences and demonstrated concomitant understanding of classroom management skills and knowledge of mathematical pedagogy.

M 5: Alumni Survey
Every fall a survey will be sent to those alumni who graduated three-years, seven-years, fifteen-years, or twenty-one years ago.

Target:
80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 4 (employment), a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 5 (graduate school).

Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O/O 7: Accomplish program mission goals
There is evidence from the graduates of the MATHLBS program that the program mission and objectives have been met.

Relevant Associations:

Related Measures:

M 1: Portfolio
Each student has a Mathematics Student Portfolio compiled by the faculty. The Mathematics Student Portfolio contains work by the student that demonstrates proof skills, problem solving, use of technology, writing skills, depth of knowledge, and knowledge of the breadth of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

Target:
80% of the graduates will have Mathematics Student Portfolios with: a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 1 (proofs), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 2 (problem solving), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 3 (technology), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 4 (writing), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 5 (depth), a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over element 6 (breath and interconnections), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

M 3: End-Program Test
All mathematics licensure majors will take a departmentally designed examination that will test their knowledge of geometry, abstract algebra, probability, and history of mathematics.
**Target:**
50% of the students taking the End-Program Test will score at least 50% as determined by a departmentally developed rubric.

**M 5: Alumni Survey**
Every fall a survey will be sent to those alumni who graduated three-years, seven-years, fifteen-years, or twenty-one years ago.

**Target:**
80% of alumni surveys will have: an average score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 over questions 1-12 (goals).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Decide on the assessment of calculus knowledge.**
Most students receive their calculus training before entering USM. The department needs to decide whether it is important to assess calculus knowledge or not.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Wallace Pye and the mathematics faculty.
- **Additional Resources Requested:** None.

**Restructure MAT 305 or leave it as it is.**
MAT 305 presently reinforces calculus knowledge through MAPLE programming. Perhaps the course should use a variety of mathematics software packages. It may be better for our students to require another computer science language and not require MAT 305.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Wallace Pye and the mathematics faculty.
- **Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Create new course in place of 309**
New NCTM and NCATE requirements created a need to show competency in arithmetic. MAT 309 was added to meet the need. However, MAT 309 is an elementary education course. There is a need to create and implement a new course that will meet the NCTM and NCATE need.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2008
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Mathematics education committee
Final Exam Assessment
A set of common problems and questions to be included in final examination in selected courses has been developed to assess students' knowledge of proofs, problem solving, technology, number operations, calculus, geometry and measurement, discrete mathematics, statistics and probability, linear algebra, modern algebra, and history of mathematics. Assessment data will be available for year 2008-2009.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Fall 2007. Data will be available for fall 2008.
Responsible Person/Group: Jose Contreras and the Mathematics faculty

Homework assessment
A set of common homework problems and questions to be used in selected courses has been developed to assess students' knowledge of proofs, problem solving, technology, number operations, calculus, geometry and measurement, discrete mathematics, statistics and probability, linear algebra, modern algebra, and history of mathematics. Assessment data will be available for year 2008-2009.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2007. Data will be available for fall 2008.
Responsible Person/Group: Jose Contreras and the Mathematics faculty

Exit survey data collection
Improve collection procedure for exit survey of graduating seniors.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Summer 09
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chen and the faculty
Mission / Purpose

TBA

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Music Theory
Students will acquire a sufficient understanding and capability with musical forms, processes and structures to use this knowledge and skill in compositional, performance, analytical, scholarly and pedagogical applications according to the requisites of their specializations. Students must also acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

Related Measures:

M 1: Music Theory (MUS 202) Test 1
Unit Test 1 for MUS 202 will demonstrate the students' ability to understand the elements of music and their interaction through two activities: (1) analysis of a musical score excerpt, and (2) composition and notation of music.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score passing grades on the MUS 202 Unit Test 1 demonstrating the ability to understand the common elements of music and their interaction in both analytical and compositional tasks.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
96% of the students scored passing grades on the MUS 202 Unit Test 1.

M 2: Aural Dictation
Dictation Test 3 for MUS 202L will demonstrate the students' ability to take aural dictation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of the students will score passing grades on the MUS 202L Dictation Test 3 demonstrating the ability to take aural dictation.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
98% of the students scored passing grades on the MUS 202L Dictation Test 3.

M 3: Score Analysis
Scores for three major analysis projects in MUS 302 Form Analysis class will measure each student's ability to apply their knowledge of musical forms, processes and structures to the understanding of classical compositions. These assignments require compositional, performance, analytical, scholarly and pedagogical perspectives and insights.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of the students will average B or better on the three MUS 302 analysis projects, thus demonstrating their understanding of musical forms, processes and structures.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
84% of the students averaged C or better on the three MUS 302 analysis projects.

**M 4: Composition**
Composition projects in MUS 201 help students to gain a basic understanding of how to work freely and cogently with musical materials in a composition activity. Each student is required to prepare and notate an original composition and to supervise its performance in a class recital. Grades for this project will measure student achievement.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of the students will score passing grades on their composition projects.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
97% of the students scored B or better on their composition project.

**SLO 2: Music History**
The student will improve their understanding of Music History in a variety of ways. The student will be able to work intellectually with relationships between music and music literature within cultural/historical contexts. The student will also demonstrate knowledge of musical style in a variety of cultures and historical periods. Finally, the student will understand the evolving relationships among musical structure, music history, performance practices, and the influence of such evolutions on musical and cultural change. Students will demonstrate knowledge of musical style in a variety of cultures and historical periods. The student will use effectively the tools of scholarship including spoken and written language, research techniques, advanced musical analysis, and applicable technologies. Reading skill in foreign languages is essential for music history majors. The student will demonstrate the ability to engage in independent study on a chosen topic.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Music History Quizzes and Exams**
Students will be measured by several exams and/or quizzes.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
70% will score 65% or better.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Spring 2013: 90% earned 65% or better Fall 2012: 77% earned 65% or better

M 6: Music History Class Discussion and Oral Presentation
Students will be assessed on general historical concepts based on in-class participation/discussion. They will also be assessed by a written term paper and oral presentation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
70% will score 65% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Spring 2013: 90% earned a 65% or better Fall 2012: 77% earned a 65% or better

M 7: Music History Term Paper and Bibliography
Students will be assessed by a written term paper. Students will also be assessed by producing a bibliography for a term paper.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
70% will score 65% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Spring 2013: 86% earned a 65% or better Fall 2012: 73% earned a 65% or better

SLO 3: Applied Lessons
Students will refine their fundamentals and increase their musical maturity through one on one applied study on their major instrument.

Related Measures:

M 8: Applied Lessons: Sophomore Proficiency Exam
In order to pass the proficiency examination typically taken at the end of their second year of applied study, the student will need to demonstrate competency in fundamental and musical skills on their respective instruments. Passing this examination will allow the student to enroll in upper division lessons.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
80% of the students taking the proficiency will score passing grades demonstrating the ability to understand advanced concepts of tone, intonation, musicality and technique.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
55 took the proficiency, 45 passed= 81%

M 9: Applied Lessons: Juries
Given at the conclusion of each semester of applied study, the jury examination measures a student's ability to demonstrate the culmination of their semester's work through the performance of a solo piece on their major instrument.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of the students taking the jury examination will score B or better demonstrating their ability to amply prepare and perform a solo work that includes technical and musical challenges.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
304 took juries, 266 passed= 87%

**SLO 4: Ensembles**
Students will be able to successfully perform their part, play in time, play in tune, and blend with their section.

**Related Measures:**

**M 10: Ensemble Performance**
Live Playing Assessment: either for the conductor within the large ensemble rehearsal, or within a sectional.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of students will achieve a grade of "B" or higher on their assessments.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved a grade of "B" or higher in both semesters.

**M 11: Ensemble Recording**
Student created performance video: student will record his or herself performing their part and submit for evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of students will achieve a grade of "B" or higher on their assessments.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved a grade of "B" or higher in both semesters.

**M 12: Ensemble Attendance**
Students attend rehearsals and performance.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
80% of students will achieve a grade of "B" or higher on their assessments.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
95% of students achieved a grade of "B" or higher in both semesters.
M 13: Ensemble: Feedback
Students are able to give critical feedback about the elements of the rehearsal or performance, either in a verbal discussion, though making changes in their own performance, or through written means.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% of students will achieve a grade of "B" or higher on their assessments.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
95% of students achieved a grade of "B" or higher in both semesters.

SLO 5: Recital Class
Students will better understand a variety of instruments/voices and their unique idiosyncrasies from weekly exposure in a concert performance setting. From this they will also better grasp repertoire from different genres of music. Students will develop their observation and evaluation of performance-related skills. Finally, students will get the opportunity to better practice and assess their own performance. Students will develop a greater ability to critically assess performances.

Related Measures:

M 14: Recital Class: Attendance
Students are graded on their weekly Recital Class attendance and participation. Students are also graded on their attendance of twelve evening performances.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
80% of students will receive a final grade of "P" in the course.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
95% earned a "P" in the course for both semesters.

M 15: Recital Class: Performance/Evaluation
Students are graded on their preparation of a piece or set of pieces for performance in class or for an evening performance. They then submit written feedback of the preparation process and an assessment of their performance (based upon their experience and viewing or listening to a recording).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
80% of students will receive a final grade of "P" in the course.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
95% received a final grade of "P" in the course.

SLO 6: MED 221, MED 320, MED 321, MED 411, MED 427, MED 450
Students will learn specific instrumental and vocal pedagogy for the development of expert teaching of various instruments, and the voice. Establishing, planning for, and executing grade appropriate goals, objectives, and assessments will be an integral part of these curricula. (music education specific pedagogy)
Related Measures:

**M 16:Exams**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 17:Demonstrations**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 18:Demonstrations II**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**SLO 7: MED 311, MED 312, MED 313**
Students will learn to assimilate content knowledge from previous courses in a practicum course format, which will allow students to demonstrate expert pedagogy within context of the learning sequence in music and the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school.

**Related Measures:**
M 16: Exams
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 17: Demonstrations
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 19: Demonstrations III
Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals using lesson plans, developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessment of student achievement as appropriate for early childhood through high school levels of instruction.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 20: Exams II
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level
Target:
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 8: MED 410, MED 493, MED 494
Students will use all prior course content and practicum experiences to successfully demonstrate content knowledge, pedagogical skill, and evaluative processes that result in teaching licensure.

Related Measures:

M 16: Exams
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 17: Demonstrations
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 9: All BME Courses
Students will use pedagogy and content knowledge of the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school to develop and execute short-term and long-term curriculum goals for various music education school settings. (curriculum plans, curriculum execution, lesson plans)

Related Measures:

M 16: Exams
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 17: Demonstrations**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**SLO 10: BME and other Music Courses Combined**
Students will learn music-centric content from various music education and general music courses in order to build knowledge for informing all planning, executing, and assessing music education curricula that leads to expert teaching pedagogy. (all music education and other music area content as each informs pedagogy)

**Related Measures:**

**M 16: Exams**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 17: Demonstrations**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**SLO 11: Overall Pedagogy**
Students will learn education-centric content knowledge and pedagogy in areas of classroom management, student-centered learning, learning style assessment, special learners, state, local and national education standards, and evaluative processes, as each informs the development of expert teaching pedagogy.

**Related Measures:**

**M 16: Exams**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**M 17: Demonstrations**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
Of all students enrolled in these courses, 83% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 83% for all courses in this group was met with 84% of all students earning a grade of B or higher. No course showed less than 84% of students earning a grade of B or higher.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Master of Music Education is to develop among its students advanced research and writing skills, a detailed knowledge of music theory and history, and greater depth in their chosen emphasis, with the goal of preparing them for entrance into Ph.D. or DMA programs or advancement in the field of music and specifically music education. It is to offer a general music education as well as the following important goals: -The ability to plan and implement music instruction with grade appropriate goals, objectives, and assessments, -The ability to demonstrate the relationship between the learning sequence in music and the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Music Education-Specific Pedagogy
Students will learn specific instrumental and vocal pedagogy for the development of expert teaching of various instruments, and the voice. Establishing, planning for, and executing grade appropriate goals, objectives, and assessments will be an integral part of these curricula.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: Teaching Demonstration
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Classroom Management Presentation
Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals using lesson plans, developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessment of student achievement as appropriate for early childhood through high school levels of instruction.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in capstone courses, 95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 2: Music Education Pedagogy Assimilated with History, Literature, Conducting, and Theory Content Knowledge
Students will learn pedagogical tools for using music education content knowledge, as well as related content from non-pedagogy based courses, to teach in all music education classroom settings.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: Teaching Demonstration
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Classroom Management Presentation
Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals using lesson plans, developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessment of student achievement as appropriate for early childhood through high school levels of instruction.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in capstones courses, 95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 3: Curriculum Development, Curriculum Execution, Lesson Plans
Students will be able to use content knowledge to develop curriculum models based on alignment of instructional goals and student achievement outcomes from early childhood curricula through to high school curricula, including AP and IB courses. These constructs are informed by content knowledge of implementing grade appropriate goals, objectives, and assessments, while accounting for the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: Teaching Demonstration
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Classroom Management Presentation
Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals using lesson plans, developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessment of student achievement as appropriate for early childhood through high school levels of instruction.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in capstones courses, 95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 4: All music Education and Other Music Area Content as it Informs Pedagogy
Students will learn music-centric content from various music education and general music courses in order to build knowledge to inform all planning, executing, and assessing music education curricula that leads to expert teaching pedagogy.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: Teaching Demonstration
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Classroom Management Presentation
Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals using lesson plans, developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessment of student achievement as appropriate for early childhood through high school levels of instruction.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in capstones courses, 95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 5: Classroom Management
Students will learn education-centric content knowledge and pedagogy in areas of classroom management, student-centered learning, learning style assessment, special learners, state-local and national education standards, and evaluative processes, as each informs development of expert teaching pedagogy.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: Teaching Demonstration
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through micro-teaching demonstrations, assessed by peers and instructors.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group
Target:
Of all students enrolled in courses taken prior to capstone courses, 90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 90% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all pre-capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 90% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Classroom Management Presentation
Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals using lesson plans, developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessment of student achievement as appropriate for early childhood through high school levels of instruction.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
Of all students enrolled in capstones courses, 95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all capstone courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Improve Accuracy of Findings
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The findings in this cycle clearly need to be more measure-specific next year so as to be able to better see the results of each...

SLO 6: Comprehensive Exam
All students completing the MMEd degree will be required to demonstrate knowledge of expert pedagogy in music education as measured by an exit/comprehensive exam. This exam will include content knowledge in subjects, which further inform curriculum design developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessments of student achievement as appropriate for all grade levels of music instruction, while accounting for the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school.

Related Measures:

M 4: Comprehensive Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
Additional target (comprehensive exams): Of all students taking MME
comprehensive exams, 90% of students will receive a grade of pass (assessment results are identified as pass or fail).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 90% of all students receiving a pass grade on comprehensive exams was met.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Add Second Measure**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
This outcome needs a second measure next year.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Add Second Measure**  
This outcome needs a second measure next year.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
  **Implementation Status:** Planned  
  **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  - **Measure:** Comprehensive Exam  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Comprehensive Exam

**Improve Accuracy of Findings**
The findings in this cycle clearly need to be more measure-specific next year so as to be able to better see the results of each target.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013  
  **Implementation Status:** Planned  
  **Priority:** High

  **Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
  - **Measure:** Classroom Management Presentation  
  - **Outcome/Objective:** Classroom Management
Mission / Purpose

This degree's mission is to provide students with the ability to plan and implement music instruction with grade appropriate goals, objectives, and assessments, as well as the ability to demonstrate the relationship between the learning sequence in music and the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through the terminal degree.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Research Design
Students will learn research designs and the application of research findings as it informs expert teaching pedagogy.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: In-Class Discussion
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through classroom discussion.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Research Summary
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through written and verbally presented research summaries.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 4: Written Exam**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**SLO 2: Research Design Application**
Students will learn pedagogical tools for implementing original research as informed by knowledge of research design.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Written Exam**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 2: In-Class Discussion**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through classroom discussion.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.
courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 3: Research Summary**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through written and verbally presented research summaries.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 4: Written Exam**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**SLO 3: Curriculum and Instruction**
Students will learn pedagogical tools as applied to areas of curriculum development and expert instruction.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Written Exam**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 2: In-Class Discussion**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through classroom discussion.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Research Summary
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through written and verbally presented research summaries.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 4: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target:
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 4: Leadership and Administration
Students will learn pedagogical tools for expert music instruction as part of leadership and administration.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all
courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 2: In-Class Discussion
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through classroom discussion.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: 95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 3: Research Summary
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through written and verbally presented research summaries.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target: 95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

M 4: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Target: 95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

SLO 5: Cognate
Students will learn education-centric content knowledge in one specific cognate area. Content knowledge will be assimilated into outcomes 1-4 and be in part assessed through the successful completion of a dissertation.

Related Measures:

M 1: Written Exam
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through written examination.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 2: In-Class Discussion**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through classroom discussion.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 3: Research Summary**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge through written and verbally presented research summaries.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**M 4: Written Exam**
Students will demonstrate content knowledge achievement through a final exam where all course content is assimilated.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
95% of pre-dissertation students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Improve Accuracy of Findings  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

The findings in this cycle clearly need to be more measure-specific next year so as to be able to better see the results of each...

**SLO 6: Comprehensive Exam**

All students completing the PhD degree will be able to demonstrate overall knowledge of expert pedagogy in music education as per degree curriculum. This knowledge will include content in subjects which further inform curriculum design developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessments of student achievement as appropriate for all grade levels of music instruction, while accounting for the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Comprehensive Exam**

All students completing the PhD degree will be required to demonstrate knowledge of expert pedagogy in music education as measured by an exit/comprehensive exam. This exam will include content knowledge in subjects which further inform curriculum design developed through knowledge of goals, objectives, and assessments of student achievement as appropriate for all grade levels of music instruction, while accounting for the physical, psychological, and emotional development of students from early childhood through high school.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**

Of all students taking PhD comprehensive exams, 100% of students will receive a grade of pass (assessment results are identified as pass or fail).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

The mean target of 95% of all students earning a grade of B or higher in all courses was met. No course showed less than 95% of students earning a grade of B or higher.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Add Second Measure**

*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*

This outcome needs a second measure next year.
Improve Accuracy of Findings
The findings in this cycle clearly need to be more measure-specific next year so as to be able to better see the results of each target.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Written Exam | Outcome/Objective: Cognate
Mission / Purpose

The purpose of the baccalaureate physics licensure program is to transmit, create, and apply the knowledge and methods of physics and physics education. The program develops an understanding of content knowledge and methodology, and as well, fosters a broad intellectual foundation for the practitioner to the extent that he or she may become a high school teacher or pursue graduate study to become a scientist.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Understand fundamentals of physics
Students understand fundamentals of physics with a broad intellectual foundation.

Relevant Associations:
National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis I
Passing score on the Praxis I examination: (tests competency in reading, writing, & mathematics). Majors must pass Praxis I in order to teach.

Target:
100% pass rate.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Current licensure student not ready to take Praxis I.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Recruitment & Retention
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The department must emphasize recruitment & retention efforts for the physics licensure program.

M 2: Praxis II
Passing score on the physics content section of the Praxis II examination. Praxis II is content-specific (i.e. physics). Majors must pass Praxis II in order to teach.

Target:
100% pass rate.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Current licensure student not ready to take Praxis II.
M 13: Research Project
All majors are required to conduct at least 3 hours of faculty-supervised research. Each major will write a research report in junior or senior academic year based on the research project.

**Target:**
80% of majors will score 80% or higher on the research project.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The current licensure student has not yet conducted any independent research.

SLO 2: Obtain entrance to graduate program using skills
Student will develop knowledge base in physics and instructional methods adequate for admission to graduate programs in education and science education.

**Relevant Associations:**
NSTA

**Related Measures:**

M 5: Employment
The rate of employment of recent majors (within 1 year of graduation), including admission to graduate school.

**Target:**
90% of physics licensure students are to find gainful employment as teachers and/or entrance into graduate school within 1 year of graduation from USM.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The program does not have a graduate within the past year.

M 8: University Supervisor Final Evaluation
Evaluation completed by major’s University Supervisor during teacher candidacy (i.e. student teaching).

**Target:**
Each major will earn scores of 80% or higher.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The current licensure student has not gone through student teaching (therefore has not been supervised).

SLO 3: Communication physics topics in an oral format
Students must demonstrate effective oral communication of a physics-related topic.

**Relevant Associations:**
NSTA

**Related Measures:**

M 6: Society of Physics Students
The Society of Physics Students will conduct at least one outreach activity per academic year.
Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target:**
SPS will document its various outreach activities (either on or off campus) for each academic year.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The Society of Physics Students hosted a visit from a class (16 students + teacher) from Bassfield High School, MS, in the Fall of 2012. The Bassfield students were given tours of physics labs & the campus, attended a lecture, and worked on a mechanics problem (momentum) in a physics lab.

**M 9: Oral Presentation**
Each major will present at least one departmental seminar based on a research or advanced laboratory project. Presentations will be evaluated by faculty for feedback to the student.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
75% of majors will score 75% or higher on presentation.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The current licensure student has not reached the stage to conduct independent research (and therefore give a presentation on it).

**M 10: Public Forum Presentation**
Students will be encouraged to give an oral presentation at a state, regional or national scientific conference.

**Target:**
25% of majors.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The current licensure student has not yet conducted any independent research (and therefore not yet given a presentation on the research).

**SLO 4: Communication physics topics in a written format**
Students must demonstrate effective written communication of physics-related topic.

**Relevant Associations:**
NSTA

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Thesis**
Students will be encouraged to complete a senior thesis.

**Target:**
15% of majors.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Current licensure student is not a senior (& therefore has not worked on a senior thesis).
M 7: Publication
Students will be encouraged to publish a research article in a scientific journal within one year of graduation.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target:
10% of majors.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The current licensure student is not at the stage to conduct independent research.

M 11: Research Report
All majors are required to conduct at least 3 hours of faculty-supervised research. Each major will write a research report in junior or senior academic year based on the research project (PHY 499).

Target:
75% of majors will score 75% or higher on the research report.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The current licensure student has yet to conduct any independent research (and therefore to write a research report).

M 13: Research Project
All majors are required to conduct at least 3 hours of faculty-supervised research. Each major will write a research report in junior or senior academic year based on the research project.

Target:
80% of majors will score 80% or higher on the research project.

M 14: Literature Review
Each major will conduct a literature search relevant to their faculty-supervised research topic (to be reviewed by the faculty member).

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% of majors will score 80% or higher on the literature review.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The current licensure student has not yet conducted any independent research (or therefore conducted a literature review).

SLO 5: Knowledge and skills of physics teachers
Students will have a well-developed knowledge base in physics and instructional methods to become practitioners.

Relevant Associations:
NSTA (National Science Teachers Association), MSTA (MS Science Teachers Association, the state branch of NSTA)
Related Measures:

**M 1: Praxis I**
Passing score on the Praxis I examination: (tests competency in reading, writing, & mathematics). Majors must pass Praxis I in order to teach.

**Target:**
100% pass rate.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Current licensure student not ready to take Praxis 1.

**M 2: Praxis II**
Passing score on the physics content section of the Praxis II examination. Praxis II is content-specific (i.e. physics). Majors must pass Praxis II in order to teach.

**Target:**
100% pass rate.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Current licensure student not ready to take Praxis II.

**M 3: Mentor Evaluation**
Mentor Teacher Formative Evaluation form (completed by two separate mentor teachers during teacher candidacy).

**Target:**
Average scores of 80% or greater.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Current licensure student has not yet done student teaching (in order to be evaluated by mentor teachers).

**M 5: Employment**
The rate of employment of recent majors (within 1 year of graduation), including admission to graduate school.

**Target:**
90% percent employment rate including graduate school admission.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
The department does not have a graduate within the past year.

**M 6: Society of Physics Students**
The Society of Physics Students will conduct at least one outreach activity per academic year.

Source of Evidence: Activity volume

**Target:**
Licensure students will become members of the Society of Physics Students by their junior year.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: **Met**
The current licensure student is not yet a junior, so is not expected to have joined SPS.

**M 12: Methods of Teaching Science**
Successful completion of middle and high school student teaching experiences (which together cover a complete semester). Common rubrics are developed amongst the science faculty (biology, chemistry, & physics) that teach the associated course.

**Target:**
85% completion on first attempt.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: **Not Reported This Cycle**
The current licensure student has not yet taken the course that teaches methods.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Create standardized lesson plan assessment**
Create standardized lesson plan & accompanying assessment in conjunction with departments of chemistry, biology, and mathematics. All licensure majors must create lesson plans as part of their teaching experiences.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Dec. 31 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Christopher Sirola

**Recruitment into program**
Contact area schools & high school students in order to recruit future licensure majors.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Dec. 31 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Christopher Sirola

**Create standardized lesson plan assessment**
Create standardized lesson plan & accompanying assessment in conjunction with departments of chemistry, biology, and mathematics. All licensure majors must create lesson plans as part of their teaching experiences.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Dec. 31 2006  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Christopher Sirola

**Recruitment into program**
The department needs to contact area schools & high school students in order to recruit future licensure majors. We also need to include other potential sources, including returning students from industry and local community colleges. Finally, we need to become more visible in the community at large.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Implementation Description: Dec. 31 2006  
Responsible Person/Group: Christopher Sirola

Department Review
The department needs to evaluate its program assessments, revisit its outcomes/objectives, and assign reporting duties to appropriate personnel.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Medium  
Implementation Description: Sept. 30, 2008  
Responsible Person/Group: Chris Sirola, Khin Maung

Recruitment
We need to make a concerted effort to recruit potential candidates into the licensure program.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Enhance outreach to local high schools & facilitate contacts with local high school physics teachers & principals.  
Projected Completion Date: 12/30/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Sirola  
Additional Resources Requested: Travel money.

Retention
We often have students express interest in the licensure program & even begin taking licensure-specific courses, but students tend to drop out of the program within a year or so after. We need to investigate why this happens.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Contact current/former physics licensure majors regarding retention.  
Projected Completion Date: 12/30/2010  
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Sirola  
Additional Resources Requested: Potential travel $$. 

Recruitment & Retention
The department must emphasize recruitment & retention efforts for the physics licensure program.

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
- **Measure:** Praxis I  
- **Outcome/Objective:** Understand fundamentals of physics

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Sirola
Mission / Purpose

Psychology is the scientific study of behavior, and application of that knowledge for the betterment of humankind. Accordingly, the above programs seek to prepare students to become competent, professional psychologists who approach the science and practice of psychology from an empirical perspective. All students will be prepared to engage in scientific research in their respective specialty areas. Students in the accredited areas (clinical, counseling, and school) will be trained in psychological assessment and intervention approaches relevant to their respective emphasis areas.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Broad Based Training

Students will receive broad based training that will prepare them for both research and applied careers.

Related Measures:

M 1: Academic Employment

Graduates will be able to secure initial employment in academic settings (e.g., research institutes, colleges or universities, medical schools) as either faculty or research fellows.

Target:

40% of graduates’ initial employment will be in academic settings (e.g., research institutes, colleges or universities, medical schools) as either faculty or research fellows.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met

11 of 21 of graduating students’ (52.3%) initial employment was in academic settings.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 14: Graduate Student Teaching Competency

Graduate students will teach undergraduate level psychology classes and be evaluated as to their competency in doing so on a scale of 1 - 4 where 1 indicates there is much needed improvement, 3 indicates an adequate job, and 4 indicates excellence in teaching.
**Target:**
25% of graduate students will teach undergraduate level psychology classes and receive a rating of adequate on a scale of 1 - 4 where 1 indicates there is much needed improvement, 3 indicates an adequate job, and 4 indicates excellence in teaching.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
15 of 15 students (100%) received a rating of adequate or excellence for competency in teaching an undergraduate psychology class.

**SLO 2: Critical Thinking Skills in Psychology**
All students will acquire critical thinking skills associated with scientific research design and data analytic strategies necessary for the production, interpretation, and application of psychological knowledge.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: Communication of Knowledge about Field of Study**
Students will orally present their dissertation proposal

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of all students will be successful in their oral presentation of the dissertation proposal.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
19 of 19 students (100%) successfully presented their dissertation proposals.

**M 19: Research and Analysis Competency**
Graduating students will be rated by graduate program faculty on research design and analysis performance with the scale consisting of the following anchors: does not meet expectations, meets expectations and exceeds expectations. Individuals who meet or exceed expectations will have demonstrated competency in all of their research design and analysis courses, that is, they will have obtained a B or higher in all of those courses (Quantitative Methods I (Psy 662), Quantitative Methods II (Psy 663), and Research Evaluation in the Behavioral Sciences (Psy 661)).

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of all graduating students will be rated by graduate program faculty as meeting or exceeding expectations for research design and analysis performance with the scale consisting of the following anchors: does not meet expectations, meets expectations and exceeds expectations. Individuals who meet or exceed expectations will have demonstrated competency in all of their research design and analysis courses, that is, they will have obtained a B or higher in all of those courses (Quantitative Methods I (Psy 662), Quantitative Methods II (Psy 663), and Research Evaluation in the Behavioral Sciences (Psy 661)).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
26 of 28 students (92.8%) performed with satisfactory or above satisfactory competence on measures of design and analysis.

**SLO 3: Production and Dissemination of Research**
All students will be trained to produce and disseminate scientific psychological research.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Conference Presentations**
Students will author conference papers or presentations.

**Target:**
50% of current students will have authored at least one conference paper or presentation.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
78 of 117 students (66.7%) authored or co-authored a conference presentation for a professional conference.

**M 9: Dissertation Timeline**
Students will complete the dissertation within eight years of program matriculation.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Target:**
90% of students will successfully complete the dissertation within seven years of program matriculation.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
23 of 23 students (100%) successfully completed the dissertation within eight years of matriculation.

**M 20: Research Funding**
Students will apply for their own research grant funding (e.g., Sigma Xi, SSCI).

**Target:**
Twenty-five percent (25%) of students will apply for their own research grant funding (e.g., Sigma Xi, SSCI).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
15 of 117 students (12.8%) applied for external funding.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Student Research Funding 2010-2011**
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*
Although we improved the percentage of students applying for external research funds, we fell short of our targeted goal. Thus, ...

**M 21: Submissions for Publication**
Students will submit co-authored peer-reviewed empirical articles or book chapters for publication.

**Target:**
25% of students will submit at least one co-authored peer-reviewed empirical article or book chapter.
SLO 4: Proficiency in Assessment and Intervention
Students in the applied emphasis areas will demonstrate proficiency in assessment and intervention.

Related Measures:

M 3: Annual Evaluations of Practitioner Performance
Students will be rated on their annual evaluations in the area of practitioner performance.

Target:
90% of students will receive satisfactory ratings on their annual evaluations in the area of practitioner performance.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
51 of 54 students (94.4%) received satisfactory ratings on annual evaluations in the area of practitioner performance.

M 4: APA Accredited Internship
Students in the accredited applied areas will complete an APA-accredited doctoral internship.

Target:
95% of all students in the accredited applied areas will complete an APA-accredited doctoral internship.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
14 of 14 students (87%) were matched with an APA accredited doctoral internship.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

APA Internship 10-11 update
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
The action described here pertains to Objective 4: Proficiency in Assessment and Intervention. Eighteen out of 21 relevant stude...
assessment and intervention courses relevant to their emphasis areas will be rated as proficient in their ability to administer intelligence and achievement tests for children and adults and to demonstrate basic clinical and interviewing skills appropriate for their level of graduate training. Ratings will occur on a scale of 1-5 with 1 indicating not proficient, 3 indicating proficient, and 5 indicating very proficient based on observations of videotaped experiential assignments.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
19 of 19 students (100%) obtained a grade of B or higher in didactic assessment and intervention courses and were rated as proficient by their supervising faculty.

**M 13: Externship Supervisor Evaluations**
Students on externship (community based placements) will earn be rated by their on-site supervisors.

**Target:**
90% of students on externship (community based placements) will earn satisfactory performance ratings by their on-site supervisors.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
39 of 39 students (100%) were rated as satisfactory or better by externship supervisors.

**M 15: Internship Supervisor Evaluation**
Students on internship will be rated on internship performance by their respective internship supervisors.

**Target:**
90% of students on internship will earn satisfactory performance ratings by their respective internship supervisors.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
13 of 13 students (100%) on internship earned satisfactory ratings from their respective internship supervisors.

**M 22: Supervised Practice**
Students in applied areas will obtain broad and general skills in the areas of assessment and intervention by accruing a minimum number hours of supervised practice before the internship year.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
90% of students will obtain broad and general skills in the areas of assessment and intervention by accruing a minimum of 5 semesters of practicum/externship before the internship year.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
14 of 14 students (100%) accrued a 5 semesters of supervised practice prior to the internship year.

**SLO 5: Socialization in the Profession**
Students will be socialized in the profession of psychology.
Related Measures:

M 2: Annual Evaluations
Students will receive a rating of in the area of professional development on their annual evaluations of student performance and progress toward the doctoral degree.

**Target:**
80% of students will receive a rating of at least satisfactory progress in the area of professional development on their annual evaluations of student performance and progress toward the doctoral degree.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
74 of 77 students (96%) were evaluated and rated as at least satisfactory in the area of professional development.

M 11: Ethics Grades
Students will be graded in the required department ethics and professional development course related to their emphasis areas.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
95% of students in the accredited emphasis areas will earn a grade of B or higher in the required department ethics and professional development course.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
10 of 10 students (100%) received a grade of B or higher in the departmental ethics and professional developmental courses required within each program area.

M 12: Exposure to National Scholars
Students will be exposed to nationally renowned scholarship in the discipline of psychology by attending colloquia and professional symposia.

**Target:**
90% of students will be exposed to nationally renowned scholarship in the discipline of psychology by attending colloquia and professional symposia.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
72 of 73 students (98.6%) were exposed to at least one nationally renowned scholar by attending colloquia or professional symposia.

M 16: Mentor Identification
Students will identify a research mentor who will serve to orient the student to and socialize the student in the profession of psychology.

**Target:**
100% of students will have identified a research mentor by the end of their second semester of graduate training who will serve to orient the student to and socialize the student in the profession of psychology.
Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
23 of 23 students (100%) identified a research mentor prior to the end of their second semester of graduate training.

M 17: Oral Presentation in History of Psychology
Students will be rated using a scale consisting of the following anchors: does not meet expectations, meets expectations and exceeds expectations, on the oral presentation portion of Psy 718 History of Modern Psychology where students present on a major psychological era. Students who meet or exceed expectations will be able to articulate the conceptualization of a major time period during which a particular theoretical framework was prevalent, identify the major theorists of the era, integrate the relevant psychological studies during the era highlighting dissentions and conflicts among theorists, and discuss the implications of the era for current trends in psychology.

Target:
Ninety-five percent (95%) of all students will be rated as meeting or exceeding expectations with a scale consisting of the following anchors: does not meet expectations, meets expectations and exceeds expectations, on the oral presentation portion of Psy 718 History of Modern Psychology where students present on a major psychological era. Students who meet or exceed expectations will be able to articulate the conceptualization of a major time period during which a particular theoretical framework was prevalent, identify the major theorists of the era, integrate the relevant psychological studies during the era highlighting dissentions and conflicts among theorists, and discuss the implications of the era for current trends in psychology.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
13 of the 15 (86.6%) students who enrolled in this class successfully completed the oral presentation with a rating of at least "meeting expectations".

M 18: Professional Organization Membership
Students will join scientific or professional societies open to graduate student membership.

Target:
75% of all preinternship/precandidacy students will hold membership in a scientific society.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
26 of 28 students (92.8%) joined scientific or professional societies open to graduate student membership.

SLO 6: Sufficient Knowledge in Core Areas
All graduating students will have acquired a sufficient knowledge base in the following core areas of psychology: (a) biological bases of behavior, (b) social basis of behavior, (c) cognitive affective basis of behavior, (d) human development or individual differences.

Related Measures:

M 8: Core Course Competency
Students who have completed their Ph.D. course requirements (excluding internship or dissertation requirements) will be rated by graduate program faculty...
on overall core coursework performance with the scale consisting of the following anchors: does not meet expectations, meets expectations and exceeds expectations. Individuals who meet or exceed expectations will have demonstrated competency in all of their core courses, that is, they will have obtained a B or higher in all of their core courses.

**Target:**
90% of students who have completed their Ph.D. course requirements (excluding internship or dissertation requirements) will be rated by graduate program faculty as meeting or exceeding expectations for core coursework performance with the scale consisting of the following anchors: does not meet expectations, meets expectations and exceeds expectations. Individuals who meet or exceed expectations will have demonstrated competency in all of their core courses, that is, they will have obtained a B or higher in all of their core courses.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
26 of 28 students (92.9%) who completed PhD requirements (except dissertation or internship) met or exceeded expectations in their core course requirements.

M 10:Doctoral Comprehensive Exams
Students will be rated by program faculty as either passing or not passing their doctoral comprehensive examinations.

**Target:**
90% of all students will successfully pass doctoral comprehensive examinations.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
16 of 17 students (94%) successfully passed their Doctoral Comprehensive Exams.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Academic Employment 2009-2010**
In the last year, the faculty have evaluated whether a target goal of 40% placement in academic areas serves the best interest of our students. According to the most recent APA Directory Survey data (2000), the percentage of psychologist employed in academic positions is 28%. Thus, although we plan to continue our training and mentoring of students towards academic careers, we have decided to adjust our goal to a more modest 30%, a level slightly higher than reported nationally. However, we will also continue to focus on training students for academia by providing increased student opportunities to teach and publish during their graduate training. We will enhance mentoring activities directed toward honing students for academic positions. Finally, we will continue to evaluate recruitment efforts to ensure that we place proper focus on the admission of students with high academic potential.

**Established in Cycle:** 2009-2010
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress
**Priority:** Medium

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Academic Employment | Outcome/Objective: Broad Based Training

Responsible Person/Group: All graduate training faculty
Additional Resources Requested: increased funds for student travel to professional conferences to increase student opportunities for networking with other academics; increased graduate stipends to attract qualified students seeking academic careers.

APA Internship 10-11 update
The action described here pertains to Objective 4: Proficiency in Assessment and Intervention. Eighteen out of 21 relevant students met the criteria for this objective, resulting in failure to meet out target performance level of 95%. Nevertheless, our actual performance level of 86% continues to be far above the national average for acceptance to APA-accredited internships (79%). In order to increase the likelihood that our performance level will improve next year, we will continue programmatic efforts to ensure students' adequate preparation for the APPIC internship match. Program faculty will continue their efforts to increase the number of clinical training opportunities through funded externships in order to allow students to gain supervised practice hours in relevant settings. Students will receive feedback and guidance on internship applications including essays, and will receive opportunities for interview preparation.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: APA Accredited Internship | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in Assessment and Intervention

Implementation Description: Mentoring
Responsible Person/Group: Training Directors and Graduate Faculty

Student Research Funding 2010-2011
Although we improved the percentage of students applying for external research funds, we fell short of our targeted goal. Thus, we will continue with our Action Plan from the previous reporting cycle. To increase the performance rate of student applications for external funding, we will emphasize the importance of this activity in all relevant classes. We will incorporate formal training pertinent to grant writing processes in relevant classes, including research design and other writing intensive classes. We will continue to schedule formal workshops dedicated to training students in grant writing. We will also continue to increase student awareness of funding opportunities for students by forwarding relevant opportunities, as well as faculty funding opportunities that have a student-relevant component.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Research Funding | Outcome/Objective: Production and Dissemination of Research
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Responsible Person/Group: Training Directors & Graduate Faculty

Review and Revisit PhD WEAVE outcomes and measures
The doctoral program in psychology has enjoyed several years of relative success. Assessment outcomes and measures have not been reviewed recently. Early in the next reporting cycle, the training directors will meet to review and revise the outcomes and measures in an effort to demonstrate continuous improvement.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Responsible Person/Group: Bonnie Nicholson & Psychology Training Directors

History of PSY oral project
This action plan addresses Outcome/Objective 5: Socialization in the Profession. It was expected that 95% of students will meet or exceed expectations on a project in History of Modern Psychology. This reporting period, 87% of students achieved this goals. Reasons for this decline in performance are not clear, so the graduate committee will plan to meet with the instructor to problem solve potential solutions to increase performance in this area.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 09/26/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee
Additional Resources Requested: none

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The analysis of this year's assessment data suggests that the PhD programs in Psychology continue to do a good job of preparing students for entry into the field of psychology. The programs continue to produce students who received high ratings in practitioner performance, assessment, professional development, and with respect to meeting research expectations and timelines. The programs continue to strive toward achieving goals associated with increased publication and presentation rates and improvements in students' engagement in the external funding process. Finally, this reporting cycle, the programs DID meet expectations for internship placement (100%), which far exceeds the national average.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
In the current reporting cycle, 2 objectives were not met. These will continue to be monitored by the graduate training faculty. The programs continue to struggle to meet objectives related to the percentage of students who apply for external funding; efforts to achieve this goal include the development of college-wide grant writing initiatives which include graduate students. An unexpected finding is that there was a decrease in
the proportion of students meeting expectations related to socialization in the professional and as measured by a History of Psychology project. The reasons behind this dip in performance are not clear, however the graduate training committee will discuss performance issues with faculty and develop an appropriate course of action to return to our previously successful rates of achievement in this area.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The primary mission of the PhD program in Psychology is training in the scientific study of behavior, and application of that knowledge for the betterment of humankind. Accordingly, the above programs seek to prepare students to become competent, professional psychologists who approach the science and practice of psychology from an empirical perspective. All students will be prepared to engage in scientific research in their respective specialty areas. Students in the accredited areas (clinical, counseling, and school) will be trained in psychological assessment and intervention approaches relevant to their respective emphasis areas. The analysis of this year's assessment suggests that the PhD programs continue to do a good job of preparing students for entry into the field of psychology. The students are well trained in core courses, in research competence, and in dissemination of scientific and scholarly information. The department is especially proud of a number of accomplishments in 2012-2013 including a high rate of grant activity, publication and student involvement in research. A noteworthy improvement involves the number of graduates who have been able to secure academic positions upon graduation. For the first time, the program is proud to have met this objective. The graduate programs in Psychology continue to be highly regarded across the university and nationally. Faculty remain highly research productive and presentations and publications include student contributions. Given the department's success, the graduate programs received additional support for the 2013-2014 academic year and were able to slightly increase admission rates.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans**

In the current reporting cycle, 2 objectives were not met. These objectives will continue to be monitored by the graduate training faculty. The first unmet goal was in the percentage of students who apply for external funding. The area Training Directors (and all faculty) have made a more conscious effort to encourage external applications from students for funding by disseminating such opportunities more widely and making this a priority for research teams. Additionally, there are college-wide efforts to improve graduate student involvement in the external funding process. We recognize the importance of this goal and will continue our formulated an action plan to increase student awareness of funding opportunities and to enhance training of students for applications for funding. We will continue to monitor our action plans for an additional year, including completion of research milestones. Additionally, there was an unexpected decrease in the performance related to a project in the History of Psychology course. Reasons for this decrease are unknown, but additional consultation with the program directors and instructors may result in new action plans for the coming year. A review of PhD goals and objectives will be completed in early Fall, 2013 and an additional objective related to retention and to licensure will be included for the coming year. Additional changes are not expected, but may occur as a result of this meeting. The 2013-2014 academic year holds a good deal of promise with several new faculty members joining the department and an increase in student funding which has resulted in additional admissions for the next academic year. The Department continues to remain one of the most productive in the college despite the deficits in faculty and support this past academic year and is is expected that with additional human
resources and financial support to increase admissions, the programs will continue to exceed expectations.

**Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking**

In the spirit of continuous improvement, the PhD (and MA/MS) goals will undergo committee review this year and revisions will be included in the assessment plans for the next reporting cycle. Additional measures and findings related to retention and licensure will be added to remain in compliance with new UAC guidelines.
Mission / Purpose

The Master of Science in Science Education Program develops the disciplinary and pedagogical competencies of secondary science educators and prepares educators to attain the AA teaching license for the State of Mississippi. Graduates of the program increase the educational and scientific expertise of the secondary and postsecondary institutions (both public and private) and informal education centers such as museums and aquariums in which they are employed, and are well prepared to pursue graduate studies at the doctoral level.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Content knowledge in discipline emphasis
Students will demonstrate master's level content knowledge in their emphasis discipline.

Relevant Associations:
National Science Teachers Association National Council of Teachers of Mathematics National Association of Biology Teachers American Association of Physics Teachers

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The student requests at least three of his or her committee members (a minimum of one science educator and one scientist) to each submit two to three comprehensive questions to the CSME administrative assistant. Students take the proctored written portion of the comps at the end of their course work in the SME conference room. Each professor scores the students responses to his or her questions. Each professor submits comments and scores to the director who then informs the student. The student meets with all committee members for the oral exam. Following the oral exam, the committee members discuss the student's answers and agrees on the appropriate action: pass or retake after remediation or additional study.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
80% of students to receive a minimum score of 4 on 5-point rubric on first attempt of discipline section of written comps. 80% of students to receive a minimum score of 4 on 5-point rubric on first attempt of discipline section of oral comps.

M 2: Content Knowledge Sample
Students will be required to upload a sample of content knowledge from their discipline. Students will be given a detailed instructions on what type of assignment, paper, test, etc. will be acceptable. SME faculty will evaluate samples
using a departmental designed rubric which evaluate content knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% will receive an overall rubric score of 4 or greater.

**SLO 2: Integrate content, instruction, and assessment**
Student will model mastery to integrate content knowledge into curricular, instructional, and assessment strategies at the educational level of student's interest.

**Relevant Associations:**
National Science Teachers Association National Association of Biology Teachers National Council of Teachers of Mathematics American Association of Physics Teachers

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The student requests at least three of his or her committee members (a minimum of one science educator and one scientist) to each submit two to three comprehensive questions to the CSME administrative assistant. Students take the proctored written portion of the exams at the end of their course work in the SME conference room. Each professor scores the students responses to his or her questions. Each professor submits comments and scores to the director who then informs the student. The student meets with all committee members for the oral exam. Following the oral exam, the committee members discuss the student's answers and agrees on the appropriate action: pass or retake after remediation or additional study.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
80% of students to receive a minimum score 4 on 5-point rubric on first attempt of integration section of written comps. 80% of students to receive a minimum score 4 on 5-point rubric on first attempt of integration section of oral comps.

**M 3: SME 601 Written Assignment**
Students in SME 601, a course required of all master's students in Science Education, will submit a written report on the constructivist learning theory.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on the integration of content component of the written assignment. 80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on the instruction component of the written assignment. 80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on the assessment component of the written assignment.

**M 4: SME 601 Oral Presentation**
The oral presentation on current educational research in science and mathematics education in SME 601.
Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
90% will receive a rubric score of 3 or higher on the integration of content component of the oral presentation. 90% will receive a rubric score of 3 or higher on the instruction component of the oral presentation. 90% will receive a rubric score of 3 or higher on the assessment component of the oral presentation.

**SLO 3: Analyze educational research**
Students will analyze results of educational research conducted in the science and math disciplines.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Comprehensive Exam**
The student requests at least three of his or her committee members (a minimum of one science educator and one scientist) to each submit two to three comprehensive questions to the CSME administrative assistant. Students take the proctored written portion of the comps at the end of their course work in the SME conference room. Each professor scores the students responses to his or her questions. Each professor submits comments and scores to the director who then informs the student. The student meets with all committee members for the oral exam. Following the oral exam, the committee members discuss the student's answers and agrees on the appropriate action: pass or retake after remediation or additional study.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Target:**
80% of students to receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on first attempt of research section of written comps. 80% of students to receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on first attempt of research section of oral comps.

**M 3: SME 601 Written Assignment**
Students in SME 601, a course required of all master's students in Science Education, will submit a written report on the constructivist learning theory.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on the assignment.

**M 4: SME 601 Oral Presentation**
The oral presentation on current educational research in science and mathematics education in SME 601.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on the analysis component of the oral presentation.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate master's level communication skills**
Students will demonstrate master’s level writing and speaking skills.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3:SME 601 Written Assignment**  
Students in SME 601, a course required of all master’s students in Science Education, will submit a written report on the constructivist learning theory.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric  
**Target:**  
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on overall assignment.

**M 4:SME 601 Oral Presentation**  
The oral presentation on current educational research in science and mathematics education in SME 601.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group  
**Target:**  
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on the analysis component of the oral presentation.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**TK-20**  
Beginning fall semester 2012, our new graduate students will be required to enroll in TK-20 in order for us to collect data from all aspects of our students’ programs. Students will upload research papers completed in their discipline-based and educational research courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** New graduate students will enroll in the USM TK-20 program.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/31/2012  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Sherry Herron
Mission / Purpose

The Ph.D. Program in Science Education prepares exemplary educators who possess both broad and deep content knowledge; who possess the ability to conduct educational research in their fields of expertise; and who know how to effectively teach and evaluate student learning using research-based curricula and innovative instructional technologies. Graduates of the Ph.D. in Science Education Program increase the educational and scientific expertise of the secondary and postsecondary institutions (both public and private) and informal education centers such as museums and aquariums in which they are employed.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Content knowledge in discipline emphasis area
Students will demonstrate doctoral-level mastery of knowledge of their emphasis discipline.

Related Measures:

M 1: Class curriculum project
Curriculum project in SME 700.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% will receive 80 or greater on the science content component of the curriculum project in SME 700.

M 7: Unit lesson plan
Students who are actively matriculating will successfully create a unit lesson plan in SME 700 according to the department rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% will receive a content knowledge rubric score of 80 or greater on a unit lesson plan in SME 700.

SLO 2: Integrate content, instruction, and assessment
Students will integrate content knowledge into curricular, instructional, and assessment strategies for students at different educational levels.

Related Measures:

M 5: Oral Presentation
Students who are actively matriculating will successfully complete (according to course rubric) a class presentation of instructional methods and assessment in SME 701, Issues in Science and Mathematics Education, which requires conceptual knowledge of nature of science and mathematics as well as learning theories and instructional methodologies and assessment.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
90% will receive a rubric score of 80 or greater on the integration of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and assessment knowledge in SME 700 class presentation.

**M 7:** Unit lesson plan
Students who are actively matriculating will successfully create a unit lesson plan in SME 700 according to the department rubric.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
90% will receive an integration rubric score of 80 or greater on a unit lesson plan in SME 700.

**SLO 3:** Analyze and synthesize educational research
Students will analyze and synthesize results of science education research conducted in their emphasis disciplines.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2:** Meta-analysis paper
In SME 703, in a meta-analysis paper, students will describe the contemporary reform movements in science and technology education that led to the development of standards in science education for grades K-12.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
90% will receive a a rubric score of 80 or greater on the science content of a meta-analysis paper submitted in SME 703, Foundations of Science and Mathematics Education..

**M 6:** Qualifying Exam
Students will pass (according to the department rubric) a qualifying exam after 12 hours of graduate coursework.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
90% of students who are actively matriculating will pass the qualifying exams according to the department rubric at first attempt.

**M 9:** Qualitative Project
SME 761/762

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other
Target:  
90% of students will achieve 80 or higher on the analyze and synthesize components of the qualitative project.

SLO 4: Oral and written communication skills  
Students will demonstrate PhD level oral and written communication skills.

Related Measures:

M 5: Oral Presentation  
Students who are actively matriculating will successfully complete (according to course rubric) a class presentation of instructional methods and assessment in SME 701, Issues in Science and Mathematics Education, which requires conceptual knowledge of nature of science and mathematics as well as learning theories and instructional methodologies and assessment.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:  
90% of students will score a 80 or higher on the rubric sections related to oral communication skills.

M 9: Qualitative Project  
SME 761/762

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:  
90% of students will achieve 80 or higher on the written components of the qualitative project. 90% of students will achieve 80 or higher on the oral components of the qualitative project.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

TK-20  
Beginning fall semester 2012, our new graduate students will be required to enroll in TK-20 in order for us to collect data from all aspects of our students’ programs. Students will upload research papers completed in their discipline-based and educational research courses.

Established in Cycle:  2011-2012  
Implementation Status:  Planned  
Priority:  High  
Implementation Description:  New graduate students will enroll in TK-20.  
Projected Completion Date:  05/31/2012  
Responsible Person/Group:  Sherry Herron
Mission / Purpose

The Teach for Mississippi (TMI) program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education (CISE) is a certificate program developed as an alternate route to a Mississippi Teaching License in middle and secondary schools. The mission of the TMI program at USM is to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to serve as effective teachers in Grades 7-12 in Mississippi schools in alignment with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

Students completing the TMI are encouraged to continue their education to complete a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT).

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate a content and theoretical knowledge.

TMI Candidates will articulate a content and theoretical knowledge base in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis I Basic Skills Licensure Examination
Praxis I is the licensure examination that tests basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics and is required for admission into teacher education programs in Mississippi.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
100% of candidates will pass the Praxis I Basic Skills Licensure Examination.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 12/12 (100%) passed Praxis I demonstrating a basic content and theoretical knowledge. *Summer is now the only semester that TMI certificate candidates enter the program; therefore, there are no Praxis scores reported for spring or summer semesters.

M 2: Praxis II: Content Specific Licensure Examination
Praxis II specific to the content area is the licensure examination that must be passed to receive a license in Mississippi. TMI candidates must pass the content area examination that is specific to the content for which they will be teaching.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target:
90% of candidates will pass the Praxis II: Content Specific Licensure Examination.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 12/12 (100%) of candidates passed Praxis II in their specific content area. *Summer is now the only semester that TMI certificate candidates enter the program; therefore, there are no Praxis scores reported for spring or summer semesters.

M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five sections which are as follows: Section 1, Planning and Preparation; Section 2, Communication and Interaction; Section 3, Teaching for Learning; Section 4, Management of the Learning Environment; and Section 5, Assessment of Student Learning. Specific elements and descriptors from sections which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric scoring is as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for articulating content knowledge.

M 4: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
90% of TMI candidates will rate 3 or higher on five point rating scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012* 3/4 (75%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge. 1/4 (25%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge. Total 4/4 (100%) rated 4 or higher on a 5-point scale for articulating a content and theoretical knowledge. *Fall is the only semester that TMI certificate candidates can complete the program; therefore, there are no exit data reported for spring or summer semesters.

SLO 2: Demonstrate content-specific pedagogical knowledge.
TMI Candidates will demonstrate a content-specific pedagogical knowledge base. NBTS 1, 2

Relevant Associations:
NBTS 1, 2
**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five sections which are as follows: Section 1, Planning and Preparation; Section 2, Communication and Interaction; Section 3, Teaching for Learning; Section 4, Management of the Learning Environment; and Section 5, Assessment of Student Learning. Specific elements and descriptors from sections which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.

**M 4: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the five-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012* 1/4 (25%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge. 2/4 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge. 1/4 (25%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge. Total 4/4 (100%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge. *Fall is the only semester that TMI certificate candidates can complete the program; therefore, there are no exit data reported for spring or summer semesters.

**SLO 3: Use assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.**
TMI Candidates will demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, manage and use assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.

**NBPTS 1, 2, 3, 4**

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five sections which are as follows: Section 1, Planning and Preparation; Section 2, Communication and Interaction; Section 3, Teaching
for Learning; Section 4, Management of the Learning Environment; and Section 5, Assessment of Student Learning. Specific elements and descriptors from sections which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric ating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for using assessment-driven instruction.

**M 4: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the five-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012* 2/4 (50%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population. 2/4 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population. Total 4/4 (100%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population. *Fall is the only semester that TMI certificate candidates can complete the program; therefore, there are no exit data reported for spring or summer semesters.

**SLO 4: Provide a supportive learning environment.**
TMI Candidates will use evidence-based rationales to provide and manage a supportive learning environment for a diverse student population. NBPTS 1,2, 3, 4, 5

**Relevant Associations:**
NBPTS 1,2, 3, 4, 5

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five sections which are as follows: Section 1, Planning and Preparation; Section 2, Communication and Interaction; Section 3, Teaching for Learning; Section 4, Management of the Learning Environment; and Section 5, Assessment of Student Learning. Specific elements and descriptors from sections which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric ating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
**Target:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for providing a supportive learning environment.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Enhance classroom management strategies for TMI candidates.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
Incorporate classroom management strategies into each of the three summer TMI courses. Bring in practitioners from school distr...

**M 4: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the program.

**Source of Evidence:** Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the five-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met**
Fall 2012* 1/4 (25%) rated 2 on a 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment. 1/4 (25%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment. 2/4 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment. Total 3/4 (75%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment. *Fall is the only semester that TMI certificate candidates can complete the program; therefore, there are no exit data reported for spring or summer semesters.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Enhance classroom management strategies for TMI candidates.**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
Incorporate classroom management strategies into each of the three summer TMI courses. Bring in practitioners from school distr...

**SLO 5: Integrate technology into teaching and learning.**
TMI Candidates will integrate technological resources and skills to enhance teaching and learning.

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five sections which are as follows: Section 1, Planning and Preparation; Section 2, Communication and Interaction; Section 3, Teaching for Learning; Section 4, Management of the Learning Environment; and Section 5, Assessment of Student Learning. Specific elements and descriptors from sections
which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric ating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for integrating technology into teaching and learning.

M 4: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the five-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
Fall 2012* 1/4 (25%) rated 2 on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning. 2/4 (50%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning. 1/4 (25%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning. Total 3/4 (75%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning. *Fall is the only semester that TMI certificate candidates can complete the program; therefore, there are no exit data reported for spring or summer semesters.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Incorporate instructional technology into TMI summer program.
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Collaborate with instructional technology faculty in CISE to incorporate more cutting-edge technology into the summer TMI cour...

SLO 6: Value professional development and service to the community.
TMI Candidates will value professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

Related Associations:
NBPTS 5

Related Measures:

M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor during the internship. The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five sections which are as follows: Section 1, Planning
and Preparation; Section 2, Communication and Interaction; Section 3, Teaching for Learning; Section 4, Management of the Learning Environment; and Section 5, Assessment of Student Learning. Specific elements and descriptors from sections which are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric ating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for valuing professional development and service to the community.

**M 4: Exit Interview/Survey**
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the program.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the five-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012* 3/4 (75%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community. 1/4 (25%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community. Total 4/4 (100%) rated 4 or higher on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community. *Fall is the only semester that TMI certificate candidates can complete the program; therefore, there are no exit data reported for spring or summer semesters.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Develop an employer survey to be administered following first semester of teaching for TMI.**
CISE TMI faculty will develop a survey to be administered to administrators and mentor teachers of TMI alternate process certificate holders to evaluate their first semester teaching experience.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Require TK20 subscription for TMI candidates.**
Beginning in fall 2012, all new TMI candidates will be required to subscribe to TK20 in order to track assessment data.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
Use Mississippi State Teacher Assessment Rubric to evaluate TMI candidates.
Beginning in the fall 2012, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument will be replaced with the Mississippi State Teacher Assessment Rubric (MSTAR) to evaluate TMI candidates.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Video tape mini-teaching sessions for each candidate.
Plan and present mini-teaching sessions in didactic classes in order to prepare for teaching in the classroom. Both self-evaluations and peer-evaluations using the TIAI will be used.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Implement in summer didactic classes prior to teaching in a classroom.

Enhance classroom management strategies for TMI candidates.
Incorporate classroom management strategies into each of the three summer TMI courses. Bring in practitioners from school districts as guest speakers.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Provide a supportive learning environment.
Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Provide a supportive learning environment.

Projected Completion Date: 08/14/2013
Responsible Person/Group: TMI instructors

Incorporate instructional technology into TMI summer program.
Collaborate with instructional technology faculty in CISE to incorporate more cutting-edge technology into the summer TMI courses.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology into teaching and learning.

Projected Completion Date: 08/14/2014
Responsible Person/Group: CISE TMI faculty and Instructional Technology Faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessment results indicate that TMI candidates meet basic skills requirements as indicated by 100% of candidates passing Praxis I and have mastered content knowledge as indicated by 100% of candidates passing Praxis II in their specific content areas.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
This is the first cycle that assessment data disaggregated from the MAT program have been required for the TMI certificate. Although assessments have been used prior to this cycle, data are not available from two of the assessments during this cycle. Continued attention will be required to collect all data from the TMI program disaggregated from the MAT program.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Teach Mississippi Institute is a program initiated by the Mississippi Department of Education and provides a pathway to teacher licensure outside the traditional, accredited program of teacher education. This pathway is a response to manpower needs that have not been met due to geographical, economic, or market-driven conditions. Alternate licensure is available under the premise that the candidate brings content expertise in an area of middle and/or high school preparation to the classroom. Acceptable Praxis I and II scores indicating mastery of basic skills and specific content knowledge must be attained to receive a certificate. The graduate certificate program focuses on instructional delivery of content knowledge.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
Actions to standardize the coursework among all instructors and to develop modules of instruction specific to the variety of disciplines have been completed to improve the program. Assessments have been revised and added to the TMI portion of the MAT program.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Actions to standardize the coursework among all instructors and to develop modules of instruction specific to the variety of disciplines have been completed to improve the program. Assessments have been revised and added to the TMI portion of the MAT program.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Special Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the special education setting. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives and the ability to empower a community of learners.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Demonstrate special education content knowledge.
Candidates will demonstrate a special education content knowledge.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/Council for Exceptional Children/ MDE Process Standards

Related Measures:

M 1: Praxis II: Special Education Content Knowledge
PRAXIS II: Special Education Content Knowledge, developed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS), is the required content knowledge standardized test for attaining Mississippi teacher licensure in K-12 Mild/Moderate Disabilities. This examination measures the candidates’ acquisition of special education content knowledge at the level required for state licensure.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education teacher candidates will attain Mississippi teacher licensure passing scores on the PRAXIS II: Special Education Content examination. NCATE and MDE require an 80% pass rate.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg and Gulfport (combined online program) Fall 2012 11/11 (100%) passed Spring 2013 5/5 (100%) passed Total 16/16 (100%) passed Dual Licensure (combined Hattiesburg and Gulfport-special education/elementary education) Fall 2012 18/18 (100%) passed Spring 2013 9/9 (100%) passed Total 27/27 (100%) passed

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Review subtest scores of Praxis II: PLT to determine areas that need to be enhanced.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
The NCATE office is now able to provide subtest scores for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching. The subtest scor...

M 4: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of special education pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the evaluation rubric for teacher candidates on the criteria of demonstrating a special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Fall 2012 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 11/11 (100%) scored (4) exemplary Total 11/11 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored .exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE) Spring 2013 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored (4) exemplary Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Review subtest scores of Praxis II: PLT to determine areas that need to be enhanced.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
The NCATE office is now able to provide subtest scores for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching. The subtest scor...

SLO 2: Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.
Special Education Teacher Candidates will demonstrate a special education pedagogical knowledge.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/Council for Exceptional Children/ MDE Process Standards

Related Measures:

M 2: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching

Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT), developed and administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS), is a standardized pedagogical examination required for special education licensure in Mississippi. The PLT measures the candidates’ abilities to apply pedagogical principles and to demonstrate professional knowledge.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state

Target:
Ninety-percent (90%) of the special education teacher candidates will attain Mississippi teacher licensure passing scores on PRAXIS II: Principles of Learning and Teaching. This demonstrates the candidates’ mastery of pedagogical knowledge at the level required for state licensure. NCATE and MDE require an 80% pass rate for teacher education institutions.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg and Gulfport (combined online program) Fall 2012 11/11 (100%) passed Spring 2013 4/5 (80%) passed Total 15/16 (94%) passed
Dual Licensure (combined Hattiesburg and Gulfport-special education/elementary education) Fall 2012 24/26 (92%) passed Spring 2013 9/9 (100%) passed Total 33/35 (94%) passed

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 4: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation

The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of special education pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3)
or exemplary(4) on the evaluation rubric for teacher candidates on the criteria of demonstrating a special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE). Fall 2012 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE). Spring 2013 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Review subtest scores of Praxis II:PLT to determine areas that need to be enhanced.**

*Established in Cycle: 2011-2012*

The NCATE office is now able to provide subtest scores for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching. The subtest scor...

**SLO 3: Use assessment information to plan differentiated learning.**

Special Education Teacher Candidates will use assessment information to plan differentiated experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs.

**Relevant Associations:**

NCATE/Council for Exceptional Children/MDE

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**

The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains that are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI rubric for the criteria of using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Fall 2012 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure) 2/11 (18%) scored mastery (3) 9/11 (82%) scored exemplary (4) Total 11/11 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI). Spring 2013 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure) 3/9 (33%) scored mastery (3) 6/9 (67%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI).

M 4: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates’ application of special education pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the evaluation rubric for teacher candidates on the criteria of using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Indicator C3 TCPE).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3) 3/4 (75%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored (3) mastery or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Indicator C3 TCPE). Fall 2012 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 2/9 (22%) scored mastery (3) 7/9 (78%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored (3) mastery or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Indicator C3 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and
Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Indicator C3 TCPE) Spring 2013 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 5/9 (56%) scored mastery (3) 4/9 (44%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan differentiated learning (Indicator C3 TCPE)

**SLO 4: Integrate technology in instruction.**
Teacher Candidates will impact student learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE Conceptual Framework/Council for Exceptional Children

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains that are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI rubric for the criteria of integrating technology into instruction (Domain I Indicator 4).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3) 3/4 (75%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI) Fall 2012 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure) 6/11 (55%) scored mastery (3) 5/11 (45%) scored exemplary (4) Total 11/11 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI) Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI) Spring 2013 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure) 3/9 (33%) scored mastery (3) 6/9 (67%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 4 TIAI)
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Present technology workshops for cohort groups prior to student teaching
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
CISE faculty will collaborate with Instructional Technology faculty to develop workshops for pre-teacher candidacy students to e...

M 4: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of special education pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery(3) or exemplary(4) on the evaluation rubric for teacher candidates on the criteria of integrating technological skills (Indicator A8 TCPE).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3) 3/4 (75%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE). Fall 2012 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 2/9 (22%) scored mastery (3) 7/9 (78%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE). Spring 2013 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE).

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Present technology workshops for cohort groups prior to student teaching
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
CISE faculty will collaborate with Instructional Technology faculty to develop workshops for pre-teacher candidacy students to e...
SLO 5: Collaborate with families to enhance learning for individuals with ELN.
Special Education teacher candidates will collaborate with families to enhance learning for individuals with Exceptional Learning Needs (ELN).

**Relevant Associations:**
Council for Exceptional Children Standard 10: Collaboration with Families

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument**
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains that are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the rubric for the criteria of using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Domain III Indicator 19).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI) Fall 2012 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure) 4/11 (36%) scored mastery (3) 7/11 (64%) scored exemplary (4) Total 11/11 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI)

Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI)

Spring 2013 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure) 2/9 (22%) scored mastery (3) 7/9 (78%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI)

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

**Emphasize using family and community resources in didactic and clinical coursework.**
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

Students with disabilities are especially in need of resources beyond the K-12 school system to become successful in their liv...

M 4: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation
The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of special education pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction. The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the rubric for the criteria of using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE).

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4). Total 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE). Fall 2012 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 1/9 (11%) scored mastery (3). 8/9 (89%) scored exemplary (4). Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 5/5 (50%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE). Spring 2013 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE).

SLO 6: Create learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN.
Special Education teacher candidates will create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs (ELN) that foster positive social interactions and active engagement in learning.

Relevant Associations:
Council for Exceptional Children Standard 5 Learning Environments and Social Interactions

Related Measures:
M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument

The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical supervisor and the mentor teacher during teacher candidacy (student teaching). The TIAI scoring rubric is divided into five domains which are as follows: Domain I, Planning and Preparation; Domain II, Assessment; Domain III, Instruction; Domain IV, Learning Environment; and Domain V, Professional Responsibilities. Specific elements and descriptors from domains that are aligned with each of the related outcomes will be used for outcome assessment. The rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1). Total scores on the combined TIAI sections are used for both individual candidate and overall program evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery or exemplary on the rubric for the criteria of creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Domain III Indicator 16 TIAI)

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program)
1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3) 3/4 (75%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Domain III Indicator 16 TIAI) Fall 2012 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program—special education dual licensure) 1/11 (9%) scored mastery (3) 10/11 (91%) scored exemplary (4) Total 11/11 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Domain III Indicator 16 TIAI)

Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program) 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Domain III Indicator 16 TIAI) Spring 2013 Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program—special education dual licensure) 1/9 (11%) scored mastery (3) 8/9 (89%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Domain III Indicator 16 TIAI)

M 4: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation

The Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) is a performance assessment of the teacher candidates' application of special education pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and teaching dispositions. The scoring rubric is divided into three sections, with outcomes and descriptors for rating teaching performance. Section 1 (A). Knowledge and Skills will be used to evaluate content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and integration of technology into instruction. Section 2 (B) Professional Dispositions and Section 3 (C) Impact on Student Learning will be used to evaluate the use of assessment for differentiated instruction The TCPE is administered by university clinical supervisors in conjunction with mentor teachers and ratings are aggregated and disaggregated on the TK20 Data Collection System. Rubric rating scores are as follows: Exemplary (4); Mastery (3); Marginal (2); and Unacceptable (1).
Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the rubric for the criteria of creating environments that enhance learning for ELN (Indicator A6-2 TCPE).

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Fall 2012 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Indicator A6-2 TCPE). Fall 2012 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Indicator A6-2 TCPE). Spring 2013 Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12) 1/5 (20%) scored mastery (3) 4/5 (80%) scored exemplary (4) Total 5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Indicator A6-2 TCPE). Spring 2013 Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual) 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) Total 9/9 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on creating learning environments that enhance learning for individuals with ELN (Indicator A6-2 TCPE).

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Ensure that candidates use assessments.**
Ensure that candidates have the opportunity to use a variety of appropriate assessments with students in K-12 settings.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Responsible Person/Group:** SPE Faculty, Clinical Instructors and OEFE

**Establish better communication.**
Establish more effective communication among faculty who teach the special education courses and clinical supervisors who supervise the teacher candidates to make sure assessments are administered and input into TK20 in a standardized format.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** Fall 2007
- **Responsible Person/Group:** SPE Faculty and Office of Field Experiences

**Improve inter-rater reliability for rubrics.**
Improve inter-rater reliability for assessment rubrics. Because of differences in ratings from faculty and clinical supervisors on rubrics, there is a need for collaboration and
training to establish better inter-rater reliability on the assessment rubrics.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Faculty, NCATE administrator, assessment specialists

**Mentor and collaborate with adjunct faculty.**  
Mentor and collaborate with adjunct faculty to make sure that standards are mastered in the designated courses, assessments are administered, and assessment data are input into TK20.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2007  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Lead faculty in Special Education courses

**Monitor new measures.**  
Monitor effectiveness of new assessments and measures to make sure they align across NCATE, CEC and SACS standards and outcomes.

**Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Implementation Description:** Spring 08  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Special Education Faculty

**Improve inter-rater reliability on measures**  
Inter-rater reliability among all faculty and for both campuses is an on-going action. Workshop sessions will provide training.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Summer 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Office of Educational Field Experiences

**Mentor and collaborate with adjunct faculty.**  
Special Education Lead faculty will mentor adjunct, visiting and doctoral students to ensure standards are taught and assessed in the proper courses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Summer 2008  
**Responsible Person/Group:** SPE lead faculty
Emphasize using family and community resources in didactic and clinical coursework. Students with disabilities are especially in need of resources beyond the K-12 school system to become successful in their lives. Special Education faculty have developed specific objectives, activities, and assessments in their didactic and clinical coursework to enhance the teacher candidates' knowledge and skills in using family and community resources for their students.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Collaborate with families to enhance learning for individuals with ELN.

Projected Completion Date: 05/14/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education clinical and didactic faculty.

Present technology workshops for cohort groups prior to student teaching
CISE faculty will collaborate with Instructional Technology faculty to develop workshops for pre-teacher candidacy students to explore cutting-edge technology to enhance special education teaching and learning.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology in instruction.  
Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology in instruction.

Implementation Description: CISE faculty will collaborate to present technology professional development workshops for co-hort groups prior to student teaching. Teachers from cooperating school districts will be asked to present technology used in their schools.  
Projected Completion Date: 05/14/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Kim Walker, Clinical Coordinator and CISE faculty

Review subtest scores of Praxis II:PLT to determine areas that need to be enhanced.
The NCATE office is now able to provide subtest scores for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching. The subtest scores have been distributed to CISE for review. Special Education faculty will review the subtest areas and develop plans to enhance those areas that have the lowest scores.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012  
Implementation Status: In-Progress  
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.
  Measure: Praxis II: Special Education Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate special education content knowledge.
  Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate pedagogical knowledge. | Demonstrate special education content knowledge.

Projected Completion Date: 05/29/2013

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The Special Education (BS) K-12 program content knowledge licensure assessment continues to show strength as documented by a 100% pass rate on the Praxis II: Special Education Content Knowledge and an overall pass rate of 98% on Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching. The 100% pass rate achievement on the state licensure special education content examination indicates a very strong program for attaining special education content knowledge. The careful alignment of special education coursework objectives to the standards of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) contribute to the outstanding performance on the content knowledge licensure examination. All outcomes were met at an exemplary or mastery level for each program. Additionally, strengths were noted in the use of assessment data to inform differentiated instruction, the integration of current technology into instruction, and using family resources to enhance instruction. Those outcomes represent essential knowledge and skills for successful special education practitioners.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Although all outcomes were met, continued attention is required for the outcome of integrating instructional technology throughout the curriculum. It will be necessary to give ongoing attention to teaching cutting-edge technology and developing the skills for integrating that technology into teaching and learning in all content areas. Special education interventions and accommodations are highly dependent on assistive technology and current evidence-based instruction. Continued attention is required for teaching special education candidates how to co-teach with regular education teachers in inclusive classrooms. Attention to student outcomes will be given in the monthly special education faculty meetings based on ongoing formative assessments.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The B.S. program in special education is a strong teacher licensure program that provides highly-desired graduates for positions as special education teachers to K-12 schools to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The dual licensure program that is available to preservice K-6 elementary education and special education majors provides graduates who are licensed in both elementary education (K-6) and special education. This program produces graduates who are highly recruited for positions in K-6 schools. Also offered is a K-12 special education licensure program, with online course options, which enables special education teacher assistants who are employed
in K-12 schools to complete special education licensure coursework. The online options also provide an opportunity for students who cannot attend classes on the two campuses to attain a special education degree and teacher licensure. Through Project REACH, the Mississippi Personnel Preparation Development Grant, the Special Education Pre-Service Improvement Grant, the Mississippi Deaf-Blind Project, the USM Autism Demonstration Project and Project LINK, special education faculty have participated in collaborative work with P-12 school districts, the Mississippi Council on Developmental Disabilities, the Mississippi Department of Education, and the Department of Psychology within the College of Education and Psychology. Furthermore, the Center for Professional Development and Outreach is engaged with a nationally-affiliated, disability-rights advocacy organization, the ARC of Mississippi. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 40 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received over four million dollars in external funding in 2012-2013. Additionally, CISE faculty serve as consultants in K-12 schools, serve on state and national advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
As a result of innovations in CISE special education programs, stronger partnerships have been developed with the schools in which clinical experiences are conducted. Clinical sites are monitored for effectiveness for field experiences on an ongoing basis. CISE clinical and didactic faculty work closely with mentor teachers in the schools to provide exemplary field experiences in both inclusion and self-contained special education settings. Additional field experiences have been added to the introductory cohort, and performance assessments aligned to Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards for each cohort have been revised to better evaluate knowledge, skills, and dispositions prior to teacher candidacy. Didactic and clinical faculty meet monthly as a team to discuss the knowledge, skills and dispositions of the candidates as they progress through the cohort groups. Particular attention is given to dispositions during the field experiences so that candidates will be better prepared for teacher candidacy. Formative assessments administered throughout the program are reviewed for individual candidates who are provided guidance and instruction throughout the program to ensure that candidates attain the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective special education teachers. CISE special education faculty meet online once a month to review both student and programmatic outcomes. As a result of the monthly meetings and ongoing continuous improvement initiatives, online courses have been monitored and evaluated to ensure that they have equity with face-to-face courses; innovative technology to enhance course delivery has been researched by graduate assistants and embedded in online classes; CEC outcomes have been monitored for the new program plans, with adjustments being made when indicated by assessment data; family members of a student with disabilities have been included in coursework to bring family perspectives; and online courses have been increased in number and enhanced with innovative online methodology.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Ongoing monitoring and enhancing of innovative technology continues to be a major effort of CISE special education faculty. Online special education courses incorporate cutting-edge techniques for enhanced electronic delivery of didactic and clinical coursework with continuous monitoring and evaluation to ensure their effectiveness. CISE faculty have collaborated with K-12 mentor teachers to assist special education teacher candidates in integrating technology that is currently being used in the schools. A continuing emphasis is placed on using family and community resources for teaching and learning with this objective being added to both didactic and clinical courses. Family members of students with disabilities have been included in the program to help teacher candidates understand the family perspective. Co-teaching of lessons with
special education and regular education students has been modeled in university classes and implemented in clinical experiences.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as effective educational leaders in a variety of roles in the K-12 settings. Candidates graduating from the University of Southern Mississippi will use the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and the ability to empower a community of learners. At the master’s level, the mission of the Special Education Program in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education is to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to enable candidates to serve as master educators in Grades K-12, to serve as leaders in school districts and agencies, and to apply scientific research to improve teaching and learning.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge

Master's Candidates will articulate a content and theoretical knowledge base in their particular areas of special education research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive e-portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling aligned to each CEC standard. It is scored by special education faculty on a four-point rubric directly aligned to CEC standards.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education M.Ed. candidates will score Mastery(3) or Exemplary(4) on the criteria of articulating special education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of articulating special education content and theoretical knowledge. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of articulating special education content and theoretical knowledge. Spring 2013 3/3 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of articulating special education content and theoretical knowledge. This program is now online with Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students combined into one program.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Develop guidelines for the comprehensive portfolio. Establish a course with a lead faculty member to introduce the portfolio to ... 

M 2: Comprehensive Examination
The Special Education Master’s Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and master of communication. Questions are directly aligned to the CEC content standards. A rubric detailing relationship of the responses to CEC standards is used for scoring. The examinations are evaluated by special education faculty members according to the rubric.

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education master’s candidates will successfully complete the master’s comprehensive examinations on the first attempt. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific special education master’s degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to CEC standards, content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. The examinations are evaluated by three faculty members according to the rubric. A majority of the faculty must pass the candidate for successful completion.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Spring 2013 3/3 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Revise the written comprehensive examination.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Change the procedures for the written comprehensive examination. Include the examination in the portfolio. Score the comprehens... 

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Target:
Ninety (90%) of special education M.Ed. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 5/8 (63%) rated 5 3/8 (37%) rated 4 Total 8/8 (100%) rated 4
or higher on articulating content and theoretical knowledge. Fall 2012 3/5 (60%) rated 5 2/5(40%) rated 4 Total 5/5 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating content and theoretical knowledge Spring 2013 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating content and theoretical knowledge

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

 Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that the CISE Exit Survey/Interview is completed by all special education graduates, the CISE graduate advisor/staff w...

SLO 2: Articulate special education pedagogy.
Master's Candidates will articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive e-portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling aligned to each CEC standard. It is scored by special education faculty on a four-point rubric directly aligned to CEC standards.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education M.Ed. candidates will score Mastery(3) or Exemplary(4) on the criteria of articulating special education pedagogy.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of articulating special education pedagogy. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of articulating special education pedagogy. Spring 2013 3/3 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of articulating special education pedagogy. This program is now online with Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students combined into one program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Develop guidelines for the comprehensive portfolio. Establish a course with a lead faculty member to introduce the portfolio to ...
M 2: Comprehensive Examination

The Special Education Master’s Comprehensive examination is an essay examination which assesses the depth and application of content and theoretical knowledge and master of communication. Questions are directly aligned to the CEC content standards. A rubric detailing relationship of the responses to CEC standards is used for scoring. The examinations are evaluated by special education faculty members according to the rubric.

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education master’s candidates will successfully complete the master’s comprehensive examinations on the first attempt. Questions are aligned to the content standards of the specific special education master’s degree program. A rubric detailing relationship of the response to CEC standards, content knowledge, support of the response by research, practice and informed opinion, comprehensiveness and organization of the response, and effectiveness of expression is used for scoring. The examinations are evaluated by three faculty members according to the rubric. A majority of the faculty must pass the candidate for successful completion.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating special education pedagogy. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating special education pedagogy. Spring 2013 3/3 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating special education pedagogy.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

M 3: Exit Interview/Survey

The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

**Target:**
Ninety (90%) of special education M.Ed. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding acquisition of special education pedagogy.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 6/8 (75%) rated 5 2/8 (25%) rated 4 Total 8/8 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating special education pedagogy. Fall 2012 3/5 (60%) rated 5 2/5(40%) rated 4 Total 5/5 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating special education pedagogy. Spring 2013 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%)
rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating special education pedagogy.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.**

*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*

To ensure that the CISE Exit Survey/Interview is completed by all special education graduates, the CISE graduate advisor/staff w...

**SLO 3: Use research to improve teaching and learning.**

Master's Candidates will analyze, synthesize, and evaluate research to contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning.

**Relevant Associations:**

NCATE/CEC

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Professional Portfolio**

The professional portfolio is a comprehensive e-portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling aligned to each CEC standard. It is scored by special education faculty on a four-point rubric directly aligned to CEC standards.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**

Ninety percent (90%) of special education M.Ed. candidates will score Mastery(3) or Exemplary(4) on the criteria of using research to improve teaching and learning.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of using research to improve teaching and learning. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of using research to improve teaching and learning. Spring 2013 3/3 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of using research to improve teaching and learning. This program is now online with Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students combined into one program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.**

*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*

Develop guidelines for the comprehensive portfolio. Establish a course with a lead faculty member to introduce the portfolio to ...

**Revise the written comprehensive examination.**

*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*

Change the procedures for the written comprehensive examination. Include the examination in the portfolio. Score the comprehensi...
M 3: Exit Interview/Survey
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education master’s candidates’ perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

Target:
Ninety (90%) of special education M.ED. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding using research to improve teaching and learning.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 7/8 (88%) rated 5 1/8 (12%) rated 4 Total 8/8 (100%) rated 4 or higher on using research to improve teaching and learning. Fall 2012 4/5 (80%) rated 5 1/5 (20%) rated 4 Total 5/5 (100%) rated 4 or higher on using research to improve teaching and learning. Spring 2013 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on using research to improve teaching and learning.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.
Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
To ensure that the CISE Exit Survey/Interview is completed by all special education graduates, the CISE graduate advisor/staff w...

SLO 4: Participate in professional development.
Master’s Candidates will participate in professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility. Current participation in professional development will be documented in the professional portfolio with reflections concerning the activities and with plans for career-long participation.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC

Related Measures:

M 1: Professional Portfolio
The professional portfolio is a comprehensive e-portfolio. It is a cumulative project with reflective journaling aligned to each CEC standard. It is scored by special education faculty on a four-point rubric directly aligned to CEC standards.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

Target:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education M.Ed. candidates will score Mastery(3) or Exemplary(4) on the criteria of participating in professional development.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of participating in professional development. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of participating in professional development. Spring 2013 3/3
(100%) scored 3 or 4 on the criteria of participating in professional development. This program is now online with Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students combined into one program.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*  
Develop guidelines for the comprehensive portfolio. Establish a course with a lead faculty member to introduce the portfolio to...

**Revise the written comprehensive examination.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2006-2007*  
Change the procedures for the written comprehensive examination. Include the examination in the portfolio. Score the comprehensiv...

**M 3: Exit Interview/Survey**  
The exit interview/survey is a survey of the special education master`s candidates` perceptions of their acquisition of the outcomes of the M.Ed. program.

**Target:**  
Ninety (90%) of special education M.ED. candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding participating in professional development.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Summer 2012 7/8 (88%) rated 5 1/8 (12%) rated 4 Total 8/8 (100%) rated 4 or higher on participating in professional development.  
Fall 2012 3/5 (60%) rated 5 1/5 (20%) rated 4 1/5 (20%) rated 3 Total 5/5 (100%) rated 3 or higher on participating in professional development.  
Spring 2013 1/2 (50%) rated 5 1/2 (50%) rated 4 Total 2/2 (100%) rated 4 or higher on participating in professional development.

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**

For full information, see the *Details of Action Plans* section of this report.

**Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2010-2011*  
To ensure that the CISE Exit Survey/Interview is completed by all special education graduates, the CISE graduate advisor/staff w...

**Provide support and mentoring for using Blackboard.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*  
Candidates who are new to online learning need additional support and mentoring in the use of Blackboard and other online techno...

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**O/O 5: Obtain employment**
M.Ed. in special education graduates will obtain employment in a K-12 school or other educational agency upon graduation.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Placement Data**
CISE staff will determine employment status of graduates through graduate exit survey or through other communication.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**
Ninety percent (90%) of M.Ed. in Special Education graduates will obtain employment in a leadership position in a K-12 school or other educational agency.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Summer 2012 6/6 (100%) obtained employment in a special education position. Fall 2012 5/5 (100%) obtained employment in a special education position. Spring 2013 3/3 (100%) obtained employment in a special education position.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**revise current action statements for SPED(MEd)**
Revision of current action statements will take place with faculty of special education program early fall 2006

*Established in Cycle:* 2005-2006  
*Implementation Status:* Finished  
*Priority:* High  
*Implementation Description:* early fall 2006  
*Responsible Person/Group:* department Chair and special ed faculty

**Collect baseline data for the new assessments.**
Collect and evaluate baseline data throughout the year to evaluate the restructuring and realignment of the M.Ed. programs to NCATE and CEC standards and new assessments.

*Established in Cycle:* 2006-2007  
*Implementation Status:* Finished  
*Priority:* High  
*Implementation Description:* Fall 2007 and Spring 2008  
*Responsible Person/Group:* Special Education Faculty

**Develop guidelines for comprehensive portfolio.**
Develop guidelines for the comprehensive portfolio. Establish a course with a lead faculty member to introduce the portfolio to the beginning M.Ed. candidates. Upload assessment rubrics from each area: LD, Gifted, EBD, Severe/Profound to TK20. The portfolio will be evaluated by two-three faculty members.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate special education pedagogy. | Participate in professional development. | Use research to improve teaching and learning.

Implementation Description: Fall 2011
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: TK20 staff

Revise the written comprehensive examination.
Change the procedures for the written comprehensive examination. Include the examination in the portfolio. Score the comprehensive examination on a separate rubric to be evaluated by two-three faculty members and defended orally.

Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate special education pedagogy.
  Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Articulate special education pedagogy. | Participate in professional development. | Use research to improve teaching and learning.

Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Faculty

Mentor and collaborate with adjunct faculty.
"Lead Faculty" have been identified for each course in the various special education M.Ed. programs. Special Education "Lead Faculty" will mentor and collaborate with adjunct faculty to ensure that all CEC standards are addressed in the appropriate courses and outcomes/objectives are mastered.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Summer 2008
Responsible Person/Group: SPE lead faculty and adjunct faculty

Recruit SPE M.Ed. Candidates.
Faculty and staff will work with area schools to recruit M.Ed. candidates for the graduate programs in Special Education.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Summer 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Special Education Faculty

Schedule graduate classes for two years.
Graduate faculty develop a two-year schedule of all SPE graduate classes so that students can be assured of required classes being available for all degrees.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: SPE graduate faculty

Require Exit Survey/Interview to be completed before graduation application is moved forward.
To ensure that the CISE Exit Survey/Interview is completed by all special education graduates, the CISE graduate advisor/staff will require that graduating candidates complete the assessment before their application for graduation is moved to the next level.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate special education pedagogy. | Participate in professional development. | Use research to improve teaching and learning.

Implementation Description: Procedures will be developed in CISE graduate office to implement candidate completion of the exit survey online.
Projected Completion Date: 08/29/2014
Responsible Person/Group: CISE graduate advisor/staff

Provide support and mentoring for using Blackboard.
Candidates who are new to online learning need additional support and mentoring in the use of Blackboard and other online technologies. CISE faculty and IT faculty will collaborate to provide this support to beginning candidates.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Participate in professional development.

Responsible Person/Group: CISE Special Education and IT faculty

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Special Education M.Ed. assessments indicated that all outcomes were met for 2012-2013. The emphasis in the coursework on aligning assignments and assessments more closely to CEC standards resulted in candidates' improved abilities to articulate both content and pedagogical knowledge and skills on the comprehensive examination and in the professional portfolio reflections. Exit interview results noted strengths in the areas of improvement of classroom teaching resulting from the practical assignments and coursework that could be directly related to the teaching of students with exceptional abilities or with disabilities. Qualitative data from the exit interviews referred to the program's preparation for the "real world" of teaching in special education and to the supportive and caring faculty and staff. The exceptional knowledge of the professors and their abilities to convey their knowledge to the candidates and to mentor them through the internships was mentioned in several exit interviews as strengths of the program. The careful advising of students regarding the course of study and the availability of scholarships and grants were reported as additional strengths of the program.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Although all outcomes were successfully met, continued attention will be given to providing candidates more technical assistance with Blackboard and other online technologies. Ongoing attention is required to develop exemplary clinical experiences that incorporate current best practices and provide model classroom teachers for students with disabilities. Specific suggestions were given on the exit interview form that more instruction should be given in managing students with disabilities in inclusion settings. This will involve locating and forming stronger partnerships with model programs in local school districts. Attention will continue to be given to incorporating a stronger language and assistive communication component to the special education M.Ed. programs based on recommendations from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) SPA report.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The Special Education M.Ed. is a strong program that provides master special education teachers and instructional leaders in K-12 schools and in other agencies that provide services to individuals with exceptionalities. The program offers emphasis areas in gifted education, behavior disorders, high incidence disabilities and low incidence disabilities. The coursework and assessments for each emphasis area are aligned to Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and NCATE standards. The increased enrollment in the program is attributed to the increased availability and enhanced quality of on-line courses. On-line special education M.Ed. courses and clinical experiences have been enhanced to provide the most current online technology available. CISE special education faculty have been a part of the USM eLearning Initiative to develop and implement a long-term plan to improve the quality of online courses and programs, enhance the level of services provided to online students, increase support to faculty teaching in online programs, create ongoing marketing and recruiting efforts for online programs, and develop a sustainable model for online learning. Special Education has adopted this vision in an effort to improve online learning in response to concerns over inconsistency in online offerings, less than satisfactory retention and graduation rates for students enrolled in online programs, and
changing demographics of students in the region—specifically a decline in traditional students and a rise in adult learners. Through Project REACH, the Mississippi Personnel Preparation Development Grant, the Special Education Pre-Service Improvement Grant, the Mississippi Deaf-Blind Project, the USM Autism Demonstration Project, and Project LINK, special education faculty have participated in collaborative work with P-12 school districts, the Mississippi Council on Developmental Disabilities, the Mississippi Department of Education, and the Department of Psychology within the College of Education and Psychology. Furthermore, the Center for Professional Development and Outreach is engaged with a nationally-affiliated, disability-rights advocacy organization, the ARC of Mississippi. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 20 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received $5,347,227.00 in external funding in 2012-2013. Additionally, CISE faculty serve as consultants in K-12 schools, serve on state and national advisory committees and serve as officers for state, regional and national professional organizations. The CISE special education graduate program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, achieved full accreditation from NCATE as a result of the successful seven-year NCATE accreditation report and site visit.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives/Additional Action Plans
CISE graduate faculty meet monthly to review program data and provide for continuous candidate and program improvement. Comprehensive examination and exit interview results are reviewed and evaluated each semester. Program plans were reviewed and have been revised in the past cycle. On-line graduate programs have been developed and enhanced as continuous improvement initiatives. Additionally, clinical experiences are continually monitored to provide model experiences that are enhanced through current technology and meet Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards as well as NCATE and NBPTS standards.

Closing the Loop/Action Plan Tracking
Actions that have been completed in the previous cycle include enhancing online and clinical site technology, aligning portfolio artifacts to specific CEC and NBPTS standards, and mentoring and collaborating with adjunct faculty to ensure that they teach the CEC standards that are aligned with their courses and that they administer the appropriate assessments for the courses. Additionally, graduate special education classes have been scheduled for a two-year period resulting in graduate students being able to sequence their degree plans. Actions to provide appropriate scheduling and sequencing of coursework and providing online graduate courses have contributed significantly to recruiting and retaining special education graduate students.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Early Oral Intervention (EOI) graduate program is to prepare highly qualified early intervention teachers of the deaf to develop listening and spoken language in infants and young children (ages birth to six) who are deaf and hard of hearing (DHH). Students learn to use advanced hearing technologies, such as cochlear implants (CI), digital hearing aids and FM systems. We are committed to preparing specialists to teach children with all levels of hearing loss (mild to profound) to develop spoken language through listening, using a family-centered approach. We prepare teachers to become lifelong learners, who will impact the lives of children with hearing loss and their families in Mississippi and the region.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Plan and implement instruction
Students will plan and implement listening, speech and spoken language instruction for classroom and family-centered individualized sessions for children who are deaf/hard of hearing (ages 0-6) and their families. Students will design and implement lesson plans for children in classroom-based, home-based and centered-based settings.

Related Measures:

M 1: Formative Evaluation - Auditory-Verbal Session Plans
In SHS 629 (Auditory-Verbal Development and Practice), each student will develop individualized, family-centered session plans in listening, speech and spoken language for a child with hearing loss (aged 0-6). Each will design session plans that demonstrate that they have identified targets appropriate for the age and stage of development of the individual child. Each session will be based on typical hierarchies of development and have selected appropriate behavioral objectives and materials, including ideas for parent(s) to implement carryover to home routines. Students will demonstrate implementation of auditory-verbal intervention techniques and strategies and measurements of child performance.

Target:
80% of students enrolled in SHS 629 will successfully complete two auditory-verbal session plans and two videos/DVDs (mid-term and end of semester) with a score of 80% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students enrolled in SHS 629 (n=9) successfully completed two auditory-verbal session plans and two videos/DVDs (mid-term and end of semester) with a score of 80% or better.

M 2: Summative Assessment - Portfolio of final practicum experience
In SHS 639 (Advanced Practicum III), students demonstrate their knowledge and skills in incorporating diversity in planning and preparation, communication and interaction, teaching for learning, management of the learning environment, and assessment of student learning in teaching children with hearing loss. Students complete a portfolio including lesson plans, classroom management plan, authentic teaching samples, reflections, evaluations, including at least two video/DVDs of evaluated teaching.

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target:**
80% of teacher candidates enrolled in SHS 639 will attain 80% or better on their final teaching portfolio.

**SLO 2:** Understand the development of listening, speech and spoken language
Understand the development of listening, speech and spoken language

**Related Measures:**

**M 3:** Language Sample and Written Report
In SHS 653 (Language Development with Infants and Young Children with Hearing Loss), students demonstrate a synthesis of their knowledge and understanding of the development of listening, speech and spoken language and the impact of hearing loss on this development. Each student collects, transcribes and analyzes an authentic language sample from a child with hearing loss and writes a report summarizing the child’s communication and language development. Each report contains a minimum of eight recommendations for planning instruction for the individual child.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
80% of students enrolled in SHS 653 will successfully complete the language sampling project, including eight recommendations for planning instruction for the individual child with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 653 (n=7) successfully completed the language sampling project, including eight recommendations for planning instruction for the individual child with a score of 80% or better.

**M 4:** Collaborative Case Study
In SHS 651 (Assessment and Development of Listening, Speech and Spoken Language), students demonstrate their understanding of the development of listening, speech and spoken language and the impact of hearing loss on this development. Students work collaboratively to assess and analyze the listening, speech and spoken language development of a child with hearing loss. Students demonstrate their knowledge and skill in using a variety of age and stage-appropriate formal and informal assessment tools to identify individualized instructional objectives. Each project includes a case study report, all completed test protocols, and a minimum of three objectives in each area of listening, speech and spoken language.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group
Target:
80% of students enrolled in SHS 651 will successfully complete a collaborative case study report and write a minimum of three objectives in each area of listening, speech and spoken language with a score of 80% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students enrolled in SHS 651 (n=7) completed a collaborative case study report and wrote a minimum of three objectives in each area of listening, speech and spoken language with a score of 80% or better.

SLO 3: Understand hearing loss, hearing assessment and use of hearing technologies with children who are deaf/hard of hearing
Understand hearing loss, hearing assessment and use of hearing technologies with children who are deaf/hard of hearing

Related Measures:

M 5: Midterm and Final Examination
In SHS 626 (Audiological Assessment and Management of Infants and Young Children), students develop their understanding of the causes, degrees and types of hearing loss and the audiological assessments routinely used with the pediatric population children.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

Target:
In SHS 626, 70% students will successfully complete a midterm with a score of 80% or better and 80% will successfully complete a final examination with a score of 80% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students (n=7) successfully completed a midterm with a score of 80% or better and 100% of students (n=7) successfully completed a final examination with a score of 80% or better.

M 6: Hearing Technology Weekly Log
In SHS 637 (Advanced Clinical Practicum I), students will demonstrate the ability to troubleshoot a variety of hearing technologies including hearing aids, FM systems and cochlear implants to check that they are functioning. Each student will keep a weekly log of the function of the hearing technologies of all children in their assigned class. Each student will keep a weekly log of individual child responses on the Ling Six Sound Test for all children in their assigned class.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
80% of students enrolled in SHS 637 will successfully complete a weekly log of the function of the hearing technologies of all children in their assigned class and a weekly log of individual child responses on the Ling Six Sound Test for all children in their assigned class with a score of 80% or better.

Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met
100% of students enrolled in SHS 637 (n=9) successfully completed a weekly log of the function of the hearing technologies of all children in their
assigned class and a weekly log of individual child responses on the Ling Six Sound Test for all children in their assigned class with a score of 80% or better.

**SLO 4: Understand family-centered practice in early oral intervention**

Students will develop an understanding of the impact of hearing loss on the child and family, the principles of family-centered practice and the professional dispositions involved with working with families from diverse backgrounds. Students develop knowledge of early intervention curricula/resources, special education laws and advocacy, and approaches for counseling families.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Early Intervention Curricula/Resource Project**

In SHS 691 (Implementing a Family-Centered Early Oral Intervention Program), students will successfully complete a project that compares and contrasts selected early intervention curricula/resources and their appropriateness for families.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**

80% of students enrolled in SHS 691 will successfully complete a project that compares and contrasts selected early intervention curricula/resources and their appropriateness for families with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

100% of students enrolled in SHS 691 (n=7) successfully completed a project that compared and contrasted selected early intervention curricula/resources and their appropriateness for families with a score of 80% or better.

**M 8: Parent Education and Counseling Resources/Materials**

In SHS 735 (Audiological Counseling) students will use the Comfort Level Checklist as a guide for identifying current resources/materials appropriate for parent education and counseling. Students write a clear narrative of how each resource will be effectively used with parents.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**

80% of students enrolled in SHS 735 will successfully identify current resources/materials appropriate for parent education and counseling and write a clear narrative of how each resource will be effectively used with parents with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

100% of students enrolled in SHS 735 (n=9) successfully identified current resources/materials appropriate for parent education and counseling and wrote a clear narrative of how each resource could be effectively used with parents with a score of 80% or better.

**SLO 5: Understand the relationship between speech perception and speech production**

Students develop an understanding of the relationship between speech perception and speech production. Students gain knowledge of the acoustic characteristics of speech
in order to evaluate the speech perception abilities of children with hearing loss and the appropriateness of their hearing technologies. Students develop skills in transcribing utterances in the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) in order to record the speech production of children with hearing loss.

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Ling Six Sound Test Case Study**
In SHS 649 (Speech Perception and Production), students will complete a case study in which they plot the acoustic characteristics of the Ling Six Sound Test on a child's aided audiogram and determine the suitability of the child's hearing technology.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students enrolled in SHS 649 will successfully complete a case study in which they plot the acoustic characteristics of the Ling Six Sound Test on a child's aided audiogram and determine the suitability of the child's hearing technology with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 649 (n=7) successfully completed a case study in which they plotted the acoustic characteristics of the Ling Six Sound Test on a child's aided audiogram and determined the suitability of the child's hearing technology with a score of 80% or better.

**M 10: Speech Analysis Project**
In SHS 629 (Auditory-Verbal Development and Practice), students will complete a project including: 1. phonetic transcription of the speech of a child with hearing loss using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA); 2. analysis of the child's speech errors; and, 3. selection of speech targets.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students enrolled in SHS 629 will successfully complete a project including: 1. phonetic transcription of the speech of a child with hearing loss using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA); 2. analysis of the child's speech errors; and, 3. selection of speech targets with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 629 (n=9) successfully completed a project including: 1. phonetic transcription of the speech of a child with hearing loss using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA); 2. analysis of the child's speech errors; and, 3. selection of speech targets with a score of 80% or better.