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: 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 1: Upper Division Assessment (Exam Questions)

Upper Division Coursework Assessment: Students enrolled in BSC 370 (Genetics) or in BSC 380 (Microbiology & Lab) demonstrate an understanding of course-specific content.

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. In both courses, answers are graded subjectively by the instructor and the cohort is separated into students seeking the B.S. in Biological Sciences, the B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure), or the B.S. in Marine Biology.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met

Fall 2013:

Hattiesburg: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in the BSC 380 course.
Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in the BSC 380 course.

Spring 2014:

Hattiesburg: 0% (n = 1) of students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) scored 70% or greater on the comprehensive final exam.
Gulf Coast: BSC 380 is not offered on the Gulf Coast in the spring.

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

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Counsel under-performing students  
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Faculty are available to students that are not performing well in classes. Faculty will advise students on additional study tec...

**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%).

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Fall 2013:
Hattiesburg: 0% (n = 2) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.
Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.

Spring 2014:
Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.
Gulf Coast: No BSC Licensure students completed the Praxis II exam this semester.

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

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

Counsel under-performing students  
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Faculty are available to students that are not performing well in classes. Faculty will advise students on additional study tec...

SLO 2: Understanding of the scientific process
Students will develop an understanding of the scientific process.

**Related Measures:**

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.

**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. The cohort is separated into students seeking the B.S. in Biological Sciences, the B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure), or the B.S. in Marine Biology.
Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met

Fall 2013:
Hattiesburg: There were not students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester.

Gulf Coast: There were not students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester.

Spring 2014:
Hattiesburg: In BSC 380L, 0% (n = 1) 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. 0% (n = 1) 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: BSC 380 is not offered on the Gulf Coast in the spring.

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

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

Refer student to Writing Center
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Underperforming students will be referred to the Writing Center on campus.

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%).

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met

Fall 2013:
Hattiesburg: 0% (n = 2) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.
Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.

Spring 2014:
Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.
Gulf Coast: No BSC Licensure students completed the Praxis II exam this semester.

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

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

Counsel under-performing students
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Faculty are available to students that are not performing well in classes. Faculty will advise students on additional study tec...

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

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: 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.

**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. The cohort is separated into students seeking the B.S. in Biological Sciences, the B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure), or the B.S. in Marine Biology.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

*Fall 2013:*
Hattiesburg: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester.

Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) enrolled in BSC 380 during this semester.

*Spring 2014:*
Hattiesburg: In BSC 380L, 0% (n = 1) 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. 0% (n = 1) 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: BSC 380 is not offered on the Gulf Coast in the spring.

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

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

**Refer student to Writing Center**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Underperforming students will be referred to the Writing Center on campus.

**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: 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).

**Target:**
80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary 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 = Mastery Level" are advised by the USM supervisor before the second evaluation of the standards is made.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
**Fall 2013:**
- Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.
- Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.

**Spring 2014:**
- Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary 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 this semester.

**M 8: 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.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
**Fall 2013:**
- Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range.
- Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range.

**Spring 2014:**
- 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.
M 9: Teacher Candidate Assessment Tools (TCAT)

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met*

**Fall 2013:**
Hattiesburg: 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 done by the mentor and USM supervisor.

Gulf Coast: 100% of (n = 3) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% (n = 3) 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 = 3) 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.

There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester.

**Spring 2014:**
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 done by the mentor and USM supervisor.

Gulf Coast: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester.

**SLO 5: 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.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013:**
- Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) indicated that they had secured professional employment.
- Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) indicated that they had secured professional employment.

**Spring 2014:**
- Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) indicated that they had secured professional employment.
- Gulf Coast: There were no students completing their B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) this semester.

**SLO 6: 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%).

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

**Fall 2013:**
- Hattiesburg: 0% (n = 2) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.
- Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.

**Spring 2014:**
- Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of students taking the Praxis II exam passed on the first attempt.
- Gulf Coast: No BSC Licensure students completed the Praxis II exam this semester.

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

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

**Counsel under-performing students**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Faculty are available to students that are not performing well in classes. Faculty will advise students on additional study tec...
**M 7: 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).

**Target:**
80% of student teachers earn an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary 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 = Mastery Level" are advised by the USM supervisor before the second evaluation of the standards is made.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013:**
Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.
Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary level" based on the NSTA Assessment of Science Teaching Rubric for each of the standards during each student teaching experience.

**Spring 2014:**
Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 1) of student teachers earned an average score of "3 = Mastery Level" or "4 = Exemplary 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 this semester.

**M 8: 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.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013:**
Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range.
Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students completing the Student Teaching scored in the acceptable range.

**Spring 2014:**
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.

**M 9: Teacher Candidate Assessment Tools (TCAT)**

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013:
Hattiesburg: 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. Gulf Coast: 100% of \((n = 3)\) student teachers earned an average score of "3=Proficient and "4= Distinguished" on the Formative Evaluation by mentors; 100% \((n = 3)\) 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% \((n = 3)\) 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. There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester.

Spring 2014:
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: There were no students seeking a B.S. in Biological Sciences (Licensure) completing their student teaching this semester.

**M 10: 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.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013:
Hattiesburg: 100% (n = 2) of students taking the ETS PLT test passed on the first attempt.
Gulf Coast: 100% (n = 3) of students taking the ETS PLT test passed on the first attempt.

Spring 2014:
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.

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

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

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: Planned
Priority: High

Counsel under-performing students
Faculty are available to students that are not performing well in classes. Faculty will advise students on additional study techniques and possible tutorial services available.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Praxis II exam (Biology: Content Knowledge) | Outcome/Objective: Broad-based knowledge of Biology | Qualified to teach high school biology | Understanding of the scientific process
Measure: Upper Division Assessment (Exam Questions) | Outcome/Objective: Broad-based knowledge of Biology

Refer student to Writing Center
Underperforming students will be referred to the Writing Center on campus.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Upper Division Assessment (Laboratory Report) | Outcome/Objective: Understanding of the scientific process
Measure: Upper Division Assessment (Technical Skills) | Outcome/Objective: Technical skills consistent with major

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

The sample size for this year’s cohort was very low so that the performance on one student impacted the overall results greatly. However, counseling students about methods to improve performance is quite effective. For example, the students that performed less than expected on the Praxis II exam were counseled by SME faculty and were successful on the second attempt. Similar methods may be useful for other assessment measures (lab reports and activities).

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

Faculty will continue to recommend that students take advantage of the Writing Center on campus to improve writing skills. Faculty will also continue to provide clear instruction and guidance to students that seem to struggle with written assignments. Faculty will also continue counseling students on preparatory materials for the Praxis II exam.

Program Summary

The Department of Biological Sciences (BSC) is in the College of Science and Technology with 35 faculty and approximately 790 undergraduate majors and 74 graduate students (36 PhD and 38 MS) in 2013 - 2014. BSC was responsible for 26.8% of the student credit hours generated by the College of Science and Technology according to IR data from fall 2013. The Department is a research-intensive unit in which our faculty explore areas from biomedical/molecular biology to field biology and marine biology. Over the past five fiscal years, the BSC faculty secured an average of $5 million per year in extramural funds in support of their research. The funding level was $8.7 million in FY 2013 - 2014. The major funding source has traditionally been the National Institutes of Health. Other sources of research funding include the National Science Foundation, Department of Defense, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture as well as state agencies, private foundations and corporations. Most of the research is carried out by graduate students but undergraduate students also play a vital part of our efforts to train the next generation of scientists, teachers, researchers, clinicians, and policy makers. Generally, faculty members mentor both graduate and undergraduate 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. The Department is also a leader in South Mississippi in providing environmental education with hands-on opportunities to K-12 students and the general public through the Lake Thoreau Environmental Center. A variety of nature camps, guided walks and overnight camps are offered throughout the year.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

The Biological Sciences Department continues to improve our degree assessments, with more attention on curriculum changes that meet the university expectations. The Capstone course curriculum has been adjusted to better meet the academic needs of our students and we have seen an increase in overall success of our students. Students seem to respond better to course assignments when they can see the value it has to their career goals. The BSC Assessment Committee however needs to incorporate assessment of student retention in our program and develop methods to continuously improve student success at all levels. The faculty of the Center for Science and Math Education provide invaluable guidance to our BSC majors. Their efforts to educate and retain these students in the area of Science Education is vital to our community, so we will work diligently over the next year to better evaluate student retention.

Closing the Loop

The BSC Assessment Committee has made a concerted effort to improve our Assessment reporting at the Degree level and the GEC course level over the past few years. Our work has been rewarding given that we have improved on meeting target achievements across the board and raised the awareness of our faculty of
our curricular weaknesses and strengths. At this point, we are working less on "how to assess" and more on "what can we change" based on assessment data. This indicates that the data we are collecting through assessment reporting is valuable to our faculty and encourages them to evaluate their teaching styles and course assignments. With these types of improvements, our students will receive a better education to help prepare them for their future careers.
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 on their first attempt.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates in the Chemistry Licensure Program.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
There were no chemistry licensure students in their junior year for this academic cycle.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013-2014 Academic Year: There were no Chemistry Licensure students enrolled in CHE 471/L and student teachers this year.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no students in CHE 471/L and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
There were no chemistry licensure students in CHE 471/L this year to complete this activity.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013-2014 Academic Year: There were no Chemistry Licensure graduates or student teachers this year.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
One Chemistry Licensure student took SME 460 this year and was successful in the safe learning environment activity. There were no Chemistry Licensure student teachers this year, so this program outcome was not evaluated as part of a portfolio.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013-2014 Academic Year: There were no Chemistry Licensure graduates or student teachers this year.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
2013-2014 Academic Year: There were no Chemistry Licensure graduates or student teachers this year.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013-2014 Academic Year: There were no Chemistry Licensure graduates or student teachers this year.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

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

O/O 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
Licencse 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
2013/2014 Academic year: There were no graduates and no student teachers in the Chemistry Licensure Program this year.

O/O 11: Job placement
Teacher candidates will be employed as science teachers in the K-12 environment after graduation

Related Measures:

M 8: graduate employment
Follow up interview

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
90% of licensure graduates will be employed as K-12 educators within 1 year.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
There were no licensure graduates during the 2013/2014 cycle.
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Fall 2008
Projected Completion Date: 08/16/2013
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: Finished
Priority: Medium

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.
Projected Completion Date: 08/16/2013
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: In-Progress
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Deborah Booth

Recruitment of Licensure Students
The Licensure Coordinator will capitalize on her contacts to area high school chemistry teachers to promote the Chemistry Licensure Program. In addition, students enrolled in the freshman general chemistry courses will be familiarized with and recruited to the program.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium
Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The junior level licensure student completed the Safety plan required in SME 460, as required by NCATE. There were no chemistry licensure graduates or student teachers to assess this year. There was not a assessment portfolio completed.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
There were no chemistry licensure graduates or student teachers this year to be assessed. The assessment measures are excessive. A revised portfolio assessment will accomplish the same goals but streamline the process.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
There were no chemistry licensure graduates or student teachers to evaluate during this academic year. A licensure student did complete SME 460 along with the Safety Plan as required by NCATE.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives
There were no chemistry licensure student graduates or student teachers this year. A recruitment program is planned to enlarge licensure enrollment. The measurement process for this program will be streamlined to include an overall portfolio evaluation that is comprehensive for all of the student teaching goals.

Closing the Loop
There were no chemistry licensure graduates or student teachers to evaluate this year. A new streamlined assessment for all student teaching measurements is planned. Recruitment of majors for the licensure program is planned to increase enrollment.
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 semester 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
FA13: (performance juries only occur in the fall semester) Target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) completed performance jury and received score of at least 3.5 (out of 5). Average score was 4.3 (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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
FA13: Target met. 100% of students (7 of 7) earned grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 96. SP14: Target not met. 80% of students (4 of 5) earned grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 91. Overall, target met with 92% of students (11 of 12) earning grade of at least 75 (out of 100) on written self-evaluation in DAN 401. Average score was 93.5.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
FA13: Target met. 88% of students (7 of 8) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 84 (out of 100). SP14: Target not met. 80% of students (4 of 5) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 82 (out of 100). Overall, target not met. 85% of students (11 of 13) earned at least 75 (out of 100) in DAN 401 performance exam. Average score was 83 (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 ...

**review DAN 401 performance exam target**
*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014
Target will be reviewed, although it has been met in the past 2 of 3 reporting cycles. Small
sample sizes highlight individual a...

review DAN 402 variation performance score
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Target will be reviewed, although it has been met in the past 2 of 3 reporting cycles.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
FA13: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) on ballet variations requiring technical skill and competence in DAN 402. Average score was 45 (out of 50). SP14: Target not met. 50% of students (2 of 4) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) variations requiring technical skill and competence in DAN 402. Average score was 43 (out of 50). Overall, target not met. 71% of students (5 of 7) earned at least 37.5 (out of 50) variations requiring technical skill and competence in DAN 402. Average score was 43.5 (out of 50).

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

review 402 variation target
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Target for 402 variations will be reviewed, although it has been met in past reporting cycles.

M 5: Growth score in DAN 402
In DAN 402, student technical and artistic growth is quantified in a growth score 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 187.5 (out of 250) on growth score in DAN 402.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
FA13: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 187.5 (out of 250) on growth score in DAN 402. Average score was 208 (out of 250). SP14: Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 187.5 (out of 250) on growth score in DAN 402. Average score was 208 (out of 250). Overall, target met. 100% of students (5 of 5) earned at least 187.5 (out of 250) on growth score in DAN 402. Average score was 208 (out of 250).

M 6: Alumni Survey- Dance Technique
Responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance. 90% of respondents rank technical preparedness at 3.5 out of 5 or higher.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements
Target:
90% of responders to graduate/alumni survey indicate they were technically prepared to enter the field of dance.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Target met. Survey administered in SP14 showed that 100% of graduating students (3 of 3) consider themselves technically prepared to enter the profession. Average score was 4.3 (out of 5) with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement of technical preparedness.

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:
90% of all projects will earn minimum score of 75 out of 100.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
FA13: Target not met. 75% of students (3 of 4) earned a score of at least 75 (out of 100) on final research presentation in Capstone course. Average score was 83. (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 its quality be high and that the stakes be correspondingly high. T...

review DAN 491 final presentation target
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The target will be reviewed, although it has been met in the past 2 of 3 reporting cycles. DED student achievement seems to be b...

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:**
90% of all projects will earn minimum score of 75 out of 100.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
FA13: DAN 131: Target not met. 75% of students (5 of 7) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 80. DAN 240: Target met. 100% of students (7 of 7) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 89. DAN 431: not offered in 2013-2014. 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 92. DED 260: Target not met. 83% of students (5 of 6) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 90. SP14: DAN 340: not offered in 2013-2014. DED 260: Target not met. 83% of students (5 of 6) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 90. DAN 351: Target met. 75% of students (3 of 4) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final project. Average score was 80. Overall, target not met. 86% of students (25 of 29) earned at least 75 (out of 100) on final projects. Average score was 86.

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

**review student scores in final projects**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Target was not met in 2013-2014, but has been previously. It appears that there is not one single course where student achieve...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
SP14: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) passed exit interview with faculty subcommittee with a score of at least 2.5 (out of 4). Average score was 3.93. (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 85 points out of 100 on average of two OEFE/SPA portfolios

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
SP14: Target met. 100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 85 points (out of 100) on OEFE/SPA portfolio. Average score was 92. (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 2 semesters in DAN 420. Students are evaluated by the choreographers with whom they work on the RDC performer rubric in the following areas: Choreographic Integrity; Manifestation of Intent; Quality of Performance; Application of Feedback; Respect; Contribution to Choreographic Process; Work Ethic & Dedication; Personal Growth and Improvement.

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

**Target:**
100% of students earn at least 80 out of 100 on Repertory Dance Company rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
FA13: Target not met. 33% of students (1 of 3) earned targeted score. Average score was 78.
SP14: Target met. 100% of students (8 of 8) earned targeted score. Average score was 93. Overall, target not met. 82% of students (9 of 11) earned targeted score. Average score was 86.

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

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

**revise RDC target**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
The measure was modified 2 reporting cycles ago and has never been met. We expected that we would need to become accustomed to t...

**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.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Guest artists in the dance program for 2013-2014 did not set works on Repertory Dance Company members. Dance unit will refer to other measures (as outlined in Assessment Plan) for measuring this outcome for this reporting cycle.

**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 candidates.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. 80% of graduates who attempted to find work as licensed dance educators (4 of 5) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. 100% of students who took the Praxis II exam (3 of 3) passed it.

**M 17: Teacher Candidate Evaluations**
Teacher candidates are evaluated by supervising and cooperating teachers using standardized instrument from the Office of Educational Field Experiences. Formative, summative, in-class and final-summative evaluations exist for both supervising and cooperating teachers.

Source of Evidence: Certification or licensure exam, national or state
Target:
a) 90% of students earn at least 80 points (out of 100) on cooperating teacher evaluation forms. 
b) 90% of students earn at least 80 points (out of 100) on supervising teacher’s evaluations.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
a) Target met. 100% of students (3/3) earned at least 80 points (out of 100) on cooperating teacher evaluation forms. Average score was 97. (Scores were adjusted to reflect new 100 point values as evaluation forms consistently change total points available) b) Target met. 100% of students (3/3) earned at least 80 points (out of 100) on supervising teacher’s evaluations. Average score was 93. (Scores were adjusted to reflect new 100 point values as evaluation forms consistently change total points available)

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 cooperating teachers
Dance program alumni become cooperating teachers in their schools, K-12. Becoming a cooperating teacher requires 3 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 cooperating 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Assessment is for combined semesters. Target met. One program alumni was eligible to become a mentor teacher and she did in SP14.

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 as a mentor teacher.

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:
90% of respondents rate dance program curriculum at 3.5 or higher (out of 5).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Target met. Survey administered in SP14 showed that 100% of graduating students (3 of 3) rated the comprehensiveness of the dance program and their preparedness to enter the profession at
least 3.5 (out of 5). Average score was 4.7 (out of 5) with all responders "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing" to statement regarding dance program curriculum.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Student teaching happens only in the spring semester. SP14: Target not met. 66% of students (2 of 3) earned at least 90 (out of 100) in creating and presenting dance in the schools in which they student taught. Average score was 90 (out of 100).

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

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

**review target for student teachers presenting concerts**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Target will be reviewed, although it has been met 5 out of 6 reporting cycles and the 2013-2014 sample size is very small. It ju...

**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:**

90% 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Target met. Survey administered in SP14 showed that 100% of graduating students (3 of 3)
indicated they had a clear sense of theoretical placement and understanding in the field of at least 3.5 (out of 5). Average score was 4.7 (out of 5) with all responders "strongly agreeing" to statement of their theoretical and aesthetic understanding of the field.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

The American College Dance Festival occurs in the spring semester. SP14: a) Target met. One student work, filling in the Gap, was selected to be adjudicated. b) Target met. Student dancers were selected for Gala concert in SP14. c) Target met. Anecdotal feedback was positive for all adjudicated works and performances, faculty and student alike. The adjudicated faculty dance, Beyond/Him, was selected to represent the South region at the National College Dance Festival. Overall, target met.

**M 23: Performance and written presentations**

Students track and articulate their individual choreographic and aesthetic preferences and technical growth. This is evidenced in performance and written work presented in DAN 310 and DAN 312. A final group study in DAN 310, final evaluations of the Quality of Work in DAN 312 and a final paper in DAN 312 are required. They are evaluated with a rubrics 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 final project in DAN 310. b. 90% of students earn at least 80 points (out of 100) on final paper in DAN 312. c. 90% of students earn at least 3 points (out of 4) on Quality of Work rubric in DAN 312.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

a. Final project SP14: DAN 310. Target not met. 63% of students (5 of 8) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on final project in DAN 310. Average score was 3.1 (out of 4). b. Final paper FA13 DAN 312. Target met. 100% of students (1 of 1) earned at least 80 (out of 100) on final paper. Average score was 90 (out of 100). SP14: DAN 312. Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 80 (out of 100) on final paper. Average score was 92 (out of 100). Overall for final paper, target met.
100% of students (3 of 3) earned at least 80 (out of 100) on final paper. Average score was 91 (out of 100). c. Quality of work rubric score FA13: DAN 212. Target met. 100% of students (1 of 1) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on Quality of work rubric. SP14: Target met. 100% of students (2 of 2) earned at least 3 (out of 4) on Quality of work rubric. Average score was 3.25 (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 ...

**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:**
90% 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Graduate survey administered in SP14. Target met. 100% of responders (3 of 3) to graduate/alumni survey indicated they were able to apply and demonstrate their broad experiences in dance-making. Average score was 4.2 (out of 5) with all responders answering they either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement about experiences of dance-making.

**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.

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

**O/O 6: Acceptance as a dance major in the Dance Department**
Prospective students audition for acceptance into the Dance Department. The number auditioned is higher than the number accepted. The department acceptance rate helps us know the external demand for our program in the region as well as our selectivity.

**Related Measures:**

**M 25: Acceptance rate**
The acceptance rate for entry into the Dance Department as a major is determined by the number of prospective students who audition divided by the number accepted. Acceptance is based on scores in a live dance audition, an interview with a faculty member and the submission of an application.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

**Target:**
The acceptance rate of the department will be no more than 75% for dance licensure majors.
Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Target met. 75% of prospective students (9 of 12) who auditioned for acceptance into the BFA in Dance Licensure program were accepted.

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: Summer and fall 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 December 2011.
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: Performance and written presentations | 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 is "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 its 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: 08/30/2011

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 of 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: 10/30/2011

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 as a mentor teacher. 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: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Program alumni as cooperating teachers | Outcome/Objective: Prepared to participate in various fields of dance

Projected Completion Date: 10/30/2011

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 to 11-12 Plan. The mentor teacher's scores will not be used as they are often inflated. We are lowering the target after 2 years 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: 10/30/2011
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 are 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 process 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: 10/30/2011
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 met in 2 subsequent reporting cycles.
Projected Completion Date: 08/30/2011
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? SU14: Do we want to consider another option for this measure? Or do we want to delete it?

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

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

**Projected Completion Date:** 10/30/2011  
**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 students in their choreography IS meeting expectations, so while are 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.  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Stacy

**Applying broad experiences of dance making**

Target was not met, but due the sample size, there is little concern in this area. Target will remain.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Finished  
**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. 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: Finished
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 the see if student achievement meets target in 12/13.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: target met in 13-14
Responsible Person/Group: Stacy and dance education 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.
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 relation between Quality of Work score and scores in these areas (project proposal, final paper, and journal)?

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

Responsible Person/Group: SRF plus composition/choreography faculty

DAN 402 growth score for DED majors
Target not met in 2012-2013. Target will not be changed, but monitored in future reporting cycles. (Target was met in 13-14); so target will remain for 14-15 reporting cycle. At present, we maintain 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. The small sample size is the main issue.

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

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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  

**Responsible Person/Group:** SRF and dance faculty

**review 402 variation target**
Target for 402 variations will be reviewed, although it has been met in past reporting cycles.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: DAN 402 Variation performances | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

**review DAN 401 performance exam target**
Target will be reviewed, although it has been met in the past 2 of 3 reporting cycles. Small sample sizes highlight individual achievement.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: DAN 401 Performance Exam | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

**Responsible Person/Group:** SRF and dance faculty

**review DAN 402 variation performance score**
Target will be reviewed, although it has been met in the past 2 of 3 reporting cycles.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
Measure: DAN 401 Performance Exam | Outcome/Objective: Perform exit competencies in dance technique

**Responsible Person/Group:** SRF and ballet faculty

**review DAN 491 final presentation target**
The target will be reviewed, although it has been met in the past 2 of 3 reporting cycles. DED student achievement seems to be better in this measure over time, so maybe the DED and PC measures should be different. (A speculative reason is because the final presentation for PC majors is formative as it captures their research at the beginning stages whereas for DED majors the final presentation is summative and culminating.)

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

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

Responsible Person/Group: SRF and dance faculty

**review student scores in final projects**
Target was not met in 2013-2014, but has been previously. It appears that there is not one single course where student achievement is consistently not meeting the target. Rather, it seems to shift from one course to another. The 90% target is met with an average of 94% success rate over the past 6 years, so clearly, we are seeing more success rather than less.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Final Projects | Outcome/Objective: Comprehensive knowledge of dance

Responsible Person/Group: SRF and dance faculty

**review target for student teachers presenting concerts**
Target will be reviewed, although it has been met 5 out of 6 reporting cycles and the 2013-2014 sample size is very small. It just means that one student was off the mark. The faculty will discuss if the target should be raised.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Teacher Candidates presenting concerts | Outcome/Objective: Articulate dance theoretically and aesthetically

Responsible Person/Group: SRF and DED faculty

**revise RDC target**
The measure was modified 2 reporting cycles ago and has never been met. We expected that we would need to become accustomed to the new measure in order to select a target that is at once achievable and also reflective of our high expectations. The target should be revised (for both WEAVE reports).

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
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

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
All measures were met for SLO #4, which is concerned with a student’s ability to apply their knowledge of dance making. That this is met shows why we offer the BFA degree (as opposed to the BA degree) for Licensure students. We are training artist-educators and equally value a student’s ability to make dance as well as instruct it. According to the results, we are doing a fine job in preparing our students to participate in various fields of dance as demonstrated in meeting 5 of 6 measures for SLO #3. The practical application of the licensure degree demands this and we deliberately focus on this in our program. 4 of 6 measures were met for SLO #1, which indicated that we are doing a fair job of technically training Licensure students. The unmet measures are similar; they are performance exams in 400 level ballet and modern technique courses. A more pertinent measure of student technical abilities is Measure #1, the annual Performance Exam, which was met in this report. The latter exam is more summative and culminating than performance exams in individual courses.

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

50% of measures (2 of 4) were met for SLO #2. What should be noticed is that of the 4 measures, the 2 that were met are licensure specific, and the 2 that were not were compound measures that included formative coursework in other courses. It appears that students are more apt to excel in coursework that pertains to their emphasis. Of note, the 50% result is generated from small sample sizes and care should be taken in making broad conclusions from this data. The discipline-specific results are more summative and most significant. (See Continuous Improvement reporting field for additional discussion of program improvement actions that are broader in scope).

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Dance department was productive and saw positive external reward over the course of this reporting cycle. Highlights are listed below. (Please note that the overlap in this section between the two dance reports reflects the organizational and instructional overlap between our two emphasis areas). Our enrollment was 75 majors in 2013-2014 with seven full time faculty members. We graduated 11 majors. We implemented electronic, juried assessments. Faculty no longer circle numbers on forms. Students are provided a summary of their jury that is quantitative as well as rich with extensive written commentary from the full faculty. We started our curriculum revision, to be implemented Fall 2015. The process is inclusive and extensive (and is described more in the "Continuous Improvement" section). Faculty member, Meredith Early, had her work Beyond/Him selected to represent the South region of the American College Dance Festival. The work will be performed by five dance majors at the Kennedy Center in June, 2014. In our second year without our main performance venue, the Mannoni Performing Art Complex, we continued to produce student and faculty work. Concert dance is now augmented with Dance for Film, site specific dance, etc. Our student performance ensemble performed in downtown Hattiesburg, at Kamper Park, at Brewski's, at The Thirsty Hippo, etc. Our relations with these communities are increased and our students are more prepared for "dance in the real world." We had our second exchange day with the dance department at Belhaven University. This event was an artistic exchange that demonstrates the spirit of collegiate dancers in Mississippi. This is also an opportunity for students to gauge their skills against others and to network. The dance program had seven guest artists in 2013-2014. These mini residencies are supported through grants and the service of dance faculty and are critical to exposing our majors to the field. We may have had one too many in this reporting cycle and will scale accordingly in the coming years. The dance department collaborated with the theatre department on a devised theatre production as part of a $20,000 National Endowment for the Arts grant. The Dance Advisory Board was initiated and was extremely active in the areas of audience and membership development, marketing and public relations and alumni development. Particularly, the dance department has gone social and has a strong presence on Facebook and Instagram. This is significant as we are working towards non-print media to advertise our productions. We had students successfully awarded scholarships to attend the American Dance Festival in summer, 2014. Dance faculty were awarded a Summer Grant for the Improvement of Instruction, Partners for the Arts grants and a CoAL faculty research grant. A student received a University undergraduate research grant to produce a dance film. Dance faculty were involved in service at all levels of the University, including University Assessment Committee, Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs, Space Planning Committee, etc.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives
Some actions in the dance unit are broader than discrete action plans. Actions currently underway (or planned) that are done so in the spirit of continuous improvement include the following. Please note that the items below, with the exception of #2, are duplicated for both dance reports. This is because the degree plans, instruction and faculty greatly intersect and overlap. Almost never do we distinguish between the two emphasis areas of our BFA degree. As a department offering one BFA degree with two emphasis areas (Performance/Choreography and Dance Licensure), we have a long-standing commitment to holding all students, regardless of emphasis area, to the same standards. Most dance coursework is offered to students of both emphasis areas and courses of study do not diverge until the junior year. We have planned both our WEAVE reports to diverge where appropriate. For example, the Performance/Choreography plan incorporates reporting on their senior choreographic project and accompanying written thesis. Conversely, the Licensure plan includes many measure related to student teaching. Over the course of annual program reporting, we are beginning to see where students in one emphasis area or the other excel in certain courses/experience/etc. The dance unit needs to consider if the shared measures (performance in technique courses and in dance coursework that all majors take) need to have the same target for students of both emphasis areas. We need to review measures that HAVE been met over 5 or 6 reporting cycles then see if we should raise our expectations/targets. These include for the Dance BFA Plan: Measures 1, 6, 8, 19, 20, 21, and 24. We need to keep an eye on the new "Acceptance Rate" measure that assesses Student Achievement. It will be informative to see how this measure relates to demand for our program in addition to its quality. The largest instance we have of Continuous Improvement is the current, complete curriculum revision process that is underway. The full faculty has reviewed our mission, our strengths, our relevance and the state of the field with input from our accrediting agency and alumni. Intended to be implemented fall 2015, we are redesigning all Dance degree plans. This includes adding/deleting courses, modifying how we offer elective choices and creating room for students to study off campus in a way suited for them. Without doubt, assessment results from this process and from annual GEC reporting are key factors in our decision making. Recognizing that students need performance opportunities each semester in order to gain performance skills (which we measure in this report), we formalized Repertory Dance Company 2 (RDC2), to a greater degree. RDC2 tours on behalf of the department and is a training ground for students who are not quite skilled enough to be accepted into the first Repertory Dance Company. An item that spans several discrete action plans and concerns student achievement in their senior project and accompanying written thesis. Through this report and through annual GEC reporting, it is clear that we need to continue to address this facet of our program. Changes to instructions and courses have been implemented at the most local level and efforts have been made to address student achievement from a broad perspective through looking at course progressions and overlap. More work is to be done.

Closing the Loop

In this reporting cycle, some planned actions have been completed. These include the following: It appears that we are finally set with a good and stable target for the student teacher portfolio. After modifying our expectations numerous times, this year we went with a well-reasoned target that reflected our expectations and it was met. Of note, it was met in a year that we side a wider range of student teacher abilities than in previous years. We decided to not include student participation in off-campus study (in intersession and/or summer programs) because we were only measuring a student’s ability to afford such an opportunity. In the future, our degree plan will likely include some form of required off campus work (internship, service learning, etc.) and that can potentially be a better and a fairer way to assess our student’s preparedness for the post baccalaureate success. Beyond the scope of last year’s action plans, we are seeing more success in the performance component of our program. Specifically, there appears to be more consistency in instructor evaluation of individual student performances (we see this as we aggregate the data from specific courses). There is also a clear, demonstrated pattern of student performance in DAN 401/402 that meets our expectations. These can be contributed to a pattern of annual, internal review that the dance unit engages in.
Mission / Purpose

Mission: The specialist program in the Department of Educational Leadership and School Counseling prepares individuals to serve as transformational educational leaders, licensed educational administrators in P-12 educational settings, and researchers in the field of educational leadership. Through world-class faculty, standards-based programs, and partnerships with educational agencies, students learn innovative, research-based practices to improve education.

The program contributes to the mission of the University through all aspects of scholarship that promote academic success; enhance the image of the Department, College, and the University; foster community relationships and involvement; and create healthy minds, bodies, and campuses.

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 (Building)

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 school 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - There were no building level specialist students to complete the comprehensive exam in the summer.

Fall 2013 - There were no building level specialist students to complete the comprehensive exam in the fall.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=2) of building level specialist students passed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

A total of N=2 building level specialist students took the comprehensive exam this year. Of the 2 100% were successful at passing on the first attempt.

M 2: Comprehensive Exam District
Candidates will demonstrate the content knowledge that promotes positive student achievement.

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

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

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2013 - There were no district level specialist students to complete the comprehensive exam in the summer.

Fall 2013 - There were no district level specialist students to complete the comprehensive exam in the fall.

Spring 2014 - There were no district level specialist students to complete the comprehensive exam in the spring.

No district level specialist students completed the comprehensive exam this year.

**M 3: School Improvement Plan Building**

Students will research and evaluate data for comprehensive analysis and report for school improvement.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - 100% of students (N=2) completed the School Improvement Plan for student achievement at a level of mastery (3) or better based on the overall grading rubric.

Fall 2013 - 100% of students (N=2) completed the School Improvement Plan for student achievement at a level of mastery (3) or better based on the overall grading rubric.

Spring 2014 - 100% of students (N=3) completed the School Improvement Plan for student achievement at a level of mastery (3) or better on the overall grading rubric.

A total of N=7 students completed the School Improvement Plan for student achievement this year. Of the 7 100% successfully completed with a master (3) or better on the overall grading rubric.

**M 4: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - The course was not offered in the summer.
Fall 2013 - The course was not offered in the summer.
Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) of students achieved mastery or better (3 or >) on the overall grading rubric.

A total of N=1 students completed the District Improvement Plan for student achievement this year. Of the 1 student 100% successfully completed at a level of mastery (3) or better based on the overall grading rubric.

SLO 2: Research

Graduates will conduct and interpret research on current education trends in the field of education.

Related Measures:

M 5: Action Research (Building)

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - Action Research is collected and completed in the spring of each year.
Fall 2013 - Action Research is collected and completed in the spring of each year.
Spring 2014 - 100% (N=2) of the Specialists students completed the Action Research Project at a level of mastery or above in REF 791 (Part 2).

A total of 2 building level specialist students completed the Action Research Project this year. 100% scored mastery or better.

M 6: Action Research Project District

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 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2013 - Action research is collected and completed in the spring of each year.
Fall 2013 - Action research is collected and completed in the spring of each year.
Spring 2014 - There were no district level students enrolled in REF 791 for the Action Research Project.

No building level specialist students enrolled in REF 791 to complete the Action Research Project this year.

M 7: RCR Building
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 80% accuracy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=1) completed the RCR/CITI training module at the prescribed department level of accuracy.
Fall 2013 - 100% (N=3) completed the RCR/CITI training module at the prescribed department level of accuracy.
Spring 2014 - No students completed the RCR/CITI training module.

A total of 4 building level specialist's students completed the RCR/CITI training module at the prescribed department level this year.

M 8: 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 70% accuracy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2013 - There were no district level students who took the RCR/CITI training module in the summer.
Fall 2013 - There were no district level students who took the RCR/CITI training module in the fall.
Spring 2014 - There were no district level students who took the RCR/CITI training module in the spring.

No district level students took the RCR/CITI training module this year.

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

**Related Measures:**

M 9: SLLA Content Areas (Building)

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 within the average or above average range on at least 5 of the 8 test categories assessed through the SLLA (School Leaders Licensure Assessment) as indicated in the ETS Praxis Report for Test code 6011.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - There were no program completers for the program in the summer semester. Fall 2013 - There were no program completers for the program in the fall semester. Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) of students scored within the average or above average range on 5 of the 8 test categories assessed through the SLLA. A total of 1 student (N=1) took and reported SLLA scores. The one student scored within the average or above average range on the 5 of the 8 test categories. ETS changed their reporting system. Some student scores are not available.

**M 10: District Leadership Essay (District)**

Students on the District Level plan of study complete a District Case Study in a designated course (EDA 742). The essay 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Summer 2013 - Course not offered this semester.

Fall 2013 - The Specialist program had no specialist's students enrolled in the course in the fall.

Spring 2014 - Course not offered this semester.

**M 11: Strategic Budget (Building)**

Candidates will conduct research, analyze data and interpret results for a compressive financial analysis of the school or district.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - 100% (N=1) of the students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

Fall 2013 - 100% (N=1) of the students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=5) of the students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

A total of N=7 students completed the Strategic Budget this year. Of the 7 100% of the students completed at mastery or better (3 or>) on a 4 point scale.
M 12: 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 Strategic Budget project.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - There were no district level specialist students enrolled in the course in the summer.
Fall 2013 - There were no district level specialist students enrolled in the course in the fall.
Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better (3 or >) in the spring.

A total of N=1 student completed the Strategic Budget this year. Of the one student 100% completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better (3 or >).

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 13: Graduate Survey Building
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 completed surveys will be rated proficient or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
A survey is sent each spring to graduates who have completed a program in educational administration within 1, 3, or 5 years of graduation. For spring 2014, surveys were sent electronically to 73 individuals who graduated in 2009, 2011, or 2013. Only 11 completed surveys were returned. Two of the surveys returned were for the EDS - Building program and both were 2009 graduates. Although both respondents rated their programs favorably, this N was too low to draw meaningful conclusions.

M 14: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
A survey is sent each spring to graduates who have completed a program in educational administration within 1, 3, or 5 years of graduation. For spring 2014, surveys were sent electronically to 73 individuals who graduated in 2009, 2011, or 2013. Only 11 completed surveys were returned. None of the surveys returned met the criteria for inclusion in the EDS report, i.e. none had graduated from the district level specialist's program in years 2009, 2011 or 2013. Therefore, data were not reported this cycle for this target.

M 15: Internship Building
Candidates will be able to demonstrate practical applications 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 a 4-point scale on the rating scale.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Summer 2013 - No students are evaluated during the summer months.
Fall 2013 - No students 0% (N=1) scored mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4-point scale on the rating scale. The only students evaluated scored a 2 (basic) on the assessment.
Spring 2014 - 100% of students (N=3) scored mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4-point scale on the rating scale.
A total of N=4 building level specialist students completed the internship for 2013 - 2014. A total of 75% of students (N=4) scored mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4-point scale on the rating scale.

M 16: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2013 - There were no district level specialist students evaluated during the summer months.
Fall 2013 - There were no district level specialist students enrolled in the internship in the fall.
Spring 2014 - There were no district level specialist students enrolled in the internship in the fall.
No district level specialist students were enrolled in the internship in 2013-2014.

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

O/O 5: Completion and Licensure
Graduates will successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.
Related Measures:

**M 17: SLLA Building**

Graduates will successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - There were no program completers in the specialist program in the summer of 2013.

Fall 2013 - There were no program completers in the specialist program in the fall of 2013.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) specialist program completer took the SLLA and passed.

A total of 1 student took the SLLA and passed with the required score. 100% of program completers were successful this year meeting the required score for the licensure exam.

**M 18: 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 or will have completed a graduate degree in Educational Administration before entering the program,

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - No specialist's students entered the program in the summer.

Fall 2013 - No specialist's students entered the program in the fall.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) of students entered the program in the summer with a valid administrator's license or graduate degree in Educational Administration.

A total of one student entered into the district level specialist's program this year. 100% held valid administrator's license or graduate degree in Educational Administration.

**M 19: Degree Completion Building**

Candidates will successfully matriculate through the program with all required criteria.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of program completers will successfully complete the program within 8 years of enrollment.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=1) of program completers successfully completed the program within 8
years of enrollment.
Fall 2013 - 100% (N=1) of program completers successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.
Spring 2014 - 100% (N=2) of program completers successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.

A total of N=4 program completers successfully completed the program this year. 100% successfully completed within 8 years of enrollment.

**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 program completers will successfully complete the program within 8 years of enrollment.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Summer 2013 - There were no district level program completers who graduated in the summer of 2013.
Fall 2013 - There were no district level program completers who graduated in the fall of 2013.
Spring 2014 - There were no district level program completers who graduated in the spring of 2014.

There were no district level program completers who graduated this year.

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

**Data Management System**
Data collection continues to be a challenge for this program. The program allows open enrollment (students may enroll any semester) and students attend part-time. For efficiency, some of the courses required in this program are also required in other programs. Some assessment data are stored in TK20, other assessment points are retained and reported by faculty. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the department will work to create a systematic data management system to better assess the program and track student progress.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Projected Completion Date:** 06/29/2015
**Responsible Person/Group:** New Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator _ TBA; Thelma Roberson, Department Chair

**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 exams and comprehensive exams, and completing assessments at a level of mastery or above. However, there are not enough data points in this data set to draw meaningful conclusions.

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?**
An area of concern within this limited data set is the fact that one student did not show mastery in the internship. Although the student reported several personal conflicts that prevented her from fully participating in the internship, the program recognizes that the internship is where students can best demonstrate application of skills and knowledge learned in the program. The internship coordinator is working with internship supervisors to identify better ways to monitor interns' progress and catch potential problems earlier in the internship experience. The department will also continue to identify field-based experiences embedded within core courses that offer additional authentic learning opportunities.

Another area of concern is the lack of participation in the post-graduate surveys the department sends. The department is working within the college to identify ways to increase participation including working with the MS Department of Education.

Improving data management continues to be a priority within the department.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The Education Specialist's (Education Administration) (EDS) degree is a 36-hour graduate program designed for majors who are interested in pursuing a graduate degree beyond the Master's level in the field of Educational Administration. The program is accredited by CAEP (formerly NCATE) / through its SPA, National Educational Leadership Preparation (formerly ELCC). The program is aligned with state licensing and national accrediting standards and is offered in two tracks. The Building level track is designed for students who do not already hold an educational administrative license and who have not completed a graduate degree in educational administration. Typically, these students are seeking the advanced degree to pursue a license as a school level Educational Administrator, e.g., Principal or Assistant Principal. This track offers an introductory program that can lead to licensure as a school (building) level administrator. The District level track is designed for individuals who are already licensed as a school administrator or who already hold a degree in educational administration. This track offers the same core courses as the Building track, but includes advanced coursework to broaden the students' knowledge in the field and prepare them for administrative work beyond the school level. Typically, individuals pursuing this track are preparing for executive level leadership of PK-12 schools, e.g., Superintendent of Education, Assistant Superintendent, Director, etc., or a faculty position in higher education.

Almost exclusively, students in the EDS program work full time in PK-12 settings and enroll in the program as part-time students. Therefore, coursework is offered at night, on weekends, and online. The program includes field-based experiences, embedded in the coursework and includes an internship. These experiences provide authentic learning opportunities and application of course content. In lieu of a thesis, students complete a research project across two semesters.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

The Department has identified a few challenges with data management including the tracking of several program milestones, e.g., RSIE (formerly RCR) training. The department is developing a 1 hour orientation course and developing a systemic data management system to ensure students are on track and completing milestones on time, e.g., RSIE training, plan of study, plagiarism tutorial, select readings, etc.

There are several factors that make data management related to this program, particularly problematic. EDA courses are offered to majors and non-majors; students at the specialists and doctoral levels take the same core courses; and within each degree program, there are two tracks (Building and District). This means a course may have EDS building, EDS district, EDD building, EDD district, PHD building, PHD district, students from other majors, and non-degree students enrolled. (Non-degree students are generally educators or administrators who are taking a course to renew their license or individuals who pursued an alternative route to licensure and are required to take additional coursework.) Majors are admitted each semester and there is no set course sequence other than the timing of the internship. Some students began in one degree program, e.g., Ph.D., and were allowed or advised to switch to a different program, e.g., Ed.S. Additionally, we have found inconsistencies in how students are coded in SOAR. Due to mixed enrollment in course, transfers between
programs and problems with coding, we are not always confident that queries produce results truly reflective of our programs. Therefore, data management remains a priority.

Closing the Loop
The review of existing data has assisted the department in making improvements. A review of our graduates' pass/fail rate on their licensure exam prompted the department to add SLLA review sessions each semester in an effort to improve pass rates. We hired a Recruitment and Retention Specialist to assist us in strategic planning to recruit and retain strong students. We streamlined schedules to create a more predictable course offering sequence. We shifted focus from growing our doctoral programs to growing our MED/EDS programs. {We were under resources in the doctoral program.} We continue to face challenges having only two tenured-faculty members (including the chair) in the department. Faculty development for new hires will be a priority for the upcoming year.
Mission / Purpose

Mission: The doctoral programs (Ed.D./ Ph.D.) in the Department of Educational Leadership and School Counseling prepares individuals to serve as transformational educational leaders, licensed educational administrators in P-12 educational settings, and as university faculty and researchers in the field of educational leadership. Through world-class faculty, standards-based programs, and partnerships with educational agencies, students learn innovative, research-based practices to improve education.

The program contributes to the mission of the University through all aspects of scholarship that promote academic success; enhance the image of the Department, College, and the University; foster community relationships and involvement; and create healthy minds, bodies, and campuses.

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 Building
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 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=2) of building level doctoral candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

Fall 2013 - 80% (4/5) of building level doctoral candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam of the first attempt. One student will rewrite the exam in the spring.

Spring 2014 - 86% (N=6/7) of building level candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. One student will have oral comps for a retake.

A total of N=14 building level doctoral students completed the comprehensive exam successfully this year. Of the 14 students 93% were successful at completing the comps on the first attempt.

M 2: Comprehensive Exam District
Candidates will demonstrate the content knowledge that promotes student achievement.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - No district level candidates took the comprehensive exam in the summer.

Fall 2013 - 100% of district level candidates (N=4) successfully completed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=2) of district level candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt.

A total of N=6 district level candidates successfully completed the comprehensive exam this year. Of the 6 100% successfully completed the exam on the first attempt.

**M 3: School Improvement Plan Building**

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - 100% of students (N=8) completed the School Improvement Plan at the level of mastery (3 or >) or better.

Fall 2013 - 100% of students (N=4) completed the School Improvement Plan at the level of mastery (3 or >) or better.

Spring 2014 - 100% of students (N=1) completed the School Improvement Plan at the level of mastery (3 or >) or better.

A total of N=13 students completed the School Improvement Plan this year. Of the 13 100% of the students completed the School Improvement Plan at a level of mastery (3 or >) or better.

**M 4: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - Class was not offered in the summer.

Fall 2013 - Class was not offered in the fall.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=5) of students completed the District Improvement Plan at a level of mastery of better (3 or >).
A total of 5 students completed the District Improvement Plan this year. Of the 5 100% completed the District Improvement Plan at a level of master or better (3 or >).

**SLO 2: Research**
Graduates will conduct and interpret research on current educational trends in the field of education.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Action Research Building**

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 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 rubric at a level of mastery or better (3 or >).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

- Summer 2013 - Action research is collected and completed in the spring of each year.
- Fall 2013 - Action research is collected and completed in the spring of each year.
- Spring 2014 - There were building level specialist students enrolled in REF 791 for the Action Research Project.

No building level doctoral students were enrolled in REF 791 this year to complete the Action Research Project.

**M 6: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

- Summer 2013 - 100% (N=5) of district level doctoral candidates successfully defended their dissertation within 8 years of their admit date.
- Fall 2013 - 100% (N=4) of district level doctoral candidates successfully defended their dissertation within 8 years of their admit date.
- Spring 2014 - 100% (N=2) of district level doctoral candidates successfully defended their dissertation within 8 years of their admit date.

**M 7: RCR Training (Building)**

Students on a Building 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 candidates will complete the RCR training module prescribed by the department at 85% accuracy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=4) of candidates completed the RCR/CITI training module at the accuracy level prescribed by the department.

Fall 2013 - 100% (N=4) of candidates completed the RCR/CITI training module at the accuracy level prescribed by the department.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=3) of candidates completed the RCR/CITI training module at the accuracy level prescribed by the department.

A total of 11 candidates completed the RCR/CITI training module at the level of accuracy prescribed by the department. 100% were successful.

**M 8: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - No students completed the RCR/CITI training module in the summer.

Fall 2013 - 100% (N=3) of candidates completed the RCR/CITI training module at the accuracy level prescribed by the department.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=2) of candidates completed the RCR/CITI training module at the accuracy level prescribed by the department.

A total of N=5 students completed the RCR/CITI training module this year. 100% of the students were successful.

**SLO 3: Student Learning**

Graduates will promote and increase student achievement.

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: SLLA Content Area (Building)**

Successful completion of the educator licensure exam for building track candidates.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of program completers will score within the average or above average range on at least 5 of the 8 test categories assessed through the SLLA (School Leaders Licensure Assessment) as indicated in the ETS Praxis Report for Test code 6011.
**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Summer 2013 - There were no program completers for the program in the summer semester with subscores available. Fall 2013 - There were no program completers for the program in the fall semester with subscores available. Spring 2014 - There were no program completers for the program in the fall with subscores available.

There were no program completers for the program whose subcontent scores were available.

ETS changed their reporting system. Some student scores are not available.

**M 10: District Leadership Essay (District)**

Students on the District Level plan of study take a District Leadership Essay in a designated course (EDA 742). The essay 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 complete the District Level Essay at mastery or better (3 or better).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - Course not offered in the summer of 2013.

Fall 2013 - 100% of students (N=4) completed the District Level Essay at mastery or better (3 or better).

Spring 2014 - Course not offered in the spring of 2013.

A total of N=4 students completed the District Level Essay this year. Of the four 100% completed the District Level Essay at a level of mastery or better (3 or better).

**M 11: Strategic Budget (Building)**

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 Building Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale using the scoring rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=4) of building level students completed the Building Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

Fall 2013 - 100% (N=1) of building level students completed the Building Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) of building level students completed the Building Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.
A total of N=6 building level students completed the Building Strategic Budget this year. Of the 6 100% completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

**M 12: 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 the "Strategic Budget" at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=2) of students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

Fall 2013 - There were no district level doctoral students enrolled in the course in the fall.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) of students completed the Strategic Budget at mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

A total of N=3 students completed the Strategic Budget this year. Of the 3 100% completed the Strategic Budget at a level of mastery or better (3 or >) on a 4 point scale.

**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 13: Graduate Survey (Building)**
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
A survey is sent each spring to graduates who have completed a program in educational administration within 1, 3, or 5 years of graduation. For spring 2014, surveys were sent electronically to 73 individuals who graduated in 2009, 2011, or 2013. Only 11 completed surveys were returned. Only six completed surveys were graduates of the doctoral program (2011, N=4; 2013, N=2) at the building level. Although most of the respondent's answers were favorable, the N is too low to draw meaningful conclusions. It was noted that one of the respondents (2011 graduates) rated 32% of the items lower than desired.

**M 14: 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: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
A survey is sent each spring to graduates who have completed a program in educational administration within 1, 3, or 5 years of graduation. For Spring 2014, surveys were sent electronically to 73 individuals who graduated in 2009, 2011, or 2013. Only 11 completed surveys were returned. Only two (a 2011 and 2013 graduate) who completed the survey were graduates from the doctoral program at the building level. Although the respondents' answers were favorable, the N is too low to draw meaningful conclusions.

M 15: Internship (Building)

Students on the Building 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 mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards for building level standards in the final evaluation.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Summer 2013 - There is no internship evaluation in the summer.

Fall 2013 - 75% of building level doctoral students (3/4) scored mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards for building level standards in the final evaluation. In addition one student was not evaluated and given an Incomplete for course. He will retake the course in the Spring.

Spring 2014 - 80% of building level doctoral students (4/5) scored mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards for building level standards in the final evaluation.

There were a total N=9 building level doctoral students were enrolled in the internship in 2013 - 2014. 78% (7/9) of students scored mastery or better on the ISSLC standards for the building level standards on the final evaluation.

M 16: Internship District

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 mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards in the final evaluation.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Summer 2013 - There are no students evaluated during the summer.

Fall 2013 - 80% of students (4/5) scored mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards on the final evaluation. One student scored basic on the assessment.

Spring 2014 - 75% of district level doctoral students (3/4) scored mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards for the building level standards on the final evaluation.
point scale) on the ISSLC standards on the final evaluation.

A total of N=9 students was enrolled in the district level doctoral internship. 78% of district level doctoral students scored mastery or better (3 or > on a 4 point scale) on the ISSLC standards on the final evaluation.

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

O/O 5: Completion and Licensure
Graduates will successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.

Related Measures:

M 17: SLLA (Building)

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - 100% (N=1) program completer passed the SLLA at the required score.

Fall 2013 - There were no program completers in the doctoral program in the fall who took the SLLA exam.

Spring 2014 - There were no program completers in the doctoral program in the spring who took the SLLA exam.

There was a total of one program completer who took the SLLA exam this year. 100% of the students met the required score.

M 18: 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 or prior Graduate Degree in Educational Administration before entering the program.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - No doctoral student entered the district level program in the summer.

Fall 2013 - No doctoral students entered the district level program in the fall.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=3) students held a valid administrator's license or a prior graduate degree.
in Educational Administration before entering into the program.

A total of 3 doctoral students entered into the district level doctoral program with a valid administrator’s license or prior graduate degree in Educational Administration. 100% of those students were successful.

**M 19: Degree Completion (Building)**

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 program completers will successfully complete the program within 8 years of enrollment.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - 100% (N=1) of building level doctoral program completer successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.

Fall 2013 - 100% (N=3) of building level doctoral program completers successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=5) of building level doctoral program completers successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.

There were a total of 9 graduates in the building level program for 2013-14. A total of 100% (N=9) of program completers successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.

**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 complete the program within the 8 year time period.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013 - 100% (N=5) of program completers completed the program within the 8 year time period.

Fall 2013 - 100% (N=4) of program completers completed the program within the 8 year time period.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=3) of program completers completed the program within the 8 year time period.

There were a total of 12 graduates in the district level program for 2013-14. A total of 100% (N=12) of district level program completers successfully completed the program within 8 years of enrollment.

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

**Data Management System**

Data collection continues to be a challenge for this program. The program allows open enrollment (students may enroll any semester) and students attend part-time. For efficiency, some of the courses required in this program are also required in other programs. Some assessment data are stored in TK20, other assessment points are retained and reported by faculty. During the 2014-2015 academic year, the department will work to create a systematic data management system to better assess the program and track student progress.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Projected Completion Date: 06/29/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator - TBA; Thelma Roberson, Department Chair

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 exams and comprehensive exams, and completing assessments at a level of mastery or above. However, there are not enough data points in this data set to draw meaningful conclusions.

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

An area of concern within this limited data set is the fact that two students did not show mastery in the internship. The program recognizes that the internship is where students can best demonstrate application of skills and knowledge learned in the program. The internship coordinator is working with internship supervisors to identify better ways to monitor interns' progress and catch potential problems earlier in the internship experience. The department will also continue to identify field-based experiences embedded within core courses that offer additional authentic learning opportunities.

Another area of concern is the lack of participation in the post-graduate surveys the department sends. The department is working within the college to identify ways to increase participation including working with the MS Department of Education.

Improving data management continues to be a priority within the department.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) and Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees are 60+ hour graduate programs designed for majors who are interested in pursuing a graduate degree beyond the Master's or Specialist's level in the field of Educational Administration. The program is accredited by CAEP (formerly NCATE) / through its SPA, National Educational Leadership Preparation (formerly ELCC). The program is aligned with state licensing and national accrediting standards and is offered in two tracks. The Building level track is designed for students who do not already hold an educational administrative license and who have not completed a graduate degree in educational administration. Typically, these students are seeking the advanced degree to pursue a license as a school level Educational Administrator, e.g., Principal or Assistant Principal. This track offers an introductory program that can lead to licensure as a school (building) level administrator. The District level track is designed for individuals who are already licensed as a school administrator or who already hold a degree in educational administration. This track offers the same core courses as the Building track, but includes advanced coursework to broaden the students' knowledge in the field and prepare them for administrative work beyond the school level. Typically, individuals pursuing this track are preparing for executive level leadership of PK-12 schools, e.g., Superintendent of Education, Assistant Superintendent, Director, etc., or a faculty position in higher education.

Almost exclusively, students in the doctoral program work full time in PK-12 settings and enroll in the program
as part-time students. Therefore, coursework is offered at night, on weekends, and online. The program includes field-based experiences, embedded in the coursework and includes an internship. These experiences provide authentic learning opportunities and application of course content. Doctoral students complete a dissertation after completing coursework and passing their comprehensive exams.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

The Department has identified a few challenges with data management including the tracking of several program milestones, e.g., RSIE (formerly RCR) training. The department is developing an orientation course and developing a systemic data management system to ensure students are on track and completing milestones on time, e.g., RSIE training, plan of study, plagiarism tutorial, select readings, etc.

There are several factors that make data management related to this program, particularly problematic. EDA courses are offered to majors and non-majors; students at the specialists and doctoral levels take the same core courses; and within each degree program, there are two tracks (Building and District). This means a course may have EDS building, EDS district, EDD building, EDD district, PHD building, PHD district, students from other majors, and non-degree students enrolled. {Non-degree students are generally educators or administrators who are taking a course to renew their license or individuals who pursued an alternative route to licensure and are required to take additional coursework.} Majors are admitted each semester and there is no set course sequence other than the timing of the internship. Some students began in one degree program, e.g., Ph.D., and were allowed or advised to switch to a different program, e.g., Ed.S. Additionally, we have found inconsistencies in how students are coded in SOAR. Due to mixed enrollment in course, transfers between programs and problems with coding, we are not always confident that queries produce results truly reflective of our programs. Therefore, data management remains a priority.

**Closing the Loop**

The review of existing data has assisted the department in making improvements. A review of our graduates' pass/fail rate on their licensure exam prompted the department to add SLLA review sessions each semester in an effort to improve pass rates. We hired a Recruitment and Retention Specialist to assist us in strategic planning to recruit and retain strong students. We streamlined schedules to create a more predictable course offering sequence. We shifted focus from growing our doctoral programs to growing our MED/EDS programs. {We were under resources in the doctoral program.} We continue to face challenges having only two tenured-faculty members (including the chair) in the department. Faculty development for new hires will be a priority 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 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: Synthesize, evaluate, articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge.
Doctoral candidates will synthesize, evaluate, articulate and demonstrate special education content and theoretical knowledge in their specialty areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC/NBPTS

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.

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 regarding special education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Summer 2013
0 candidates took qualifying examinations.
Fall 2013
0 candidates took qualifying examinations.
Spring 2014
0 candidates took qualifying examinations.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point
Spring 2014
1/1 (50%) rated mastery (2)
1/1 (50%) rated exemplary (3)

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
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.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

- Summer 2013
  - 0 candidates at this transition point.
- Fall 2013
  - 0 candidates at this transition point.
- Spring 2014
  - 0 candidates at this transition point.

**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 (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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

- Summer 2013
  - 0 graduates.
- Fall 2013
  - 0 graduates.
- Spring 2014
  - 0 graduates.

**SLO 2: Synthesize, evaluate, articulate and demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.**
Doctoral candidates will synthesize, evaluate, articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/CEC/NBPTS

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) rated exemplary (3)

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
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.

**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 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

- Summer 2013
  0 candidates at this transition point.
- Fall 2013
  0 candidates at this transition point.
- Spring 2014
  0 candidates at this transition point.

**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 (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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

- Summer 2013
  0 graduates.
- Fall 2013
  0 graduates.
- Spring 2014
  0 graduates.

**SLO 3: Analyze, synthesize, evaluate, 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/CEC/NBPTS

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) rated exemplary (3)

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
0 candidates at this transition point.

**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 (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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Summer 2013
0 graduates.
Fall 2013
0 graduates.
Spring 2014
0 graduates.

SLO 4: Develop and demonstrate technological resources and skills.
Doctoral candidates will develop and demonstrate technological resources and skills to impact teaching and learning.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE Conceptual Framework-Technology/NBPTS

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) rated exemplary (3)
0 candidates at this transition point.
Total
2/2 (100%) rated exemplary (3) on the outcome for developing and 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Summer 2013
0 graduates.
Fall 2013
0 graduates.
Spring 2014
0 graduates.

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: Serve in leadership roles for professional development and community service.
Doctoral candidates will serve in leadership roles for professional development and community service as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/CEC/NBPTS

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met

Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) rated mastery (2) on the outcome for serving in leadership roles for professional development and community service.
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 (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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2013
0 graduates.
Fall 2013
0 graduates.
Spring 2014
0 graduates.

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

O/O 6: Obtain employment in a highly specialized position.
Special Education Ph.D. graduates will obtain employment in a university, school district or agency in a highly specialized position.

Related Measures:

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 special education Ph.D. candidates will report that they have obtained employment in a highly specialized position in a university, public school, or agency.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Summer 2013
0 graduates.
Fall 2013
0 graduates.
Spring 2014
0 graduates.

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

Provide experiences with grant writing.
Provide experiences with writing grants. Encourage each candidate to take a grant writing course or participate in departmental grant writing experiences.
Established in Cycle: 2006-2007
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: Chair CISE and Special Education Faculty

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: Synthesize, evaluate, articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Synthesize, evaluate, articulate and demonstrate pedagogical knowledge.

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: Finished
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Fall 2007
Responsible Person/Group: SPE faculty and Graduate Advisor

Secure current SPE technologies.
Secure current SPE assistive/augmented 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:** Develop and demonstrate technological resources and skills.  
**Measure:** Exit Interview/Survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Develop and demonstrate technological resources and skills.

**Implementation Description:** Fall 2010 Candidates will participate with undergraduate cohorts in interactive white board training.

**Responsible Person/Group:** CISE Graduate Faculty and Cohort Promethean Training

---

**Involve 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

**Review special education Ph.D. program plan.**  
As part of the curriculum audit for CISE, graduate faculty will review the Ph.D. program plan for special education to ensure the program is aligned with current CEC standards.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

---

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

**What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?**  
In 2013-2014 the assessments documented mastery of each of the 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 11 candidates successfully completed the dissertation, with that one candidate graduating in the summer of 2014. The one graduate gained employment in a state agency prior to graduation. 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. Qualitative data indicate that special education Ph.D. candidates feel prepared to hold high level positions upon completion of the Ph.D. 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 2013-2014 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 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 11 Ph.D. in Special Education candidates at various transition points in the program in 2013-2014. 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.

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, the Mississippi Hearing-Vision Project, the Statewide Vision Workshops Grant, the Supports for Transition Grant, the Bridge to Independence Grant and the Assisting with Transition to Community Life Grant, 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 2013-2014. 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

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

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 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 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 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, one of which is 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 2: Content Knowledge

To prepare students who demonstrate the content knowledge necessary to serve as educational leaders.

Related Measures:

M 3: Student Achievement Plan

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 Gulf Coast - EDA 605 100% of students (N=16) scored mastery or better on the Student Achievement Plan. 14 students scored Exemplary (4); 2 students scored Mastery (3). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - EDA 605 100% of students (N=9) scored mastery or better on the Student Achievement Plan. 6 students scored Exemplary (4); 3 students scored Mastery (3).
Spring 2014 Gulf Coast - EDA 605 100% of students (N=11) scored mastery or better on the Student Achievement Plan. Nine students scored Exemplary (4) and two students scored (3) mastery.

A total of 36 students was enrolled in EDA 605 and completed the Student Achievement Plan. 100% of students scored mastery or better.

M 4: School Improvement Plan

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - Course not offered in the summer.
Fall 2013 Gulf Coast - EDA 607 100% (N=16) of students scored mastery or better. 15 of the 16 scored exemplary.
Spring 2014 Gulf Coast - EDA 607 100% of students (N=9) scored mastery or better on the School Improvement Plan. Eight (8) of the students scored Exemplary and one (1) students scored mastery.

A total of 25 students were enrolled in EDA 607 and completed the School Improvement Plan. 100% of the students scored mastery or better on the assignment.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - Course not offered in the summer.
Fall 2013 Gulf Coast - EDA 606 100% (N=16) of the students scored at mastery level or higher on the Strategic Plan. Thirteen (13) of the sixteen (16) scored exemplary.
Spring 2014 - Hattiesburg - EDA 606 100% (N=9) of students scored mastery or higher on the Strategic Plan. Six scored Exemplary and three scored mastery.

A total of 25 students was enrolled in EDA 606 and completed the Strategic Plan. 100% of students scored mastery or higher on the assignment.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - 100% of students (N=9) achieved mastery or better (3 or >) on the Diversity Research Paper. Seven achieved distinguished (4) and 2 achieved mastery (3).
Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - 91% (N=11) of students achieved mastery or above (3 or >) on the Diversity Research Paper. One student scored basic (2).
Spring 2014 - Course not offered this spring.

A total of N=20 students was enrolled in EDA 603. 95% of students achieved mastery or above on the Diversity Research Paper.
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - 94% of students (N=17) scored proficient or better (3 or >) on the final evaluation of the internship. One student scored less than mastery (<3) on the internship evaluation.

Fall 2013 There are no students in the final phase of the internship in the fall semester.

Spring 2014 Gulf Coast - 69% of students (N=16) scored proficient or better (3 or >) on the final evaluation of the internship. A total of 5 students scored less than mastery (<3) on the internship evaluation.

A total of 33 students was enrolled and evaluated in EDA 636 this year. 81% of the students scored mastery or better on the internship evaluation.

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

Internship Experience
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Based on data collected from our assessments we will address deficits in our internship experience by providing additional su...

M 8: Graduate Survey
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: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
80% of completed surveys will be rated proficient or better (3 or >).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
A survey is sent each spring to graduates who have completed a program in educational administration within 1, 3, or 5 years of graduation. For spring 2014, surveys were sent electronically to 73 individuals who graduated in 2009, 2011, or 2013. Only 11 completed surveys were returned. None of the surveys returned met the criteria for inclusion in the MED report, i.e, none had graduated from the master's program in years 2009, 2011 or 2013. Therefore, data were not reported this cycle for this target.
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 or better on the Case Study Analysis based on the assignment rubric.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 Gulf Coast - EDA 604 100% of students (N=16) scored mastery (3) or better on the Case Study Analysis. Fourteen (14) scored Exemplary (4) and 2 scored Mastery (3).

Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - EDA 604 100% of students (N=9) scored mastery (3) or better on the Case Study Analysis. Five (5) scored Exemplary (4) and 4 scored Mastery (3).

Spring 2014 Gulf Coast - EDA 604 100% of students (N=11) scored master (3) or better on the Case Study Analysis. Eight (8) scored Exemplary (4) and 3 scored mastery (3).

A total of 36 students was enrolled in EDA 604 and completed the Case Study Analysis. 100% of the students scored mastery or better on the assignment.

M 10: SLLA 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 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 within the average or above average range on at least 5 of the 8 test categories assessed through the SLLA (School Leaders Licensure Assessment) as indicated in the ETS Praxis Report for Test code 6011.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013 - There were no program completers for the program in the summer semester.

Fall 2013 - There were no program completers for the program in the fall semester.

Spring 2014 - 100% (N=1) of students scored within the average or above average range on 5 of the 8 test categories assessed through the SLLA.

A total of 1 student (N=1) took and reported SLLA scores. The one student scored within the average or above average range on the 5 of the 8 test categories.

ETS changed their reporting system. Some student scores are not available.
Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

O/O 1: Completion and Licensure
To prepare graduates who can successfully obtain licensure in Educational Administration.

Related Measures:

M 1: SLLA Composite Score
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
The master’s program is on a cohort design. Students graduate in the summer and spring each year.
Hattiesburg - Summer 2013 - 100% (N=14) of program completers passed the SLLA with a minimum score of 169 or better.
Fall 2013 - There were no program completers in the fall.
Gulf Coast - spring 2014 - 57% (4/7) of program completers passed the SLLA with a minimum score of 169 or better.
A total of N=21 program completers took the SLLA exam this year. Of the 21 program completers 86% (18/21) scored at least 169 or better.

M 2: Degree Completion
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 within six year time limit.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg - summer 2013 - 100% of graduates (N=17) completed the program within the six year time limit.
Fall 2013 - There are no program completers who graduate in the fall.
Gulf Coast - spring 2014 - 100% of graduates (N=16) completed the program within the six year time limit.

A total of 33 students graduated from the programs. 100% completed within the six year time limit.

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

Internship Experience

Based on data collected from our assessments we will address deficits in our internship experience by providing additional supervision of our students by university supervisors. We will also address these deficits by increasing the contact and communication between the students and the internship coordinator. By increasing
the communication and the supervision of the students during their internship experience, we can better address potential issues that may arise earlier in the process.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Internship | Outcome/Objective: ISSLC

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

The Master’s Program in Educational Administration continues to be a strength in terms of the design of the program (cohort design) and the variety of delivery methods that successfully meet the needs of working educational professionals. The cohort design provides needed continuity for students enrolled in the program and courses are consistently offered based on a set schedule. Potential students have two delivery modes to choose from in order to best meet their needs. We will continue with this format to continue to provide options for local applicants as well as to recruit students nationally. This model proves to be beneficial for the students who state that they are happy they have the cohort model. Scores reflect positively when we analyze the outcomes from the program, specifically in degree completion, the Student Achievement Plan, and the School Improvement Plan.

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

We will address the deficit in SLLA scores for students enrolled in the Gulf Coast Cohort. The goal is for at least 80% of our students in the Gulf Coast Cohort to meet with success on the first attempt at the SLLA Licensure Exam. In order to meet this goal we will have students participate in a mandatory review/preparation session as a part of their 3rd semester of the program. Students will also have additional opportunities for preparation as we incorporate additional case studies within the coursework that align with the format of the SLLA Licensure Exam Essays.

We have made improvements in this assessment, however, we will continue to monitor the outcomes and provide resources to the students.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Master’s Program in Educational Administration and Supervision is offered in a cohort model providing an opportunity for students in the program with added support throughout the program and following graduation. This format also allows the students an opportunity to build lasting relationships and continuous networking opportunities through the partnerships that they have developed during their matriculation through the program. The M.Ed. offers two program options for candidates looking to pursue a degree in Educational Administration. Option #1 is the hybrid option which admits students every summer. This option has a face to face component offered in a condensed mini session format followed by online instruction in the summer. The fall and spring terms are offered completely online through Blackboard to accommodate the schedules of classroom teachers who are engaged in fulltime teaching responsibilities in the fall and spring. The program concludes the following summer with a repeat of the combination of the face to face and online instruction. Option #2 is a fully online option for candidates looking to complete the program online and those who do not live in close proximity to the USM Hattiesburg Campus. This option also affords us the opportunity to recruit nationally. The coursework for both program options are identical with the only variation being the delivery method. Both program options include an embedded internship experience which flows throughout the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th semesters of the program. Students in the program are required to identify both a primary and
secondary mentor at two site separate site levels (i.e., elementary school, middle school, and/or high school level).

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

In an effort to continuously improve the M.Ed. Program in Educational Administration we have closely monitored the progression of the program and continued to evaluate its success by soliciting feedback from students in the program as well as the instructors who teach in the program. One area that has identified as needing improvement has been in the area of recruitment. To address this deficiency we have scheduled a number of recruiting campaigns including by not limited to; school district visits with teachers, school district visits with principals and superintendents, investing in the purchase of high quality print materials, delivery of print materials, and recruiting at the Making Connections Conference on the Gulf Coast. We have also explored additional recruiting opportunities in both Louisiana, Florida, and Alaska. Additionally, we have maintained a presence at the regional consortium meetings for superintendents on the gulf coast and in the pine belt areas.

Another area that we identified as needing improvement was the supervision of the internship experience. To enhance this part of the program, two retired and well respected superintendents were hired on a part-time basis to increase our university supervisor presence on the internship sites. These superintendents bring a wealth of experience and expertise to our students who are just beginning their journey into the realm of school leadership.

Our final area identified as needing improvement was how our students performed on the SLLA Licensure Exam. The SLLA exam is required in many states for students to obtain licensure. In order to address this area we have provided review study sessions for students who near completion of semester three of the four semester program. The preparation course is required for all students in the program who plan to take the SLLA for licensure.

Closing the Loop

In an effort to close the loop for the M.Ed. program in Educational Administration we have continued to monitor and evaluate the program. One of the areas identified in the action plan as needing improvement was increasing student performance on the SLLA Licensure exam by students enrolled in the Master’s Program in Educational Administration. In order to address this concern and to better prepare students in the EDA Program for the exam, we implemented a mandatory review/preparation session towards the end of the 3rd semester of the program. Our goal was to achieve 80% passing among students in the program on the first attempt. Although we did meet the 80% passing for the Hybrid cohort (Hattiesburg Program) we fell short of the 80% passing for the Gulf Coast cohort. To address this deficiency we will continue to provide the SLLA review/preparation session. In addition, we have begun including additional case studies within the coursework that mimic the format of the SLLA Licensure exam. With this addition to the preparation protocol for the SLLA we expect to meet our goal of at least 80% of our students passing the exam on the first attempt.
Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**SLO 1: Plan, design and implement instruction**

Students will plan and design a unit of instruction and lesson plans from the domains of the curriculum: math, social studies and science using the Understanding by Design model and with constructivist methodology. Students will align the unit goals and objectives with the State of Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks, the DOK wheel and Bloom’s Taxonomy. Students will write lesson plans for deaf and hard of hearing students in classroom and individual settings including modification and differentiation of instruction to address individual learning needs. Students will include individual or group IEP goals and objectives within the plans and instruction.

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Formative evaluation: plan, design unit of instruction and lessons**

In SHS 422 (Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching for Students who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing) each student will develop lesson/session plans including State of Mississippi Curriculum Framework standards and the DOK list based on Bloom’s Taxonomy. Students will develop goals, objectives, anticipatory set, procedures and student assessments for small group and individual learning of deaf and hard of hearing children. Using the Understanding by Design mode, each student will design a unit of instruction including sequential lesson plans. Students explore differentiation of planning and instructional design for deaf and hard of hearing students. Students write IEP goals and objectives incorporating techniques and strategies to facilitate learning as well as appropriate student assessment.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**

80% of students will complete a unit of instruction and a sequence of lesson plans including IEP goals and objectives, anticipatory set, procedures, and student assessment as a major project with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

100% of students (n=4) completed a unit of instruction with a score of 80% or better.

**M 2: Student Teaching Assessment**

Each student completes a final semester of supervised student teaching with deaf and hard of hearing students in two different educational placements. This is the Capstone experience. In SHS 495 and SHS 496 (Student Teaching), students demonstrate their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions 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 diverse students with hearing loss. Students complete field experience portfolio including lesson plans, classroom management plan, teaching samples, reflections, evaluations, a video of teaching with self-evaluation and reflection and analysis of observation of instruction. Students are evaluated by the University Supervisor and the Cooperating teacher at mid-term and at the end of the experience on the In-Class Evaluation tool.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
Target:
90% of teacher candidates enrolled in SHS 495 will attain a grade of B or better on their final assessment with the In-Class Evaluation instrument as rated by the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of teacher candidates enrolled in SHS 495 (n=1) attained a grade of B or better from the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor on the In-Class Evaluation. 100% of teacher candidates enrolled in SHS 496 (n=1) attained a grade of B or better as graded by the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor on the final In-Class Teacher Evaluation.

SLO 2: Understand of typical development of listening, speech and spoken language and implications of deaf and hard of hearing students
In SHS 433 (Language Development for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students), students demonstrate an understanding of the stages, sequences and progression of typical development of spoken English language and the impact of hearing loss on these developments. Students review informal and formal means of assessing components of language and review curricula and approaches designed for deaf and hard of hearing students. Each student practices collecting and analyzing authentic and prepared language samples from children and students with hearing loss and learn how to identify teaching targets. In SHS 435 (Developing Auditory-Oral Communication with Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students) students develop an understanding of the relationships between listening, speech and spoken language development and the impact of hearing loss from infancy through school age. Students develop an understanding of speech perception and speech production, auditory development and functional auditory assessment, speech development, assessment and speech teaching. Students analyze auditory-verbal teaching sessions, observe and discuss auditory-verbal communication strategies and techniques. Each student will complete a Ling Six Sound Test project. Students will assess and describe auditory-verbal communication development of a deaf or hard of hearing child and write a case study report with a minimum of three objectives in each area of listening, speech and spoken language.

Related Measures:

M 3: Assess auditory access of student with hearing loss and use of hearing technology
In SHS 435 (Developing Auditory-Oral Communication with Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students) students develop an understanding of the relationships between listening, speech and spoken language development and the impact of hearing loss from infancy through school age. Students develop an understanding of speech perception and speech production, auditory development and functional auditory assessment, speech development, assessment and speech teaching. Students analyze auditory-verbal teaching sessions, observe and discuss auditory-verbal communication strategies and techniques. Each student will complete a Ling Six Sound Test project. Students will assess and describe auditory-verbal communication development of a deaf or hard of hearing child and write a case study report with a minimum of three objectives in each area of listening, speech and spoken language.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
85% of students enrolled in SHS 435 will successfully complete the Six Sounds Test project and report with a score of 80% or better.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of students (n=4) enrolled in SHS 435 completed the Ling Six Sounds Test project and report with a score of 80% or better.

M 4: Sample language, make recommendations for teaching
In SHS 433 (Language Development for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students), students demonstrate an understanding of the stages, sequences and progression of typical development of spoken English language and the impact of hearing loss on these developments. Students review informal and formal
means of assessing components of language and review curricula and approaches designed for deaf and hard of hearing students. Each student practices collecting and analyzing authentic and prepared language samples from children and students with hearing loss and learn how to identify teaching targets.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students enrolled in SHS 433 will successfully complete a language sampling project, including at least 3 recommendations for planning instruction for the student, with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students (n=4) enrolled in SHS 433 completed a language sampling project with a score of 80% or better.

**SLO 3: Understand hearing loss, causes and hearing assessment and use of hearing technologies used by deaf/hard of hearing students**
Students who will be modern teachers of the deaf and hard of hearing need to have scientific knowledge and understanding of the different causes and incidence of hearing loss in the population, especially children. Students need to be understand how hearing loss is assessed and what tests are appropriate at different ages. Students acquire knowledge of how hearing aids, cochlear implants, bone conduction hearing aids and FM systems work. To be effective students develop hands-on skills in daily listening checks and troubleshooting the deaf and hard of hearing student's personal hearing technology and its use by the student to listen to spoken language.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Understand hearing loss, causes and hearing assessment**
In SHS 421, (Aural Habilitation) each student develops an understanding of the causes, degrees and types of hearing loss and the audiological assessments routinely used with the pediatric and school-aged population. Students learn to interpret audiological results and the implication for individual learning. Students will complete mid-term and final exams to demonstrate learning.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
80% of Deaf Education majors will successfully complete a midterm exam with a score of 80% or better and 80 % will successfully complete a final examination with a score of 80% or better.

**M 6: Audiological Management Project**
In SHS 312 (Practicum I and Practicum II) students will demonstrate development in their ability to troubleshoot a variety of hearing technology including hearing aids, cochlear implants and FM systems to check that they are functioning. Students will complete an audiological management project. Each student will keep a log of the functioning of the hearing technology that students use in their practicum settings. Students will administer the Six Sounds Test as often as appropriate in their educational setting and will keep a record of responses of students in their class.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
85% of students enrolled in SHS 312, Practicum II will successfully complete an audiology management project appropriate for their educational placement with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS Practicum I (n=4) completed an audiology management project
with a grade of B or better. 100% of students enrolled in SHS Practicum II (n=2) completed an audiology management project with a grade of B or better.

**SLO 4: Understand educational and psychosocial aspects of deafness**

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. The diverse, heterogeneous nature of the children with hearing loss the range and shifts in educational placements, the changing role of teachers of the deaf. Students learn the causes, incidence and intervention and educational options available to parents. Importance of literacy and curriculum attainments for D/HH children are explored as well as facilitative strategies. Outcomes in language and literacy development are explored

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Write a research paper on educational and psychosocial aspects of deafness**

In SHS 425 (Educational and Psychosocial Impact of Hearing Loss) students will successfully complete a 20-page research paper on a topic of relevance in the current educational and psychosocial aspects of deafness.

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

**Target:**

80% of students in SHS 425 will successfully complete a 20 page research paper on a topic of choice relevant to understanding the educational and psychosocial aspects of deafness with a grade of B or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

14/17 students, 82% successfully completed a 20 page research paper with a score of B or better.

**M 10: Create reading and writing materials on aspects of literacy to use with deaf/hard of hearing students**

In SHS 436 (Literacy and deafness), each student will create reading and writing materials on at least 3 aspects of literacy development and present/demonstrate within the class.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**

90% of students enrolled in SHS 436, (Literacy Development for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students) will successfully create reading and writing materials on at least 3 aspects of literacy development and present/demonstrate within the class with a score of 80% or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

100% of students (n=2) created reading and writing materials and presented with a score of 80% or better. SHS 436 not offered in fall semester, in lieu students did SHS 492 Independent Study, topic of literacy and deafness.

**SLO 5: Demonstrate receptive and expressive skills in American Sign Language, ASL**

Through as sequence of three courses (basic, intermediate, advanced), students develop knowledge and skills in receptive and expressive American Sign Language, ASL. Students acquire knowledge of the history of sign language, ASL linguistics principles, fingerspelling skills, vocabulary and practice in communicating in sign language. Students also learn about the use of ASL in the Deaf culture and community.
Related Measures:

**M 7: Develop basic receptive and expressive skills in American Sign Language, ASL**

In SHS 323, Basic American Sign Language I, students develop basic skills in receptive and expressive American Sign Language. Receptive skill development and expressive skills in communicating in ASL are measured separately through a series of quizzes and a mid-term exam and final exam.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
In SHS 322 (Basic American Sign Language) 80% of students will demonstrate development of basic receptive ASL across a series of quizzes with cumulative grade equivalent of 80% or higher. 80% of students will demonstrate development of basic expressive skills in ASL across a series of quizzes with a cumulative grade equivalent of 80% or higher.

**M 8: Demonstrate advanced receptive and expressive skills in American Sign Language, ASL**

In SHS 340, Advanced American Sign Language III, students continue to develop skills in receptive and expressive American Sign Language. Knowledge and skill development are measured through papers, mid-term and final exam and quizzes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
In SHS 323 (Basic American Sign Language) 80% of students will demonstrate development of basic receptive ASL across a series of quizzes with cumulative grade equivalent of 80% or higher. 80% of students will demonstrate development of basic expressive skills in ASL across a series of quizzes with a cumulative grade equivalent of 80% or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013, Section 9450: receptive ASL, 95% (19/20) received a cumulative quiz grade of 80% or higher.

Fall 2013, Section 9450: expressive ASL, 95% (19/20) received a cumulative quiz grade of 80% or higher.
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 and demonstrate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

Master's candidates will articulate and demonstrate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge in their particular areas of research and study.

Relevant Associations:
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NCTM/NBPTS

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:
95% of elementary education M.Ed. candidates will score exemplary(3) or mastery(2) on the criteria of articulating and demonstrating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on articulating content and theoretical knowledge.
Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on articulating content and theoretical knowledge.
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Stan...

Review elementary education program plans.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

M 2: 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 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. Graduation from the program is dependent upon successfully completing the comprehensive examinations.

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

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met

Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating elementary education 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.

Review elementary education program plans.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...
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 articulating and demonstrating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on articulating and demonstrating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.
Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on articulating and demonstrating elementary education content and theoretical knowledge.
Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 5 articulating and demonstrating elementary education 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.

Review elementary education program plans.
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

SLO 2: Articulate and demonstrate elementary education pedagogy.
Master’s candidates will articulate and demonstrate an elementary education pedagogical knowledge.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE/ACEI/IRA NCTM/NBPTS

**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 and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.
Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

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

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

Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Stan...

Review elementary education program plans.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

M 2: 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 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. Graduation from the program is dependent upon successfully completing the comprehensive examinations.

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

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) scored >3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

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

Review elementary education program plans.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

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 articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met

Summer 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 4 on articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on articulating and demonstrating elementary education pedagogy.

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

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

Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Stan...

Review elementary education program plans.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

SLO 3: Analyze, synthesize and evaluate 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/NBPTS

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 analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating research to improve teaching and learning.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating research to improve teaching and learning.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating research to improve teaching and learning.

Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating 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.

**Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Stan...

**Review elementary education program plans.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

**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 analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating research to improve teaching and learning.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 3 on analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating research to improve teaching and learning.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating research to improve teaching and learning.
Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 4 on analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating 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.

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

Review elementary education program plans.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on integrating technology into teaching and learning.
Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on integrating technology into teaching and learning.
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on integrating technology into teaching and learning.

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

Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Stan...

**Review elementary education program plans.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*  
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

- **Summer 2013**  
  1/1 (100%) rated 5 on integrating technology into teaching and learning.
- **Fall 2013**  
  1/1 (100%) rated 5 on integrating technology into teaching and learning.
- **Spring 2014**  
  1/1 (100%) rated 4 on integrating technology into teaching and learning.

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

**Review elementary education program plans.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*  
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

**SLO 5: Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.**  
Master`s candidates will value and participate in professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

**Relevant Associations:**  
NCATE/ACEI/IRA/NBPTS

**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 and participating in professional development and service to the community.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community.

Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) scored exemplary (3) or mastery (2) on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community.

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

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

**Develop a recruitment plan for M.Ed. program.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Graduate faculty will collaborate to develop a recruitment plan for elementary education M.Ed. students through working with the...

**Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Stan...

**Review elementary education program plans.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

**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 and participating in professional development and service to the community.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community.

Fall 2013
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 5 on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community.

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

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

**Develop a recruitment plan for M.Ed. program.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*  
Graduate faculty will collaborate to develop a recruitment plan for elementary education M.Ed. students through working with the...

**Review elementary education program plans.**  
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*  
Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and na...

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

**O/O 6: Obtain Mississippi AA teacher licensure in elementary education.**  
Upon successfully completing comprehensive examinations for graduation, M.Ed. graduates will obtain upgraded teacher licensure from A to AA status in elementary education. AA licensure provides for a raise in pay and enhanced employment opportunities.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: 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 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. Graduation from the program is dependent upon successfully completing the comprehensive examinations.

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

**Target:**  
Ninety-five percent (95%) of master’s candidates will successfully complete the master’s comprehensive examinations on the first attempt as a prerequisite to graduation. Upon graduating, candidates are awarded an AA teaching certificate.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**  
Summer 2013  
3/3 (100%) passed and graduated.  
Fall 2013  
1/1 (100%) passed and graduated.  
Spring 2014  
1/1 (100%) passed and graduated.

**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

**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:** 07/31/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate advisor/staff CISE elementary education graduate faculty Graduate School 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

**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:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High  
**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.

**Develop a recruitment plan for M.Ed. program.**  
Graduate faculty will collaborate to develop a recruitment plan for elementary education M.Ed. students through working with the USM Writing Project.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.

**Develop a revised internship performance rubric aligned with NBPTS.**

Elementary Education graduate faculty will develop a performance rubric based on National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) to be used for evaluation of graduate students in their internship.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Articulate and demonstrate elementary education pedagogy.
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Analyze, synthesize and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education pedagogy. | Integrate technology into teaching and learning. | Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Coordinator and elementary education graduate faculty.

**Review elementary education program plans.**

Graduate faculty will review elementary education program plans to determine if revisions are needed to accommodate state and national standards.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Articulate and demonstrate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education pedagogy.
Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Analyze, synthesize and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education pedagogy. | Integrate technology into teaching and learning. | Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.
Measure: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Analyze, synthesize and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate elementary education pedagogy. | Integrate technology into teaching and learning. | Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.

**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 2013-2014. The M.Ed. (Elementary Education) online cohorts demonstrated excellent knowledge, skills and
dispositions on each measure. Qualitative assessment data indicated a strong appreciation for the practicality and accessibility of the online course work in applying theory to evidence-based practice and for the knowledgeable and supportive professors that taught the online courses. Program strengths were further evidenced by the comprehensive examination results in which candidates were able to articulate and synthesize both content and pedagogical knowledge. Revision of the comprehensive examinations to be more closely aligned to National Board and ACEI standards and related course work resulted in graduate students' successful completion of the examinations.

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 online 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 and to making face-to-face support readily available to the students. 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 standards for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), and the International Reading Association (IRA). The development of a fully online program resulted in better accessibility to the degree program as well as an enhancement of the quality of candidates' knowledge and skills as indicated by the excellent comprehensive examination results and an increase in the students' perceptions of the usefulness and practicality of the course work as indicated in exit interviews.

The CISE M.Ed. program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, is fully accredited by NCATE. CISE elementary education faculty and staff are principal investigators and administrators of the World Class Teacher Program Grant that provides assistance to in-service teachers pursuing NBPTS certification; the America Reads Grant that provides literacy training and tutoring services to Mississippi public schools; and the South Mississippi Writing Project. As a department, CISE faculty have received over $4,000,000 in external funding in 2013-2014. 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

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 addressing Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in the appropriate elementary education graduate courses with an emphasis on developing academic competencies across the elementary education curriculum. Comprehensive examinations have been aligned with NBPTS, ACEI, and IRA 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.

Closing the Loop

Actions to align the M.Ed. program coursework and assessments to ACEI, IRA, 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. Online delivery of course work has been enhanced to provide more effective collaboration among students and more effective teaching and learning.
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 elementary education 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. This licensure examination serves as both a program measure and an individual student outcome measure. Mississippi Department of Education requires an 80% program pass rate for teacher education programs in Mississippi.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Hattiesburg
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
115/120 (96%) passed

Gulf Coast
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
51/58 (88%) passed

Teacher Assistant Program (TAP online)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
6/6 (100%) passed
OVERALL
172/184 (93%) passed

*ETS reports fall and spring Praxis II results together in one report.
*percentages are rounded

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

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

Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emp...

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 teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) rubric for the criteria of demonstrating elementary education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 2013
Hattiesburg
19/67(28%) scored mastery (3)
48/67(72%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
67/67 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Fall 2013
Gulf Coast
1/32 (3%) scored marginal (2)
14/32 (44%) scored mastery (3)
17/32 (53%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
31/32 (97%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Fall 2013
Teacher Assistant Program (online)
2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg
2/59 (4%) scored marginal (2)
25/59 (42%) scored mastery (3)
32/59 (54%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
57/59 (97%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
26/28 (93%) scored mastery (3)
2/28 (7%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
28/28 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Spring 2014
Teacher Assistant Program (online)
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) 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.

**Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

**Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emp...

**SLO 2: Demonstrate elementary education 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. This licensure examination serves as both a program measure and an individual student outcome measure. Mississippi Department of Education requires an 80% program pass rate for teacher education programs in Mississippi.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
113/122 (93%) passed

Gulf Coast
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
53/59 (90%) passed

Teacher Assistant Program (TAP online)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
6/6 (100%) passed

**OVERALL**
172/184 (93%) passed

*ETS reports fall and spring Praxis II results together in one report.
*percentages are rounded

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

**Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

**Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional fac...

**Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emp...
**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 Candidate Performance Evaluation rubric on the criteria of demonstrating elementary education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013**

Hattiesburg

2/67 (3%) scored marginal (2)

21/67 (32%) scored mastery (3)

44/67 (65%) scored exemplary (4)

Total

65/67 (97%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

Gulf Coast

3/32 (8%) scored marginal (2)

15/32 (46%) scored mastery (3)

14/32 (46%) scored exemplary (4)

Total

29/32 (91%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

Teacher Assistant Program (online)

2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)

1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)

Total

3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

**Spring 2014**

Hattiesburg

2/59 (3%) scored marginal (2)

28/59 (47%) scored mastery (3)

29/59 (50%) scored exemplary (4)

Total

57/59 (97%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).
Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
1/28 (4%) scored marginal (2)
17/28 (62%) scored mastery (3)
10/28 (34%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
27/28 (96%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Teacher Assistant Program (online)
2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored mastery (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) on demonstrating 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.

Develop a model "smart classroom" to demonstrate current technology.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
CISE elementary education and instructional technology faculty will collaborate with technology vendors to develop a model class...

Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enh...

Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional fac...

Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.  
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS).  Specific emp...

SLO 3: Use assessment information to plan 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 mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation rubric on the criteria of using assessment information to plan differentiated instruction (Indicator C-3 TCPE).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013**
- Hattiesburg: 17/67 (25%) scored mastery (3)
- 50/67 (75%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total: 67/67 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated instruction (Indicator C-3 TCPE).

**Fall 2013**
- Gulf Coast: 14/32 (44%) scored mastery (3)
- 18/32 (56%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total: 32/32 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated instruction (Indicator C-3 TCPE).

**Fall 2013**
- Teacher Assistant Program (online): 1/3 (33%) scored mastery (3)
- 2/3 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total: 3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated instruction (Indicator C-3 TCPE).

**Spring 2014**
- Hattiesburg: 14/59 (24%) scored mastery (3)
- 45/59 (76%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total: 59/59 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated instruction (Indicator C-3 TCPE).

**Spring 2014**
- Gulf Coast: 23/28 (82%) scored mastery (3)
- 5/28 (18%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total: 28/28 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated instruction (Indicator C-3 TCPE).

**Spring 2014**
- Teacher Assistant Program (online)
1/3 (33%) scored mastery (3)
2/3 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated instruction (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.

**Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

**Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional fac...

**Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emp...

**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. 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 indicators 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:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education teacher 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 to plan differentiated learning.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013
Hattiesburg
1/67 (2%) scored marginal (2)
15/67 (22%) scored mastery (3)
51/67 (76%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
66/67 (98%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

Fall 2013
Gulf Coast
1/32 (3%) scored marginal (2)
20/32 (63%) scored mastery (3)
11/32 (34%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
31/32 (97%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

Fall 2013
Teacher Assistant Program (TAP) online
2/3 (66%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg
18/59 (31%) scored mastery (3)
41/59 (69%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
59/59 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
17/28 (61%) scored mastery (3)
11/28 (39%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
28/28 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

Spring 2014
Teacher Assistant Online Program (TAP)
2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information for differentiated learning (Domain I Indicator 6).

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

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

Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional fac...

SLO 4: Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
Teacher candidates will utilize current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.

**Relevant Associations:**
NCATE Conceptual Framework/Association for Childhood Education International

**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 mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation rubric on the criteria of using current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013**
Hattiesburg
6/67 (9%) scored mastery (3)
61/67 (91%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
67/67 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

**Gulf Coast**
11/32 (33%) scored mastery (3)
21/32 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
32/32 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

**Teacher Assistant Program (online)**
1/3 (33%) scored mastery (3)
2/3 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

**Spring 2014**
Hattiesburg
8/59 (14%) scored mastery (3)
51/59 (86%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
59/59 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
1/28 (4%) scored marginal (2)
7/28 (25%) scored mastery (3)
20/28 (71%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
27/28 (96%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Indicator A-7 TCPE).

Teacher Assistant Program (online)
1/3 (33%) scored mastery (3)
2/3 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (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.

**Develop a model "smart classroom" to demonstrate current technology.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
CISE elementary education and instructional technology faculty will collaborate with technology vendors to develop a model class...

**Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

**Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional fac...

**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. 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 indicators 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:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education teacher candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the TIAI rubric (Domain I-Indicator 3) for the criteria of using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

Fall 2013
Hattiesburg
5/67 (7%) scored marginal (2)
20/67 (30%) scored mastery (3)
42/67 (63%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
62/67 (93%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Domain I Indicator 3).

Fall 2013
Gulf Coast
4/32 (12%) scored marginal (2)
15/32 (47%) scored mastery (3)
13/32 (41%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
28/32 (88%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Domain I Indicator 3).

Fall 2013
Teacher Assistant Program (TAP) online
1/3 (33%) scored mastery (3)
2/3 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Domain I Indicator 3).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg
4/59 (7%) scored marginal (2)
23/59 (39%) scored mastery (3)
32/59 (54%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
55/59 (93%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Domain I Indicator 3).

Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
3/28 (11%) scored marginal (2)
5/28 (18%) scored mastery (3)
20/28 (71%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
25/28 (89%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Domain I Indicator 3).

Spring 2014
Teacher Assistant Online Program (TAP)
2/3 (67%) scored mastery
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary on
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using instructional technology to support and enhance student learning (Domain I Indicator 3).

**Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**
Develop a model "smart classroom" to demonstrate current technology.

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

CISE elementary education and instructional technology faculty will collaborate with technology vendors to develop a model class...

Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional fac...

**SLO 5: Engage K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking.**

Teacher candidates will implement higher-order questioning procedures and teaching activities to engage students in analytic, creative, and critical thinking.

**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 TCPE rubric for the criteria of engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2-4 TCPE).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

Fall 2013

Hattiesburg

4/67 (6%) scored marginal

25/67 (37%) scored mastery

38/67 (57%) scored exemplary

Total

63/67 (94%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2- 4 TCPE).
Fall 2013
Gulf Coast
4/32 (12%) scored marginal (2)
15/32 (47%) scored mastery (3)
13/32 (41%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
28/32 (88%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2-4 TCPE).

Fall 2013
Teacher Assistant Program (online)
1/3 (33%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2-4 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg
2/59 (3%) scored marginal (2)
25/59 (42%) scored mastery (3)
32/59 (54%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
57/59 (97%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2-4 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
1/28 (3%) scored marginal (2)
22/28 (79%) scored mastery (3)
5/28 (18%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
27/28 (96%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2-4 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Teacher Assistant Program (online)
2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Indicator A2-4 TCPE).

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

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

**Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

**Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emp...

**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. 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 indicators 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:**
Ninety-five percent (95%) of elementary education teacher candidates will receive a rating of (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on the TIAI rubric (Domain III-Indicator 17) for the criteria of engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

Fall 2013
Hattiesburg
11/67 (16%) scored marginal (2)
21/67 (32%) scored mastery (3)
35/67 (52%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
56/67 (84%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI).

Fall 2013
Gulf Coast
9/32 (28%) scored marginal (2)
15/32 (47%) scored mastery (3)
8/32 (25%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
23/32 (72%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI).

Fall 2013
Teacher Assistant Program (TAP) online
2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg
3/59 (5%) scored marginal (2)
30/59 (51%) scored mastery (3)
26/59 (44%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
56/59 (95%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI).
Spring 2014
Gulf Coast
1/28 (4%) scored marginal (2)
19/28 (68%) scored mastery (3)
8/28 (29%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
27/28 (89%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (Domain III Indicator 17 TIAI).

Spring 2014
Teacher Assistant Online Program (TAP)
2/3 (67%) scored mastery (3)
1/3 (33%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on engaging K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking (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.

Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enha...

Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emp...

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

O/O 6: Obtain Mississippi teacher licensure in elementary education.
Elementary Education students will pass Praxis II Elementary Content and Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching and graduate from the program to obtain Mississippi licensure in elementary education.

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. This licensure examination serves as both a program measure and an individual student outcome measure. Mississippi Department of Education requires an 80% program pass rate for teacher education programs in Mississippi.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Hattiesburg
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
113/122 (93%) passed

Gulf Coast
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
53/59 (90%) passed

Teacher Assistant Program (TAP online)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
6/6 (100%) passed

OVERALL
172/184 (93%) passed

*ETS reports fall and spring Praxis II results together in one report.
*percentages are rounded

**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. This licensure examination serves as both a program measure and an individual student outcome measure. Mississippi Department of Education requires an 80% program pass rate for teacher education programs in Mississippi.

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.

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

**Develop a model "smart classroom" to demonstrate current technology.**

CISE elementary education and instructional technology faculty will collaborate with technology vendors to develop a model classroom so that teacher candidates can observe and use current instructional technology.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

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

**Measure:** Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.

**Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | **Outcome/Objective:** Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
Implementation Description: Elizabeth Giddens and CISE elementary education and instructional technology faculty will collaborate to develop the "smart classroom" to serve as a model for pre-service and in-service teachers.

Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Giddens, Jon Beedle, Janet Boyce, Kim Walker

Develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience.

In response to data obtained from field-testing a year-long student teaching program, the decision was made to develop an enhanced two-year clinical experience beginning with the introductory cohort, including the intermediate and senior cohorts, and concluding with student teaching.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II: Elementary Education Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education content knowledge.
- Measure: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge.
- Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education content knowledge. | Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge. | Engage K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking. | Use assessment information to plan differentiated learning. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
- Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Engage K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking. | Use assessment information to plan differentiated learning. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Anne Sylvest, Dr. Janet Boyce, Ms. Kim Walker
Additional Resources Requested: This initiative is partially funded by a summer grant.

Develop personalized learning systems with the use of instructional technology.

CISE is planning a collaborative initiative among elementary education faculty, special education faculty, and instructional faculty that will provide teacher candidates with the ability to understand and use personalized learning systems for their students rather than traditional systems. The initiative will focus on a mastery or competency based achievement model with ongoing, embedded, formative, and dynamic assessment of knowledge and skills. Digital and online interactive content from a variety of sources will allow for a variety of instructional and assessment sources.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge.
- Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge. | Use assessment information to plan differentiated learning. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
- Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Use assessment information to plan differentiated learning. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.

Responsible Person/Group: Elizabeth Giddens (NCATE coordinator) Dr. Janet Boyce, Dr. Jon Beedle, Dr. Diane Fisher
Form faculty focus groups to study implementation of CC-SS higher order thinking skills.

Faculty focus groups will be formed to study academic competencies related to Common Core-State Standards (CC-SS). Specific emphasis will be given to developing higher order literacy skills in teacher candidates. Professional development workshops will be conducted with teacher candidates to help them develop higher order literacy and thinking skills. Assignments and assessments in course syllabi will be enhanced to include CC-SS higher order literacy skills.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Praxis II: Elementary Education Content Knowledge | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education content knowledge.
- Measure: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge.
- Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate elementary education content knowledge. | Demonstrate elementary education pedagogical knowledge. | Engage K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking. | Use assessment information to plan differentiated learning.
- Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Engage K-6 students in analytic, creative and critical thinking.

Implementation Description: Dr. Janet Boyce and Ms. Kim Walker received a summer grant to study implementation of CC-SS in relation to developing higher order literacy and thinking skills in teacher candidates so that teacher candidates are more proficient at developing higher order thinking in their K-12 students.

Projected Completion Date: 05/31/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Boyce and Ms. Walker

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 2013-2014, 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 for the Hattiesburg campus a 96% pass rate for the content examination and a 93% pass rate for the pedagogy examination; for the Gulf Coast campus an 88% pass rate for the content examination and a 90% pass rate for the pedagogy examination; and for the TAP-online program a 100% pass rate for both examinations. Both content and pedagogy licensure examination results for all three programs on both examinations 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 Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and 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 developing elementary education content and pedagogical knowledge and on using assessment information for differentiated instruction. 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 2013-2014 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. Because of the
importance of instructional technology as a teaching and learning tool, CISE faculty have launched an initiative to become a model teacher education program for instructional technology. This will be a major emphasis area in 2014-2015 as elementary education faculty collaborate with instructional technology faculty to develop both a demonstration classroom and an instructional program for teacher candidates to learn how to incorporate current technology in lesson plans to teach common core academic competencies to K-6 students.

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’ academic competencies as well as the development of their knowledge and skills to teach higher order thinking and literacy skills to K-6 students. With the strong emphasis on implementing the academic competencies associated with 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 and the use of instructional technology for personalized learning, 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. The CISE elementary education program, along with the other teacher education programs at USM, is fully accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and has attained national recognition from the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Specialty Professional Association (SPA). 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 elementary education faculty and staff are principal investigators and administrators of the World Class Teacher Program Grant that provides assistance to in-service teachers pursuing National Board certification; the America Reads Grant that provides literacy training and tutoring services to Mississippi public schools; and the South Mississippi Writing Project. As a department, CISE faculty have received over $4,000,000 in external funding in 2013-2014. 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

In Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education (CISE), elementary education continuous improvement initiatives are aligned with the academic competencies from the national Common Core-State Standards (CCSS), the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) standards for elementary education, and the International Reading Association (IRA) and International Dyslexia Association (IDA) standards for reading instruction. The 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 technology, such as interactive smart boards and cutting-edge software, 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 is 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 2013-2014 results from the revised TIAI revealed that CISE elementary education teacher candidates made significant progress in meeting state and national outcomes.

For the past three years, CISE elementary education faculty 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. Analysis of data from the field study led CISE faculty to develop a two-year enhanced clinical model beginning with the introductory cohort, including the intermediate and senior cohorts, and concluding with an enhanced student teaching experience. CISE elementary education faculty collaborated throughout the spring 2014 and summer 2014 semesters to standardize course syllabi to provide standardized outcomes and assessments for the Hattiesburg campus, the Gulf Coast campus, and the online teacher assistant program. Academic competencies related to national common core standards and cutting edge instructional technologies have been embedded into specific courses and clinical experiences.

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
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 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. Resequencing of courses to include classroom management course work during the more intense clinical experiences of the senior block resulted in improved candidate outcomes for classroom management. Student teachers now begin their intern experiences at the beginning of the K-6 semester to get an authentic view of beginning of the year procedures. Additionally, CISE faculty elementary education faculty have participated in professional development seminars to share and learn about cutting-edge instructional technology and have met in curriculum content groups to standardize didactic and clinical course syllabi across the three elementary education programs.
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 the ability to articulate a clear thesis and fully developed argument.

Relevant Associations:
CAEP

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 comprises four subheadings; subheading number one measures Outcome One, 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 to achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Hattiesburg: 93.33% (14 out of 15 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on writing-intensive papers-thesis and argument. Gulf Park: 66.67% (8 out of 12 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 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, all syllabi will articulate common student learning outcomes...

Undergraduate Assessment Committee
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Undergraduate Committee will convene new undergraduate assessment committee. UG assessment committee will review all findings; e...

**Gulf Coast Thesis/Argument and Research Skills**

*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014

The Gulf Coast workgroup and undergraduate assessment committee will meet to address how to improve thesis/argument writing skill...

**M 6: 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, and conduct research.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**

- Undergraduate Exit Survey

**Target:**

Target = 75% scoring 3 or better

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of thesis and argument. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of thesis and argument.

**SLO 2: Analysis**

Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze literary texts.

**Relevant Associations:**

CAEP

**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 scoring rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number two measures Outcome Two, 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 to achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Hattiesburg: 86.67% (13 out of 15 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on writing-intensive papers-analysis. Gulf Park: 75% (9 out of 12 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, all syllabi will articulate common student learning outcomes...

Undergraduate Assessment Committee
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Undergraduate Committee will convene new undergraduate assessment committee. UG assessment committee will review all findings; e...

M 6: 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, and conduct research.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Connected Document
- Undergraduate Exit Survey

Target:
Target = 75% scoring 3 or better

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of analysis. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of analysis.

SLO 3: Writing Skills
Students will demonstrate stylistic and grammatical proficiency at the sentence, paragraph, and essay levels.

Relevant Associations:
CAEP

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 scoring rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number three measures Outcome Three, 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 to achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 100% (15 out of 15 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on writing-intensive papers-writing skills. Gulf Park: 100% (12 out of 12 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, all syllabi will articulate common student learning outcomes...

Undergraduate Assessment Committee
Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Undergraduate Committee will convene new undergraduate assessment committee. UG assessment committee will review all findings; e...

M 6: 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, and conduct research.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Connected Document

• Undergraduate Exit Survey

Target:
Target = 75% scoring 3 or better

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of writing skills. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of writing skills.

SLO 4: Research Skills
Students will demonstrate the ability to use scholarly sources to support an argument and to document those sources appropriately.

Relevant Associations:
CAEP

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 scoring rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number four measures Outcome Four, 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 to achieve a score of 3 ("competent") or better on a five-point scale.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**
Hattiesburg: 86.67% (13 out of 15 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on writing-intensive papers-research skills. Gulf Park: 58.33% (7 out of 12 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 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, all syllabi will articulate common student learning outcomes...

**Undergraduate Assessment Committee**
*Established in Cycle:* 2009-2010
Undergraduate Committee will convene new undergraduate assessment committee. UG assessment committee will review all findings; e...

**Licensure Research and Writing Skills**
*Established in Cycle:* 2010-2011
Task licensure workgroup with developing strategies for improving the writing and research skills of English licensure student...

**Gulf Coast Thesis/Argument and Research Skills**
*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014
The Gulf Coast workgroup and undergraduate assessment committee will meet to address how to improve thesis/argument writing skill...

**M 6: 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, and conduct research.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**
- *Undergraduate Exit Survey*

  **Target:**
  Target = 75% scoring 3 or better

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (5 out of 5) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the
category of research skills. Gulf Park: 100% of students (1 out of 1) score themselves as a 3 or better out of 5 in the category of research skills.

**SLO 5: Professional Disposition**
Students will demonstrate a professional demeanor in the classroom.

**Relevant Associations:**
CAEP

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: 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 for each of the two student teaching experiences.

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

**Target:**
90% of students will score 115 or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg: 100% of students (9 out of 9 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 (9 out of 9 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 (3 out of 3 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 (3 out of 3 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
Undergraduate Committee will convene new undergraduate assessment committee. UG assessment committee will review all findings; e...

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

**O/O 6: Job Placement**
Program achievement will be measured by assessing the job placement rate of English licensure graduates seeking full-time teaching positions. Because not all May graduates will have found employment by the time the assessment report is written, we will look at the job placement rate for the previous May and December graduating classes.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Job Placement Data**
The percentage of English licensure students who graduated the previous May and December and were hired in full-time teaching positions will be determined.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas
Target:
66% of students who graduate from the English licensure program in previous May and December and seek full-time teaching position will find full-time employment as an English teacher.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg: 100% of students seeking a full-time teaching position were hired (9 out of 9); one additional student began graduate school and one decided not to seek a full-time teaching position. Gulf Park: 83.33% of students seeking a full-time teaching position were hired (5 out of 6).

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, all syllabi will articulate common student learning outcomes (at present, some do not). In addition, each student will be provided with copies of the grading rubrics used to measure competency.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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
Undergraduate Committee will convene new undergraduate assessment committee. UG assessment committee will review all findings; establish appropriate targets where necessary; develop and implement capstone oral presentation rubric; develop and implement UG exit survey and alumni survey; 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: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- 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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Research Skills | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills

Implementation Description: Licensure students are now meeting targets for writing skills.
Responsible Person/Group: licensure workgroup

Gulf Coast Thesis/Argument and Research Skills
The Gulf Coast workgroup and undergraduate assessment committee will meet to address how to improve thesis/argument writing skills and research skills for Coast English licensure students.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Research Skills | Outcome/Objective: Research Skills
Measure: Writing Intensive Papers--Thesis and Argument | Outcome/Objective: Thesis and Argument

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The first measure for student learning outcomes is a seminar paper that is blind scored by two faculty members. A sample of graduating students complete an exit survey as the second measure for each learning outcome, and the survey asks students to score their skills for each of the program's four student learning outcomes. The Hattiesburg licensure program met targets for all of the designated student learning outcomes: thesis/argument, analysis, writing skills, and research skills. Only one or two essays out of 15 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 met targets for analysis and writing skills, with a full 100% of students meeting the targets for writing skills and student dispositions. Between 13.33% and 33.33% of Hattiesburg students scored a 4 (accomplished) or higher on these learning outcomes. Between 25% and 41.67% of Coast licensure students did so. 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 job placement rate for students who graduate from the English licensure program is excellent. Because not all May graduates will have found employment by the time the assessment report is written, we will look at the job placement rate for the previous May and December graduating classes: May 2013 and December 2013 for the 2013-2014 report cycle. A full 100% of Hattiesburg licensure students who sought full-time teaching positions, 9 out of 9, were hired to teach (one other Hattiesburg graduate decided to put off teaching for at least a year, and one other entered graduate school straight out of the undergraduate program instead of teaching). Of the English licensure graduates from the Coast campus, 83.33%, 5 out of 6, found full-time teaching positions.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
English licensure students from the Gulf Park campus did not meet targets for thesis/argument and research skills. For the 2013-2014 academic year, the sole Coast faculty position in English licensure on the Coast campus
was filled with a one-year visiting instructor while the department undertook a tenure-track search. With a successful hire, the department anticipates that this new faculty member will bring increased stability to the English licensure program and will work with the undergraduate assessment committee to address the unmet targets. Nine upper-level Coast English courses were taught by adjuncts in fall 2013, and seven in spring 2014. Full-time, permanent faculty with experience working with USM students would likely show more consistent results, so we will continue to seek support for an additional faculty line for the Coast English program.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**
The Department of English has about 100 English licensure majors on the Hattiesburg and Gulf Park campuses, as well as 36 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 2013-2014 academic year was the fourth 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**
The Undergraduate Assessment Committee will meet to discuss the assessment results and how to maintain the success of the Hattiesburg licensure program and to meet targets for thesis/argument and research on the Coast campus. The successful hire of a tenure-track English licensure faculty member on the Coast will assist with the long-term success of the program.

**Closing the Loop**
Minor modifications were made to English licensure course syllabi and faculty addressed unmet targets from previous cycles. Since students in the licensure program met targets for writing skills in this cycle, the action plan associated with writing and research skills has been marked as finished. A new action plan will be developed to address thesis/argument and research.
Mission / Purpose

The English M.A. program’s mission is to prepare students to make useful contributions to literature by producing well-researched and well-argued literary criticism and well-written creative works, and by teaching and conducting research in English studies under close supervision.

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

SLO 1: Thesis and Argument

Students will demonstrate the ability to articulate a clear thesis and fully developed argument that is informed by scholarly research and an appropriate methodology.

Related Measures:

M 1: Seminar Papers—Argument/Thesis

Random, anonymous seminar papers collected by instructors from graduate classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point grading rubric. The grading rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number one measures Outcome One, Argument/Thesis, 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

Target:

80% of students scoring 3 (“competent”) out of 5 or better on Argument/Thesis.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met

M1. 70% (7 out of 10 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on seminar 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.

Graduate Assessment Committee

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013

Graduate Committee will convene new graduate assessment committee. Graduate assessment committee will review all findings; estab...
M 6: Exit Survey of Graduating MA Students

Students completing the MA degree are given an exit survey on which they rate themselves in the categories of thesis & argument, close reading, research skills, and writing skills on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "unacceptable" and 5 being "exemplary."

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Connected Document
- Graduate Program Exit Survey

Target:
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Thesis and Argument

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4 students who completed the MA exist survey) scored 3 or better out of 5 on exit survey-thesis and argument.

SLO 2: Close Reading

Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze literary texts using advanced close reading skills and a sophisticated methodological apparatus.

Connected Document
- Graduate Program Exit Survey

Related Measures:

M 2: Seminar Papers--Close Reading
Random, anonymous seminar papers collected by instructors from graduate classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point grading rubric. The grading rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number two measures Outcome Two, Close Reading, evaluating students' ability to analyze literary texts.

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

Connected Document
- Revised (2010) Graduate Rubric

Target:
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Close Reading.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
M2. 80% (8 out of 10 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on seminar papers-close reading.

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

Graduate Assessment Committee
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Graduate Committee will convene new graduate assessment committee. Graduate assessment committee will review all findings; estab...

M 6: Exit Survey of Graduating MA Students

Students completing the MA degree are given an exit survey on which they rate themselves in the categories of thesis & argument, close reading, research skills, and writing skills on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1
being "unacceptable" and 5 being "exemplary."

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**
- Graduate Program Exit Survey

**Target:**
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Close Reading.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (4 out of 4 students who completed the MA exist survey) scored 3 or better out of 5 on exit survey-close reading.

**SLO 3: Research Tools**
Students will demonstrate the ability to carry out independent primary and secondary research, use sources appropriate to support an argument, and employ appropriate discipline-specific documentation.

**Connected Document**
- Graduate Program Exit Survey

**Related Measures:**

**M 3: Seminar Papers--Research Skills**
Random, anonymous seminar papers collected by instructors from graduate classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point grading rubric. The grading rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number three measures Outcome Three, Research Skills, evaluating students' ability to carry out original and independent primary and secondary research and to utilize appropriate discipline-specific research documentation.

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

**Connected Document**
- Revised (2010) Graduate Rubric

**Target:**
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Research Skills.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
80% (8 out of 10 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on seminar papers-research skills.

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

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

**Graduate Assessment Committee**
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Graduate Committee will convene new graduate assessment committee. Graduate assessment committee will review all findings; estab...

**M 6: Exit Survey of Graduating MA Students**
Students completing the MA degree are given an exit survey on which they rate themselves in the categories of thesis & argument, close reading, research skills, and writing skills on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "unacceptable" and 5 being "exemplary."
Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**
- *Graduate Program Exit Survey*

**Target:**
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Research Skills.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (4 out of 4 students who completed the MA exist survey) scored 3 or better out of 5 on exit survey-research skills.

**SLO 4: Writing Skills**
Students will demonstrate sophisticated prose writing that reflects stylistic and grammatical proficiency at the sentence, paragraph, and essay levels.

**Connected Document**
- *Graduate Program Exit Survey*

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Seminar Papers--Writing Skills**
Random, anonymous seminar papers collected by instructors from graduate classes and evaluated by blind/cross-reading using departmentally-approved 5-point grading rubric. The grading rubric comprises four subheadings; subheading number four measures Outcome Four, Writing Skills, evaluating students' ability to demonstrate stylistic and grammatical proficiency at the sentence, paragraph and paper levels.

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

**Connected Document**
- *Revised (2010) Graduate Rubric*

**Target:**
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Writing Skills.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
70% (7 out of 10 papers from fall and spring combined) scored 3 or better out of 5 on seminar papers-writing skills.

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

**Graduate Assessment Committee**
*Established in Cycle: 2012-2013*
Graduate Committee will convene new graduate assessment committee. Graduate assessment committee will review all findings; estab...

**Thesis/Argument and Writing Skills**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
The graduate literature workgroup and assessment committee will convene to address unmet targets in the categories of thesis/arg...

**M 6: Exit Survey of Graduating MA Students**
Students completing the MA degree are given an exit survey on which they rate themselves in the categories of thesis & argument, close reading, research skills, and writing skills on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "unacceptable" and 5 being "exemplary."

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Connected Document**

- Graduate Program Exit Survey

**Target:**
80% of students scoring 3 ("competent") out of 5 or better on Writing Skills.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (4 out of 4 students who completed the MA exist survey) scored 3 or better out of 5 on exit survey-writing skills.

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

**O/O 5: Graduation Rate**
For the program objective, the English department will assess the graduation rate of students in the MA program. The program is designed to be completed in two years of study for full-time students, so we the percentage of students who complete the program in six full semesters--fall, spring, and summer for two years--will be determined.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Graduation Rate**
For the program objective, the English department will assess the graduation rate of students in the MA program. The program is designed to be completed in two years of study for full-time students, so we the percentage of students who complete the program in six full semesters--fall, spring, and summer for two years--will be determined.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

**Target:**
66% of full-time students will graduate within six semesters, including summer terms.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
80% (4 out of 5) students who began the MA program in Fall 2011 completed degree requirements by the conclusion of the Summer 2013 term. One student changed degree programs.

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

**Begin collecting alumni data**

Though a survey instrument is in place to track the success of our MA graduates, no data has yet been collected. We will begin to survey alumni from three years ago to assess their present employment, publication record, and the degree to which the program prepared them for professional employment and/or doctoral-level or other post-graduate study.

**Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Fall 2006
**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate curriculum committee
Department discussion of expectations
The department will undertake a series of discussions in the fall regarding its expectations about MA-level student writing.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: The graduate literature workgroup has had this discussion. A more specific action plan to focus on unmet targets will be developed.

Establish common assignment
The department will develop a common assignment all MA students will be required to complete, emphasizing research and scholarship.

Established in Cycle: 2007-2008
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: Graduate literature seminars do include a research-based assignment.
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate studies committee

Graduate Assessment Committee
Graduate Committee will convene new graduate assessment committee. Graduate assessment committee will review all findings; establish appropriate targets where necessary; develop and implement graduate exit survey and alumni survey; and will formulate and make policy recommendations to Graduate Committee about how to improve student performance in relation to existing Student Learning Outcomes.

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

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Seminar Papers--Argument/Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Thesis and Argument
Measure: Seminar Papers--Close Reading | Outcome/Objective: Close Reading
Measure: Seminar Papers--Research Skills | Outcome/Objective: Research Tools
Measure: Seminar Papers--Writing Skills | Outcome/Objective: Writing Skills

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Committee

Thesis/Argument and Writing Skills
The graduate literature workgroup and assessment committee will convene to address unmet targets in the categories of thesis/argument and writing skills. Future instructors of ENG 640 and 641, criticism and research methods courses, will address these skills.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Seminar Papers--Argument/Thesis | Outcome/Objective: Thesis and Argument
Measure: Seminar Papers--Writing Skills | Outcome/Objective: Writing Skills

Responsible Person/Group: graduate literature workgroup

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The first measure for student learning outcomes is a seminar paper that is blind scored by two faculty members. A sample of graduating students complete an exit survey as the second measure for each learning outcome, and the survey asks students to score their skills for each of the program's four student learning outcomes. The MA program met targets for one of two measures for the category of thesis/argument, both measures for close reading/analysis, both measures for research, and one of two measures for writing skills. Students did not meet targets for one or more measures in the categories of thesis/argument and writing skills. Results from year to year are fairly consistent for the first, direct measure: 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 thesis/argument M1 90% met target 80% met target 70% met target close reading M2 100% met target 90% met target 80% met target research skills M3 70% met target 60% met target 80% met target writing skills M4 90% met target 70% met target 70% met target A full 30% of MA students exceed targets by scoring a 4 (accomplished) or higher in the categories thesis, close reading, and writing skills. For research skills, 20% of MA students exceed the target by scoring a 4 (accomplished) or higher. In the category of research skills, the program improved results by 20%. The department has introduced a second methods course, ENG 641 (advanced research and methods), which is designed to help students further develop their analytical, research, and writing skills. It was offered for the first time in spring 2012, so we have begun to see the benefits of the course. We will continue to refine both 640 and 641 as needed in order to improve outcomes. For the program objective, the English department will assess the graduation rate of students in the MA program. The program is designed to be completed in two years of study for full-time students, and we expect at least 66% of full-time students to complete the program in two years. Many students take the final summer term to complete thesis requirements, so we will consider six full semesters--fall, spring, and summer for two years--in determining graduation rates. A full 80% of students who began in fall 2011 completed the MA by summer 2013.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
In the categories of thesis/argument and writing skills, the program missed its targets by a single student essay. Although the program saw 10% declines from the previous year in the categories of thesis/argument and close reading/analysis, the inconsistency of results from year to year makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions. Small variations affecting target success can be expected from year to year, with one or two ineffective essays negatively affecting the program results.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
Graduate degrees offered by the Department of English are designed to prepare students for careers as scholars and teachers. The English department offers three degree programs (MA, PhD, and combined MA-PhD) and two emphasis areas (literature and creative writing), for a total of five degree plans (MA-literture, MA-creative writing, PhD-literature, PhD-creative writing, Combined-MA-PhD-literature). A third MA emphasis in English education has recently been added for which students are being recruited. Students in the combined MA-PhD are admitted directly into the PhD from the BA and complete requirements for the MA en route to the PhD, so until they receive the MA they are assessed as part of the MA program. The department currently assesses both emphasis areas together. The department includes about 41 active literature students and 42 active creative writing students during 2013-2014. A total of 11 literature students were completing MA requirements, and 8 creative writing students were completing MA requirements. The remaining 30 literature students were completing PhD requirements, and 34 creative writing students were completing PhD requirements. A total of 19 students (MA and PhD) began the English graduate program in 2013-2014. The literature degree plans require students to take courses in a variety of literary periods, a nontraditional literature course (ethnic, postcolonial, African-American, or children's literature), two criticism/methods courses, and a course on literary theory. The department offered ENG 641: Advanced Research and Methods in English, the second methods course, for the first time during spring 2012. The new curriculum also includes a comprehensive exam taken after the first year of coursework. Students in both creative writing degree plans also take substantial coursework in literature, criticism/methods, and theory. All students in the program who teach as part of their assistantship take a 3-credit course on the practice and theory of composition pedagogy. The English department maintained its commitment to helping graduate students professionalize by offering extracurricular workshops on giving conference presentations, transforming seminar papers into articles for
publication, and entering the job market. Students made presentations or gave readings at both national and international conferences, and they published critical articles, reviews, stories, and poems in scholarly journals and literary magazines. The English graduate program is nationally ranked by U.S. News and World Report.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

The graduate assessment committee will meet to discuss the assessment outcomes and propose ways to improve student outcomes for thesis/argument and writing skills. Further modifications to ENG 640 and ENG 641 may be necessary. The department has compiled updated contact information for alumni and will send out a survey to collect information about employment and accomplishments.

**Closing the Loop**

Over the past few cycles, the department has given increased attention to thesis-driven writing, research skills, and writing skills. Efforts to continue addressing thesis/argument and writing skills are ongoing, though graduate literature seminars do now include at least one research-based writing assignment. Students are now meeting or nearly meeting targets in these areas and have done so for two cycles. The Graduate Assessment Committee will review outcomes for all measures and discuss strategies for improving success, paying particular attention to thesis and writing skills.
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 60-point rubric.

**Target:**

80% of our graduating seniors will achieve an overall score of 48 or higher out of 60 on the oral presentation rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

(H) Target: 80% of graduating licensure seniors will achieve an overall score of 39 or higher out of 48 on the oral presentation rubric. Findings: 50% (1/2; fall and spring semester combined) received an overall rubric score of 39 or higher.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

(H) Target: 80% of graduating licensure students will receive a score of 400 or better on the departmental four skills rubric in oral proficiency. Findings: 50% (1/2; fall and spring combined) received an overall rubric score of 400 or higher.

**M 5: ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview**
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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, and Superior.

**Target:**
100% will achieve at least an Advanced Low rating at the completion of their Spanish degree.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) Target: 100% will achieve at least an advanced low rating at the completion of their degree.
Findings: 50% (1/2; fall and spring semesters combined) received at least an advanced low rating.

**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 nine or higher out of twelve points.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) Target: 80% of graduating licensure students will achieve an advanced level of formal written expression as evidenced by a score of 16 or higher out of 20 points on the research paper rubric.
Findings: 50% (1/2; fall and spring semester combined) received an overall rubric score of 16 or greater.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) 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: 50% (1/2; fall and spring semesters combined) received a score of 400 or better.
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) 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: 50% (1/2; fall and Spring semesters received a score of 400 or better.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) Target: 80% of graduating licensure seniors will receive a score of 400 or better on the departmental Four Skills Rubric in Listening Comprehension. Findings: 50% (1/2; fall and spring semester combined) received a score of 400 or better.

**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.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) 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. Findings: 50% (1/2, fall and spring semesters combined) received a score of six or higher.

**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

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
(H) Target: At least 80% of FL licensure students will score at least 3 out of 4 in sociocultural awareness on the oral presentation rubric. Findings: 50% (1/2; fall and spring semesters combined) scored at least a 3 out of 4.

**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: licensure advisors

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
Productive language skills
Given that the data indicate a need to focus on the productive skills associated with language acquisition the following changes are planned: 1) A programmatic structure change in the form of a reduction of course size in the basic language series which is currently enrolling 60 students per class, to be reduced to 30 per class. This reduction in class size should give more students time to practice speaking the language in the classroom. 2) Standardizing a calendar of regularly scheduled meetings called "mesas de conversación" where students can come and practice their speaking skills in a non-anxiety producing atmosphere. 3) Faculty Development and training in the use of technology associated with live, synchronous interaction. 4) Continue to encourage at least one full semester of study abroad instead of focusing our energy on shorter summer programs.

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 (2 graduating seniors this year), student performance percentages are not a reliable indicator of program/curricular quality or overall student success rates in this program. With such a small sample size and personal knowledge of both students who participated in the program I can add that there was a chasm of different linguistic abilities between the two students. The student who scored beyond our targets had spent a full year living abroad in the context of an exchange program and completely immersed in the culture where she was studying. The other student participated in a five-week summer program abroad. She also postponed taking the Praxis II and as of this date has yet to take it. The student 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. This underscores the importance of advising for licensure students. Mississippi is a critical needs state for Foreign Language Licensure and our graduates are some of 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?
As previously mentioned the small sample size (2/2) makes this analysis unreliable quantitatively. That said, the results for this group highlight the continued need for advisement efforts and action plans we put into place in prior years. If the students are attentive to the requirements of the program of study and they have strong linguistic abilities there is a higher rate of success. In many ways, the licensure program mirrors the same concerns as with the Foreign Language Spanish program. In fact, the students involved should be even more prepared as they are going to be teachers. Therefore, their productive skills of speaking and writing should be strengthened and would require the same plan of action as for the general Spanish curriculum.

Program Summary
The Foreign language Licensure program is designed to prepare teachers for teaching in both elementary and high school teaching contexts. It is a rigorous program which involves attention to teaching methodology and includes student teaching as part of the practical experience. In fact, because of the quality of preparation
directly associated with the program's rigor, one of our students this year who applied to teach in Europe in a highly competitive teacher selection program received offers to teach in both France and Spain for the next two years. Also, this year as in previous years we see a 100% job placement rate which can attest to the quality of the program.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives
Study abroad has a direct connection to the linguistic competencies displayed by students. This year we are examining different venues of study abroad to offer to our students. We hope that changing sites will correlate to improved linguistic opportunities for students to engage in. Also, having a dedicated faculty that regularly is involved in the students' academic lives leaves lasting impressions on students with respect to retention and enrollment numbers.

Closing the Loop
As in previous years and for students who major in a foreign language study abroad is key. The two students who participated in this year's licensure program were vastly different regarding their linguistic capabilities as is seen in the data. Therefore, having students who major in the language study abroad for at least one full academic semester greatly improves their productive abilities in the language being studied. Therefore, we should continue implementing current and past action plans that focus on producing the language.
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met

90% 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 2013: 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg student teachers received a passing score of 150 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. His score was 157.

Findings: Gulf Park Fall 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 159 to 171.

Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2014: 100% (11 of 11) of Hattiesburg student teachers received a passing score of 150 or greater on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination. Scores ranged from 184 to 148. The failing student retook the exam in the summer of 2014 and passed it.

Findings: Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.
For 2013-2014, 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (12 of 12) received passing scores on the Praxis II Social Studies Examination; 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not 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.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73/104 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their University Supervisor. His score was 80/104. 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 73 (70%) or greater on the In-Class Evaluation conducted by their mentor teachers. His score was 98/104.

Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2013: 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 77/104 to 85/104; the mentor teacher’s scores ranged from 92/104 to 103/104.
Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2013: 90% (10 of 11) 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 67/104 to 104/104. 100% (11 of 11) 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 76/104 to 95/104.

Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2012-2013, 91% (11 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall score of 70% or better on the mentor teachers' in-class evaluation instrument required by the Office of Educational Field Experiences. 100% received an overall score of 70% or better on the university supervisor's in-class evaluation. 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 140/200 (70%) or greater.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. His score was 142/200.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 153/200 to 189/200.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2014: 81% of Hattiesburg student teachers (9 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 122/200 to 176/200.

Gulf Park: Spring 2014: There were no student teachers in this group from Gulf Park.

For the year 2013-2014, 83% (10 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (3 of 3) 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.

**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 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 (2013-2014) - 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 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. His score was 75.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 164/200 to 180/200.

Findings: Spring 2014: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (11 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 144/200 to 194/200.

Spring 2014: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2013-2014, 100% (12 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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.

**SLO 2: Mastery of writing and speaking skills**

Students will demonstrate mastery of writing and speaking skills essential to successful teaching.

**Relevant Associations:**

NCATE, NCSS Related Measures: • Mentor Teacher In-Class Evaluation Rubric • HIS 300 Rubrics for Oral Presentations • HIS 300 Rubrics for Research Project

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation, overall scores and Oral Communication indicators.**
Overall scores on Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation, the assessment required by the Educational Field Experiences Office for all student teachers.

Scores on these two indicators will be examined in particular:

Candidate demonstrates oral and written communication.
Candidate presents information in an articulate and precise manner.

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

**Target:**
Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (196 of a possible 228 points) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation. They will score a minimum of 75% (6 of a possible 8 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (159 of a possible 228 points) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation. They will score a minimum of 75% (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators. Please note that the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation was dropped by the Office of Educational Field Experiences in spring 2014. As a result, the Final In-Class Evaluation scores will be used for this measure for 2013-2014 so that there is consistency between fall and spring scores. New target: Student Teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of a possible 104 points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation. They will score a minimum of 75% (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators.

Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: There was only one student from the Hattiesburg campus in this cohort. 100% of the Hattiesburg students (1 of 1) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences’ Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. His score was 75.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of the Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences’ Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 80/104 to 93/104.

Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 100% (1 of 1) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment's Oral Communication Indicators. His score was 3 out of a total of 4 possible points.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% (3 of 3) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators. All scores were a 3 out of possible 4 points.

Spring 2014

Target: 100% of student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (159 of a possible 228 points) on the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation. They will score a minimum of 75% (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators. Please note that the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation was dropped by the Office of Educational Field Experiences in spring 2014. As a result, the Final In-Class Evaluation scores will be used for this measure for 2013-2014 so that there is consistency between fall and spring scores. New target: Student Teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of a possible 104 points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation. They will score a minimum of 75% (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators.

Spring 2014: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) received 70% or better (73 of a 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office rubric
for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 76/104 to 95/104.

Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester.

Hattiesburg: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment's Oral Communication Indicators. All scored 3 of 4 possible points.

Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester.

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 pass their TIAI In-Class Evaluations with a score of 70% or better.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met

Target: 100% of History Education students will pass their TIAI In-Class Evaluations with a score of 70% or better. Student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of a possible 104 points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation.

Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: There was only one student from the Hattiesburg campus in this cohort. 100% of the Hattiesburg students (1 of 1) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences' Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. His score was 75.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of the Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 80/104 to 93/104.

Spring 2014: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) received 70% or better (73 of a 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 76/104 to 95/104.

Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester. Hattiesburg: 100% of the Hattiesburg
students (11 of 11) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators. All scored 3 of 4 possible points. Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester.

For 2013-2014, 100% of both Hattiesburg and Gulf Park students scored 70% or better on the In-Class Evaluations.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 140/200 (70%) or greater. Findings:

Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. His score was 142/200. Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 153/200 to 189/200. Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2014: 81% of Hattiesburg student teachers (9 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 122/200 to 176/200. Gulf Park: Spring 2014: For the year 2013-2014, 83% (10 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - 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 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. His score was 75. Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 164/200 to 180/200. Findings: Spring 2014: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (11 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 144/200 to 194/200. Spring 2014: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (12 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (1 of 1) 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 2013: 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 2014: Hattiesburg: 100% of students (11 of 11) 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. Two students turned in their surveys late.

Spring 2014: Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For 2013-2014, 100% (12 of 12) 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. Two students have been contacted a second time to return their surveys; they returned them this summer.

For 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Fall 2013 Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (14/20) or greater.

Findings: Hattiesburg Fall 2013: 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14 of 20 possible points) or greater. His score was 15/20.

Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2013: 66% (2 of 3) students received an overall rubric score of 70%. The scores ranged from 0/20 to 17/20.

Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2014: 100% (11 of 11) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14 of 20 possible points) or greater. Scores ranged from 15/20 to 16/20.

Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2013: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2013-2014, 100% (12 of 12) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 70% (14/20 points) or greater.
For the year 2012-2013, 2 of 3 (66%) 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 remediate...

**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 University 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not 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 2013: 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 35/50 (70%) or greater. The score was 38/50.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 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 42/50.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2014: 81% (9 of 11) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 35/50 (70%) or greater. Scores ranged from 34/50 to 49/50.

Gulf Park: Spring 2013: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For 2013-2014, 83% (10 of 12) of Hattiesburg students met the target; 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) 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 remediating...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Fall 2013: Hattiesburg: 100% (1 of 1) 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 2013: 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 2014: Hattiesburg: 100% of students 11 of 11 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. Two students turned in their surveys late. Spring 2014: Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort. For 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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. Two students have been contacted a second time to return their surveys; they returned them this summer. For 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not 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.) Also, in spring 2014, the point value changed again to 56. So in the spring, the passing score is 39 (70%).

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 0% (0 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. His score was 46.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 57/68 to 68/68.

Findings: Hattiesburg; Spring 2014: 81% (9 of 11) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 39 (0%) or greater. Scores ranged from 0/56 to 56/56.

Gulf Park: Spring 2013: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2013-2014, 75% (9 of 12) Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47/68 (70%) or greater.

For the year 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Target: 100% of History Education students will pass their TIAI In-Class Evaluations with a score of 70% or better. Student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of a possible 104 points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation. Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: There was only one student from the Hattiesburg campus in this cohort. 100% of the Hattiesburg students (1 of 1) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences' Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. His score was 75. Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of the Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences' Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 80/104 to 93/104. Spring 2014: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) received 70% or better (73 of a 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 76/104 to 95/104. Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester. Hattiesburg: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment’s Oral Communication Indicators. All scored 3 of 4 possible points. Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester. For 2013-2014, 100% of both Hattiesburg and Gulf Park students scored 70% or better on the In-Class Evaluations.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not 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.) Also, in spring 2014, the point value changed again to 56. So in the spring, the passing
score is 39 (70%). Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 0% (0 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. His score was 46. Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 47 or greater. Scores ranged from 57/68 to 68/68. Findings: Hattiesburg; Spring 2014: 81% (9 of 11) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 39 (0%) or greater. Scores ranged from 0/56 to 56/56. Gulf Park: Spring 2013: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort. For the year 2013-2014, 75% (9 of 12) Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 47/68 (70%) or greater. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (140 of 200 possible points) or greater.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 0% (0 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 140 or greater. His score was 118/200.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 66% (2 of 3) of Gulf Park students received an overall rubric score of 140 or greater. Scores ranged from 110/200 to 182/200.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2014: 63% (7 of 11) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 140 or greater. Scores ranged from 92/200 to 180/200.

Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2013-2014, 58% (7 of 12) of Hattiesburg students received an overall rubric score of 140/200 or 70%. For the year 2013-2014, 66% of Gulf Park students (2 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 2013: 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg student teachers received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. His score was 159.

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 158 to 169.

Spring 2014: 100% (11 of 11) of Hattiesburg student teachers received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. Scores ranged from 155 to 186. (One student retook the exam in the summer of 2014.)

Gulf Park Spring 2013: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

Findings: For 2013-2014, 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (12 of 12) received passing scores on the Praxis II Principles of Teaching and Learning Examination. 100% 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...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Target: 100% of History Education students will pass their TIAI In-Class Evaluations with a score of 70% or better. Student teachers will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (73 of a possible 104 points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation. Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: There was only one student from the Hattiesburg campus in this cohort. 100% of the Hattiesburg students (1 of 1) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences' Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. His score was 75. Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of the Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received 70% or better (73 of 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences' Experiences rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 80/104 to 93/104. Spring 2014: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) received 70% or better (73 of a 104 possible points) on the Final In-Class Evaluation, the Educational Field Experiences Office rubric for student teacher evaluation. Scores ranged from 76/104 to 95/104. Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester. Hattiesburg: 100% of the Hattiesburg students (11 of 11) scored 75% or better (3 of a possible 4 points) on the assessment's Oral Communication Indicators. All scored 3 of 4 possible points. Gulf Park: There were no Gulf Park students this semester. For 2013-2014, 100% of both Hattiesburg and Gulf Park students scored 70% or better on the In-Class Evaluations.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 140/200 (70%) or greater.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. His score was 142/200.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 153/200 to 189/200.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2014: 81% of Hattiesburg student teachers (9 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 122/200 to 176/200.

Gulf Park: Spring 2014:
There were no student teachers in this group from Gulf Park.

For the year 2013-2014, 83% (10 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% (140/200) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - 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 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. His score was 75. Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% of Gulf Park student teachers (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 164/200 to 180/200. Findings: Spring 2014: 100% of Hattiesburg student teachers (11 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. Scores ranged from 144/200 to 194/200. Spring 2014: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (12 of 12) of Hattiesburg student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park student teachers received an overall rubric score of 70% or greater.

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

Page 164 of 333
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg Fall 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg students (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. His score was 7/10.

Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2013: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 9/10 to 10/10.

Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2014: 90% of Hattiesburg students (10 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 0/10 to 10/10.

Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2014: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2013-2014, 91% (11 of 12) of Hattiesburg students, received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (3 of 3) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

100% will receive a passing score on the BTLE.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Fall 2013: 100% (1 of 1) of Hattiesburg students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination.

Gulf Park: Fall 2013: 100% (3 of 3) of Gulf Park students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination.

Findings: Hattiesburg: Spring 2014: 100% (11 of 11) of Hattiesburg students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination.

Gulf Park: Spring 2014: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort.

For the year 2013-2014, 100% (12 of 12) of Hattiesburg students received a passing score on the Basic Technology Literacy Examination. For the year 2013-2014, 100% (3 of 3) 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 technology...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

Target: 100% will receive an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10) or greater. Findings: Hattiesburg Fall 2013: 100% of Hattiesburg students (1 of 1) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. His score was 7/10. Findings: Gulf Park Fall 2013: 100% of Gulf Park students (3 of 3) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 9/10 to 10/10. Findings: Hattiesburg Spring 2014: 90% of Hattiesburg students (10 of 11) received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. Scores ranged from 0/10 to 10/10. Findings: Gulf Park Spring 2014: There were no Gulf Park students in this cohort. For the year 2013-2014, 91% (11 of 12) of Hattiesburg students, received an overall rubric score of 70% (7/10 points) or greater. For the year 2012-2013, 100% (3 of 3) 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...

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** already implemented
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professional Educational Faculty

**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.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** already implemented
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Professional Education Faculty

**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:** In-Progress
- **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
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.

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.

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.

Praxis I
The department will continue to monitor closely Praxis I scores.

Praxis II
The Licensure Coordinator will encourage teacher candidates to take the Praxis II examination.
Established in Cycle: 2005-2006
Implementation Status: In-Progress
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: In-Progress
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: In-Progress
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 faculty and advisors
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: Finished
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 program.
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 assessing social science
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

**Responsibility 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: 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

**Responsibility 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 University 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):
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
**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. Cultural diversity 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 a experiences in academic, classroom, and cultural settings. In journals, they will describe at 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

**Projected Completion Date:** 12/01/2012

**Responsible Person/Group:** HIS faculty

**Additional Resources Requested:** none

---

**Plan to help students improve quality of teaching PowerPoints**

In HIS 487, an original PowerPoint 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 assessments showed strengths in classroom teaching, content knowledge, knowledge of pedagogy, classroom management (actual practice,) spoken and written communication, lesson planning (portfolio), and appraisals of teaching skills by the mentor teachers.

Scores on the classroom management, assessment of student learning, and PowerPoint presentations are trending higher, although we are still not reaching our 100% mastery goal. Praxis II scores have also improved, especially in the content area. (This assessment has higher cut scores now.)

Students consistently express that they believe they have been well-prepared for the classroom.

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

Our students still need additional practice in assessment of actual student work.

They also need more exposure to diverse student populations, as well as additional readings on this topic. The student who received a zero on this assignment in Fall 2013, however, turned the assignment in too late to receive credit. (He did not have problems with addressing diversity in his student teaching classroom.)

Ethical and professional dispositions were an issue in spring 2014 with two students. (One student failed her PowerPoint assignment as a result of improper citation; this caused the program not to meet its goal of 100% student success on this assignment. Another did not properly cite his classroom management assignment, which caused him to fail this assignment.)

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The History B.A. with Licensure program has seen its graduates eagerly hired by school districts both in and out of state this year. Anecdotal evidence and conversations with administrators during job reference talks have indicated that our graduates are in high demand. The various written assignments that have been integrated into both student teaching and our History pedagogy courses have prepared our candidates to address challenging interview questions. More importantly, their field experiences have prepared them to tackle all manner of challenging classroom situations.

With a very few exceptions, we expect 100% of our students to pass our assessments. In the cases of assessments that were "not met," one or two students at most did not hit the mark.

Our data from 2013-2014 has indicated strengths as well as weaknesses.

Our students, with one exception, have all passed the more challenging Praxis II content area examination on their first try. All have passed the Praxis Principles of Teaching and Learning.
Our students' lesson plans and materials have been quite good; administrators and mentor teachers have been pleased with their implementation as well. They have also improved their understanding of the National Council for the Social Studies Thematic Standards and their incorporation of the standards into their units. With one exception, their PowerPoint presentations have been well organized and have incorporated appropriate visuals and text. (One student who did not properly cite sources received a zero on this assignment.)

Mentor teachers' scores of teaching, with one exception, have been good.

One student, who is now repeating student teaching, committed a major ethics violation in addition to performing below par on his teaching evaluations. He is now repeating the field experience under a carefully crafted remediation plan and is experiencing success this fall.

We find that our students need to not only read more about all types of student diversity, but experience it firsthand in the classroom during their observations and student teaching. Our scores for the assessment of student learning assignment in HIS 490/491 show that they also need more background and practice in assessment of actual student work. In practice, however, our mentor teachers report that our students show respect for diversity and that they "go the extra mile" to meet students' needs.

Two students did not reach our expectations for their classroom management plans in student teaching. This was largely a result of not following the directions for comparing and contrasting their student teaching management plan with their CIS 313 or HIS 488 management plan.

The most difficult of the student teaching assignments has historically been the assessment of student learning. Although scores have risen, a few students still struggle with this assignment.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

With a very few exceptions, we expect 100% of our students to pass our assessments. In the cases of assessments that were "not met," one or two students at most did not hit the mark.

Our data from 2013-2014 has indicated strengths as well as weaknesses.

Our students, with one exception, have all passed the more challenging Praxis II content area examination on their first try. All have passed the Praxis Principles of Teaching and Learning.

One student, who is now repeating student teaching, committed a major ethics violation in addition to performing below par on his teaching evaluations. He is now repeating the field experience under a carefully crafted remediation plan and is experiencing success this fall. We are redoubling our efforts to familiarize students with the Mississippi Educators Code of Ethics and the National Council for Social Studies Code of Ethics in HIS 110, 111, 487 and 488, as well as during student teaching.

We find that our students need to not only read more about all types of student diversity, but experience it firsthand in the classroom during their observations and student teaching. Our scores for the assessment of student learning assignment in HIS 490/491 show that they also need more background and practice in assessment of actual student work. One step that has been taken is to double the number of classroom observations of actual public school classrooms in HIS 487.

Two students did not reach our expectations for their classroom management plans in student teaching. This year, the number of extra seminars on this topic have been increased by Educational Field Experiences. This should help our candidates have a better idea of what should be included in this important assignment.

The most difficult of the student teaching assignments has historically been the assessment of student learning. Although scores have risen, students still struggle with this assignment. More attention must be paid in HIS 488 and HIS 487 in terms of providing readings and experiences to prepare students for actual student assessment and analysis of the results.
Closing the Loop
   No report at this time.
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 138 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 (138) established by the Mississippi Department of Education on the Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge (0091) Exam.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
The pass rate for the Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge (0091) exam was 100% (n = 7).

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
The pass rate for the Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) was 100% (n = 7). Students have the option of one of three tests. The number of students taking and passing each test was:
- PLT K-6: 2/2 earned a passing score.
- PLT 5-7: 1/1 earned a passing score.
- PLT 7-12: 4/4 earned 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. Students 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 in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" as described by the FITNESSGRAM 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 within the "Healthy Fitness Zone."

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
   The mean score for indicators related to Planning and Teaching on the TIAI was 3.7 (n = 7). The range of mean scores for each indicator was 2.67-4.00.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
   The mean score for indicators related to Planning and Teaching on the TIAI was 3.7 (n = 7). The range of mean scores for each indicator was 2.67-4.00.

**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 a mean score of 3 for all criteria related to "Instruction" on the TIAI.

   **Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
   The mean score for all items relate to Instruction and Learning Environment on the TIAI was (n = 7). Mean scores for individual indicators ranged from 3.67-4.00.

**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 a mean score of 3 on items related to "Learning Environment" on the TIAI.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The mean score for all items related to "Learning Environment" was 3.97. The range of scores was 3.67-4.00.

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 490/491: Assessment of Student Learning-Data Analysis
The scoring rubric for the assessment project in HPR 490/491 is used to collect this data.

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

Target:
Students in HPR 490 (Student Teaching in Elementary Physical Education) and HPR 491 will earn a mean score of 3.00 for all criteria related to "Data Analysis" on the scoring rubric for the assessment project.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The mean score for all items related to "Data Analysis" on the scoring rubric for the assessment project was 3.13.

M 10: HPR 490/491: Assessment Project-Reflection
The scoring rubric for the assessment project in HPR 490/491 is used for data collection.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
Students in HPR 490/491 will earn a mean score of 3.00 or better on all categories TC Assessment Project Rubric related to "Reflection".

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The mean score for all items related to "Reflection" on the scoring rubric for the assessment project was 3.55.

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 490/491: Assessment Project-Reflection | Outcome/Objective: Impact on Student Learning

Projected Completion Date: 12/06/2012
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
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. Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - No IT/BTE teacher candidates registered for the Praxis II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - No IT/BTE teacher candidates registered for the Praxis II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - No IT/BTE teacher candidates registered for the Praxis II: Business Education content knowledge professional examination. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

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

**Review Praxis II Subscores**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Review Praxis II subscores for individual teacher candidates. Analysis of subscores will enable faculty to determine if there a...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Students demonstrate business education content knowledge in both IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education and IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the Fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). No students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - No IT/BTE students registered for IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education. IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the Spring semester, (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the Fall semester and IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the Spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - Students are assessed by their mentor teacher and university supervisor on how they apply skills in their student teaching experience. No IT/BTE students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only taught in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only taught in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

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

Assessment Instruments
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Educational Field Experience has conducted various focus groups with university supervisors, mentor teachers, students, and fiel...

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Students apply skills in a field-based experience during IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - No students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the spring semester, (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education, is only offered in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - Students demonstrate effective communication skills during their microteaching in IT 456. No IT/BTE students registered for IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (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 students will score mastery or exemplary on Indicator 23 of the TCPE.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Students demonstrate effective communication skills in both IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education and IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). No students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester, (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester and IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

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

**Review Praxis II: PLT**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*  
Faculty will review subscores for Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching to determine pedagogical areas that may need em...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - In IT 493, students develop student-centered lesson plans which include the application of teaching/learning theories. No IT/BTE students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only taught in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only taught in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - Students apply teaching/learning theories in their microteaching which is demonstrated in IT 456. No IT/BTE students registered for IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus 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: 2012-2013*
Individualized attention will be given to the student who needs more practice in applying teaching/learning theories. Evaluatio...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Students apply teaching/learning theories in a field-based experience during IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - No students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the spring semester, (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education, is only offered in the spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - Students integrate technology in their instruction during their microteaching which is demonstrated in IT 456. No IT/BTE students registered for IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (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 students will score mastery or exemplary on Indicator 26 of the TCPE, Candidate impacts learning by integrating technology effectively in instruction.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Students integrate technology in instruction during their microteaching in IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education and during their student teaching in IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. Spring 2014 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). No students registered for IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - No IT/BTE students registered for IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education. IT 493, Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the spring semester, (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only). Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - IT 456, Methods in General and Career/Tech Business Education is only offered in the fall semester and IT 493,
Student Teaching in Business Technology Education is only offered in the Spring semester. (Program offered on Hattiesburg campus only).

**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:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Two weeks after course begins.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Online Instructor

**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 2012.

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

**Assessment Instruments**
Educational Field Experience has conducted various focus groups with university supervisors, mentor teachers, students, and field directors to determine if revisions are needed to the Teacher Intern Assessment instrument (TIAI). This instrument has been piloted to serve as the common student teacher assessment instrument for teacher preparation programs across the state of Mississippi. IT/BTE faculty will continue to work with Educational Field Experience to offer suggestions for possible revisions. In addition, BTE faculty will monitor student performance in each domain of the instrument to determine if any curricular revisions are necessary.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Review Praxis II Subscores**
Review Praxis II subscores for individual teacher candidates. Analysis of subscores will enable faculty to determine if there are business education content areas that need further emphasis.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
**Measure**: Praxis II: Business Education Content Knowledge  |  **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate content knowledge

**Responsible Person/Group**: IT/BTE faculty

**Review Praxis II: PLT**

Faculty will review subscores for Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching to determine pedagogical areas that may need emphasis. 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**: 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status**: Planned  
**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure**: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)  |  **Outcome/Objective**: Apply teaching/learning theories

**Responsible Person/Group**: BTE Faculty

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

Because no students were enrolled in methods or student teaching in business technology education for 2013-2014, this discussion does not focus on assessment data. Students who were in line to enroll in methods classes in the fall and student teaching in the spring were pushed back because they had not completed the prerequisites to enroll in methods courses. Business technology education students will continue to be assessed on lesson plan development using Depth of Knowledge (DOK) which prepares them for better lesson plan writing experiences during student teaching. In the past, the individual attention given to students who needed extra help writing student-centered lesson plans proved successful in the development of long lesson plans. Students take their Praxis II and PLT exams during the methods semester. 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 2014-2015, 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?**

Because no students were enrolled in methods or student teaching in business technology education for 2013-2014, this discussion does not focus on assessment data. However, in 2014-2015, one of the student learning outcomes will focus on student achievement to include graduation, course completion, state licensing exams, student portfolios, and job placement rates. Traditionally business technology education students are successful in completing course requirements, passing the Praxis II, obtaining state licensure with multiple endorsements, and finding jobs.

One objective of the program will be to recruit more students. In the fall 2013, I visited all business students enrolled at Pearl River Community College, Hattiesburg campus and all business students enrolled at Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Jeff Davis campus in an effort to recruit them to the IT/Business Technology Education program.

Assessment results from 2012-2013 showed the need to add the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) as a measure for student learning outcomes to bring more awareness to this instrument during the methods courses which will give students a model of the expectations for their student teaching experience.
Past 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 to three portfolio assignments located in tk20 were inefficient, and meetings were held with Education Field Experience office to revise these instruments. The BTE program will use these revised instruments in the 2014-2015 academic year. These assignments are required during the student teaching experiences; the rubrics will be modified before the next student teaching experience for BTE students.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The Instructional Technology (Business Technology Education Emphasis) is historically within the original mission of The University of Southern Mississippi. The Business Technology Education (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 a 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 and board members of state, regional, and national professional organizations. The BTE faculty improved the program 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. Faculty are aware of the technology tools used in the 7-12 classroom setting, and teacher candidates are prepared to integrate the technology tools in their teaching for positive student learning outcomes.

In addition, the BTE faculty continuously work with the Mississippi Department of Education to align the program with needed licensure/endorsements in the field. Currently, all graduates of the IT/BTE program receive license and endorsements to teach all academic and career/technical courses in the State of Mississippi. Credentials earned by BTE graduates place them in a very marketable situation, and graduates are sought after by school districts needing business and/or technology teachers.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

BTE faculty met with the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) as members of a task force to review and update the state business education curriculum frameworks. Several meetings resulted in the plan for MDE to merge academic and career/technical programs in secondary settings, reduce the redundancy of course content, and streamline the course offerings. More work will continue on this initiative with MDE and the teacher preparation programs to make certain that students graduating from these programs will attain the necessary licensure to teach any business class in the state. In addition, the BTE curriculum continues to be updated to align with the changes from MDE as well as current and future technological trends. 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.

An objective of the program will be to focus on the student recruitment and retention rates. Helping students succeed academically will be a priority. Plans are being made to establish a Student Advising and Support Center in the department to supplement faculty advising. Through this center, students will be able to gain help and support in a timely manner. These efforts should reduce the number of students who may be on probation or suspension and will provide students with needed guidance. In an effort to recruit more students into the IT/BTE program, in the fall 2013 I visited business students enrolled at Pearl River Community College, Hattiesburg campus and business students enrolled at Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, Jeff Davis campus. Recruitment efforts will continue with plans being made to visit area high school business students in the fall 2014. Additional recruitment efforts are now underway with Teacher Academy Students through partnerships we have in the College of Education and Psychology.

**Closing the Loop**

Action Plans that were in progress were moved to the finished category. Currently there are no action plans in progress. There are three action plans that were created in 2013-2014 that are currently active.
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. (This measure was formerly in LIS 511. In the 2013-14 academic year it was moved to LIS 636 in accordance with an action plan.)

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
96% (47/49) students (combined, summer, fall and spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking on the rubrics for interpreting the Library Bill of Rights...
Six (100%) licensure students achieved satisfactory. Forty-one out of forty-three (95%) non-licensure students achieved satisfactory or excellent; 2 students did not turn in papers.

**M 2: Develop balanced collection policies**


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

**Target:**
85% of students (groups) should achieve satisfactory ranking according to the rubrics for the collection development policies.

**Findings (2013-2014)** - **Target: Met**
Overall target for 2013-2014 (combined summer, fall, spring) was MET with 96% (46/48, n=48) students achieving satisfactory or excellent ranking according to the rubrics for the collection development policies.
Nine out of ten (90%) of licensure students achieved satisfactory or excellent.
Thirty-eight out of thirty-nine (97%) non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.

**SLO 2: Knowledge of the basic tenets of reference, collection development and cataloging**

Master's degree candidates demonstrate knowledge of the 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 concepts and practices of original cataloging. Candidates identify 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 advanced hypothetical reference questions, identify key concepts for searching reference materials, identify and evaluate 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:**
85% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014)** - **Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET 2013-2014 MET. 95% (45/47) of students (combined summer, fall, and spring) achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric.
Seven out of seven (100%) licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.
Thirty-eight out of forty (95%) non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.

**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:**
85% 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET MET. 85% (46/54) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory ranking against the community analysis rubric.
Nine out of nine (100%) licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.
Thirty-seven out of forty-five (82%) non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.

**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:**
85% of students will achieve satisfactory performance of organizational activities related to the assignment rubrics

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET MET: 97% (38/39) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent performance of organizational activities related to the assignment rubrics.
Two out of two (100%) licensure students achieved a rating of excellent or satisfactory.
Thirty-six out of thirty-seven (97%) non-licensure students achieved a rating of excellent or satisfactory.

**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: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

**Target:**
85% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET 2013-2014 MET 89% (50/56) (combined summer, fall, spring) students achieved satisfactory ranking against the reference question rubric.
Twelve out of thirteen (92%) licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.
Thirty-eight out of forty-three (88%) non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET MET 97% (29/30) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubrics for written analyses of articles from the professional management literature.
Five out of five (100%) licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ratings.
Twenty-four out of twenty-five (96%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET for 2013-2014 was met. 90% (48/53) (combined summer, fall spring) of students' analysis of the impact of the Library Bill of Rights on librarianship will rank satisfactory on the rubrics.
Eight out of eight (100%) licensure students achieved satisfactory or excellent.
Forty out of forty-five (89%) non-licensure students achieved satisfactory or excellent.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
OVERALL TARGET 2013-2014 MET 100% (5353) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking against the research proposal rubric.
Ten out of ten (100%) licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking.
Forty-three out of forty-three (100%) non-licensure students achieved excellent or satisfactory ranking.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
OVERALL TARGET 2013-2014 MET 100% (58/58) (combined summer, fall, spring) achieved satisfactory or excellent ranking against the rubric for the Master’s Project as determined by at least two faculty members.
Eight out of eight (100%) licensure students were rated satisfactory or excellent.
Fifty out of fifty (100%) non-licensure students were rated satisfactory or excellent.

SLO 5: Technology literacy

Candidates develop an awareness of the effects of technology on all library and information centers' operations, the uses of technology in management, public access, and instruction, 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 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
OVERALL TARGET 2013-2014 MET 91% (43/47) (combined summer, fall, spring) students achieved a satisfactory rating based on the rubrics for analysis and reporting on professional reading and research activities in LIS 651 Introduction to Information Science assignments.
Five out of eight (62%) licensure students were rated as satisfactory or excellent.
Thirty-eight out of thirty-nine (97%) non-licensure students were rated as satisfactory or excellent.

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

**M10 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...

**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, word processors, spreadsheets and other course identified software with satisfactory performance as measured on assignment rubrics. This target is assessed in LIS 516 Technology in the School Library, LIS 557 Computer Application in Libraries, and LIS 558 Internet Resources. All students must take one of these courses as an elective.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
2013-14 Target MET. 100% (61/61) students (combined LIS 516, 557, 558) demonstrated satisfactory technological literacy through their use of a variety of current technologies as measured on assignment rubrics.
Eight out of eight licensure students demonstrated satisfactory technological literacy.
Fifty-three out of fifty-three (100%) non-licensure students demonstrated satisfactory technological literacy.
Sixteen out of sixteen students (100%) in LIS 516 (fall 2013) demonstrated satisfactory technological literacy through construction of a webquest. Of those, seven were licensure and nine were non-licensure.
Twenty-two out of twenty-two students (100%) in LIS 557 (fall 2013) demonstrated satisfactory technological literacy through construction of an electronic portfolio. There were no licensure students in the class.
Twenty-three out of twenty-three students (100%) in LIS 558 (spring 2014) demonstrated satisfactory technological literacy through construction of an electronic portfolio. Of those, there was one licensure student and twenty-two non-licensure students.
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...

M11 Improve assessment alignment between assignments
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Data gathered from three different courses. Review syllabi, assignments, and rubrics to ensure alignment of assessment coverage.

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: Video or audio tape (music, counseling, art)

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

O/O 6: Retention and Graduation
Students admitted to the library and information science master’s program will progress through the program and graduate.

Related Measures:

M 13: Retention
70% of the students admitted to the library and information science master’s program will be retained in the program. Retention will be measured by data from Institutional Research and/or data from PeopleSoft.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
70% of students will be retained in the program as measured by Institutional Research data and/or data from PeopleSoft.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
78% (289/370; n=370) of students were retained in the program as measured by data from PeopleSoft. This finding was obtained by looking at students admitted since fall of 2008 and tracking graduation, active, dismissal and discontinued students. Students who graduated or are currently active in the program were considered to be retained.

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

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

Retention
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Students who fail to register will be contacted to ascertain reasons and see if intervention is possible.
M 14: Graduation
90% of the students who graduated from the Library and Information Science master’s program will graduate within three years as determined by data from Institutional Research or data from PeopleSoft.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
90% of the students who graduated from the Library and Information Science master’s program will graduate within three years as determined by data from Institutional Research or data from SOAR.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
95% (186/194) of the students who graduated from the Library and Information Science master's program did so within three years as determined by data from PeopleSoft. These students were tracked by looking at admitted students who graduated since fall of 2008.

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: Finished
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: 01/13/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty, Curriculum Committee, Director
Additional Resources Requested: none
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

M10 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: In-Progress
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:** 05/28/2015  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee and LIS 651 teaching 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Target will be amended.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/28/2014  
**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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** This assessment measure will be deleted for the next cycle. No replacement is planned at this time.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/28/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Curriculum Committee  
**Additional Resources Requested:** None

**Essential 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:** Finished  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Amend target  
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/28/2014  
**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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Review timeline for draft feedback and incorporation.
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014
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 class. 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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Target will be amended. Discussion regarding faculty standardization in assessment will be carried out.
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Amend target
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014
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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Revise target percentage
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014
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: Finished  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Revise target percentage to 85%  
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014  
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum committee  
Additional Resources Requested: None.

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: Finished  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Target will be adjusted. Assessment will be monitored to see if improvement continues.  
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014  
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: Finished  
Priority: High  
Implementation Description: Assessment will be moved to a different course.  
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014  
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: Finished  
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Measure will be deleted.
Projected Completion Date: 06/28/2014
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: Finished
Priority: High

Curriculum Review
Faculty will undertake a comprehensive curriculum review during the 2014-15 academic year. Current outcomes and measures will be reviewed for current relevancy and correct course placement.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: None

Decide whether to add exit survey data as an outcome/measure
The department has begun to systematically give an exit survey and consideration will be given during this cycle as to whether that data should be incorporated as part of the formal assessment system.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: None

M11 Improve assessment alignment between assignments
Data gathered from three different courses. Review syllabi, assignments, and rubrics to ensure alignment of assessment coverage.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Technology tool assessment | Outcome/Objective: Technology literacy

Projected Completion Date: 05/30/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Faculty teaching LIS 516, 557, 558
Additional Resources Requested: None

Retention
Students who fail to register will be contacted to ascertain reasons and see if intervention is possible.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Retention | Outcome/Objective: Retention and Graduation

Responsible Person/Group: Faculty advisors.

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 in meeting the outcomes/objectives of the program. Failure to achieve at least satisfactory on the student’s part is generally due to either not completing the assignment or failing to follow assignment instructions. After analyzing last year’s results it was determined that the performance target in the three introductory courses would be lowered to 85%. With that in place, there is a tiered performance target system with assessments in the three beginning courses being at 85%, the next four required course assessments being at 90% and the assessment in the capstone course being at 95%. This change was decided upon because of the challenging material in the beginning courses and the adjustment that students often need to make to balance courses, especially online courses, jobs, and family responsibilities. These three courses are the foundation for the program and outcomes 1 and 2 have at least one measure in one or more of those courses. Last year some assessments with the corresponding assignments were moved to different courses and this has proved successful and relieved some of the assessment burden on particular courses, especially LIS 511. After two years of failure to collect data for M11, it was determined that data would be collected in a combination of three courses, LIS 516, 557 and 558, and that was done during this cycle. All students must take one of these three courses as an elective so all students will be assessed.

Retention and graduation rates were added to the assessments. Both the retention and graduation targets were met. However, recruitment, retention, and graduation remains a priority for the department.

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

The introductory courses were given standardized performance targets of 85% and performance at the new levels will be monitored over the next several cycles. At least in the first year this has proved to be successful. 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. M11 was implemented this year for the first time in several years because of previous failure to collect data. The target was rewritten and assigned to three elective classes; all students are required to take at least one of those three electives. Additional work will be done during the coming year to standardize the assessment assignment among the three classes but the initial outcome this year was positive. A comprehensive curriculum review is planned for the 2014-15 academic year and this may result in some changes to outcomes/objectives and/or measures. We have begun to collect systematic data through an exit survey and consideration will be given to incorporating that data as a measure for one or more outcomes.

An assessment was added for retention and graduation data. Although the targets were met continued attention will be given tracking and mentoring matriculated students to encourage retention and move students through to graduation. Faculty has discussed and will continue to focus on possible barriers for students to enter and remain in the program. Recruitment has been and remains a priority.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The Masters 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 approximately 20 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.

In 2009-2010 we proposed and had approved a Graduate Certificate in Archives and Special Collections, which has attracted new students as well as alums. Four students successfully completed the certificate in 2013-14. The newer Youth Services and Literature certificate produced four completers during the 2013-14 year. The MLIS is one of the most frequently awarded master's degrees at The University of Southern Mississippi. Master student enrollment during 2013-14 was 142 in spring 2013, 113 in summer 2013 and 143 in fall 2013. Spring 2014 was not available at this writing. 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 47 years. The festival attracts national attention and participants to the university for the Southern Mississippi Silver Medallion awarded annually for the last 46 years. The 2012 winner was author and poet Jane Yolen, 2013 was Jon Scieszka, and the 2014 winner was Christopher Paul Curtis; all are recipients of multiple literary awards. They joined a long list of authors, illustrators and storytellers honored to receive the Medallion. 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, Collaborate Live Classroom, and Podcasting and continue to be active in testing new technology appropriate for our field. Our courses 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. 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
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 brings a new area of expertise which will allow SLIS to offer new courses and highlight their talent. A comprehensive planning and review process for the department has been initiated and is envisioned to take several years. The focus for 2014-15 will be a complete curriculum review to pinpoint duplication, ensure coverage of needed material, and focus on embedded technologies. Recruitment, retention, and graduation remain priorities for the department.
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Since library and information science has very dynamic evolving technology systems and structures, e.g., blogs, wikis, gaming, social media 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 selected a common assignment in three courses to serve as the assignment for M11. The faculty will be reviewing courses and assignments 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 and ensuring coverage. Data were gathered during this cycle for M11 for the first time in three years and the assessment will be refined further during the coming cycle.

Target percentages for those assessments falling in the three beginning courses were revised to 85% to reflect the subject matter difficulty and issues that students sometimes have in learning to balance work, family and school, especially online courses, as they begin a graduate program. Target percentages rise to 90% and finally to 95% as students progress through the program. This change was addressed in several action plans that were finalized during this cycle.

Measure 1, Library Bill of Rights analysis, was moved to a different course in accordance with an action plan for this cycle. This relieved the assessment burden on LIS 511 Collection Development and the M1 assessment fit equally well in the other course.

The master's project timeline has been monitored, as per an action plan, and an effort has been made to allow students more time to incorporate changes from proposal to draft to final paper. The assessment target was met in all sections during this cycle.

Retention and graduation rates were added as assessments for the first time. Initial targets were met but recruitment, retention, and graduation remain a priority for the department.

During the coming cycle a comprehensive curriculum review is planned which may result in changes to outcomes, assessments, etc., depending on findings by the faculty.
Mission / Purpose

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.

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

Target:

The rubric to score the portfolio does not directly contain an element on calculus. However, it is clearly stated that all portfolios are to contain work from calculus. In particular, each portfolio must contain concepts from calculus demonstrated from a numerical, graphical, analytical, and verbal perspective. This is scored as part of the 6 elements as indicated. 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 (breadth and interconnections), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met

87.5% (7 out of 8) had materials documenting calculus. The rubric to score the portfolio does not directly contain an element on calculus. However, it is clearly stated that all portfolios are to contain work from calculus. In particular, each portfolio must contain concepts from calculus demonstrated from a numerical, graphical, analytical, and verbal perspective. This is scored as part of the 6 elements as indicated.

100% (8 out of 8) had a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 on each of element 1 (proofs), element 2 (problem solving), element 4 (writing skills), element 5 (depth of knowledge) and element 6 (breadth of knowledge). 87.5% (7 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 element 3 (use of technology). 100% (8 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1 - 6.

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 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.

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

**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).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (8 out of 8) had a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 on each of element 1 (proofs) and 100% (8 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1 - 6.

**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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**
80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 3 (proofs).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
95% (19 out of 20) chose a score a 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 3 (proofs). The online survey did not distinguish the campus, but 19 had studied at the Hattiesburg campus. The survey also did not distinguish LBS from BS so all data is combined.

**M 6: Exit Survey**
Graduating students will be required to complete an exit survey.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
80% of exit surveys will have a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 2 (proofs) and an average score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on questions 1-12.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of respondents (10 out of 10) chose a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 2 (constructing mathematical proofs). 90% of respondents (9 out of 10) chose an average score of 3 or better on questions 1-12. There were 7 respondents from Hattiesburg and 4 from the Gulf Coast; not all respondents answered all questions. The survey was anonymous, so we were unable to separate LBS data from BS data or Hattiesburg data from Gulf Coast data.

**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 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.

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

**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 6 (breadth and interconnections), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (8 out of 8) had a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 on each of element 6 (breadth and interconnections) and 100% (8 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1 - 6.

**M 2: Capstone Course**
A graduate’s performance in the capstone course will be deemed satisfactory.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**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.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students (6 out of 6) on the Hattiesburg campus passed the capstone course with a grade of C or better. 100% of students (1 out of 1) on the Gulf Park campus passed the capstone course with a grade of C or better.

**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.

The end or program test has been eliminated as a measure.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**
50% of the students taking the End-Program Test will score at least 50% as determined by a departmentally developed rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Due to the difficulty in receiving the data to analyze the measure, the end of program test measure has been eliminated as a measure for the licensure program.

**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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**
80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 2 (breath and interconnections).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (20 out of 20) scored a 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 2 (breadth and interconnections). The online survey did not distinguish the campus, but 19 had studied at the Hattiesburg campus. The survey also did not distinguish LBS from BS so all data is combined.

**M 6: Exit Survey**
Graduating students will be required to complete an exit survey.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
80% of exit surveys will have a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on questions 1 (breadth and interconnections) and an average score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on questions 1-12.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of respondents (10 out of 10) chose a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 1 (breadth and interconnections). In fact, all respondents chose a score of 4 or better on question 1. 90% of respondents (9 out of 10) chose an average score of 3 or better on questions 1-12. There were 7 respondents from Hattiesburg and 4 from the Gulf Coast; not all respondents answered all questions. The survey was anonymous, so we were unable to separate LBS data from BS data or Hattiesburg data from Gulf Coast data.

**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.

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

**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).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (8 out of 8) had a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 on each of element 1 (proofs),
element 2 (problem solving), element 4 (writing skills), element 5 (depth of knowledge) and element 6 (breadth of knowledge). 87.5% (7 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 element 3 (use of technology). 100% (8 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1 - 6.

**M 2: Capstone Course**

A graduate’s performance in the capstone course will be deemed satisfactory.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

**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.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

100% of students (6 out of 6) on the Hattiesburg campus passed the capstone course with a grade of C or better. 100% of students (1 out of 1) on the Gulf Park campus passed the capstone course with a grade of C or better.

**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.

The end or program test has been eliminated as a measure.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**

50% of the students taking the End-Program Test will score at least 50% as determined by a departmentally developed rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Due to the difficulty in receiving the data to analyze the measure, the end of program test measure has been eliminated as a measure for the licensure program.

**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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**Target:**

80% of alumni surveys will have: a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 4 (communication).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

95% (19 out of 20) scored a 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 4 (reading, writing, speaking). The online survey did not distinguish the campus, but 19 had studied at the Hattiesburg campus. The survey also did not distinguish LBS from BS so all data is combined.

**M 6: Exit Survey**

Graduating students will be required to complete an exit survey.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers
Target:
80% of exit surveys will have a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 3 (communication) and an average score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on questions 1-12.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of respondents (10 out of 10) chose a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 3 (read, write, listen, speak mathematically). In fact, all respondents chose a score of 4 or better on question 3. 90% of respondents (9 out of 10) chose an average score of 3 or better on questions 1-12. There were 7 respondents from Hattiesburg and 4 from the Gulf Coast; not all respondents answered all questions. The survey was anonymous, so we were unable to separate LBS data from BS data or Hattiesburg data from Gulf Coast data.

SLO 5: Use technology to solve mathematical problems and to teach mathematics
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 technology to solve mathematical problems and to teach mathematics.

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 breath of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

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

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).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (8 out of 8) had a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 on each of element 3 (technology) and 100% (8 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1 - 6.

M 2: Capstone Course
A graduate’s performance in the capstone course will be deemed satisfactory.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target:
80% of students will use technology to teach mathematics during their capstone course as indicated by a score of 80 or better out of a score of 100 on the assignment that provides an analysis of mathematical websites that can be used to teach mathematics. 80% of students will use technology to teach mathematics during their capstone course as indicated by a score of 80 or better out of a score of 100 on the paper that explains how to incorporate technology in the teaching of mathematics.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100 % (6 out of 6) students scored an 80 or better on the analysis of mathematical websites that can be used to teach mathematics. 100% (6 out of 6) score 80 or higher on the paper that explains how to incorporate technology in the teaching of mathematics.
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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
The alumni Survey does not address the question about computer programing or technology. This target has been deleted from this assessment.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
The alumni survey does not address the question about technology. This target has been deleted from the 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.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

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.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of students (6 out of 6) on the Hattiesburg campus passed the capstone course with a grade of C or better. 100% of students (1 out of 1) on the Gulf Park campus passed the capstone course with a grade of C or better.

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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

Target:
80% of alumni surveys will have a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 5 (graduate school). 80% will have an average score of 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on all questions. 80% will report a salary of $40K or higher.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
95% (19 out of 20) chose a score of 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 5 (graduate study). 76% (13 out of 17) reported a salary of $45K or better. 95% (19 out of 20) scored an average of 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on all questions. The online survey did not distinguish the campus, but 19 had studied at the Hattiesburg campus. The survey also did not distinguish LBS from BS so all data is combined. If the respondents to the survey are teachers, it is unlikely that the salary will
be $45K or above. The target was edited to report a salary of $40K or higher to take into consideration the salary teachers will make.

**M 6: Exit Survey**
Graduating students will be required to complete an exit survey.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
80% of exit 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), and an average score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on questions 1-12.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
90% of respondents (9 out of 10) chose a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 4 (employment) and 90% (9 out of 10) chose a score of 3 or better on a scale of 1 to 5 on question 5 (graduate school). 90% of respondents (9 out of 10) chose an average score of 3 or better on questions 1-12. There were 7 respondents from Hattiesburg and 4 from the Gulf Coast; not all respondents answered all questions. The survey was anonymous, so we were unable to separate LBS data from BS data or Hattiesburg data from Gulf Coast data.

**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 breath of the mathematical sciences and their interconnecting principles.

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

**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 (breadth and interconnections), and an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1-6 (goals).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (8 out of 8) had a score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 on each of element 1 (proofs), element 2 (problem solving), element 4 (writing skills), element 5 (depth of knowledge) and element 6 (breadth of knowledge). 87.5% (7 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 element 3 (use of technology). 100% (8 out of 8) had an average score of 2 or better on a scale of 1 to 3 over elements 1 - 6.

**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.

The end or program test has been eliminated as a measure.

Source of Evidence: Standardized test of subject matter knowledge

**Target:**
50% of the students taking the End-Program Test will score at least 50% as determined by a departmentally developed rubric.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Due to the difficulty in receiving the data to analyze the measure, the end of program test measure has been eliminated as a measure for the licensure program.

**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.

Source of Evidence: Alumni survey or tracking of alumni achievements

**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).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
95% (19 out of 20) scored an average score of 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5 on questions 1-12. The online survey did not distinguish the campus, but 19 had studied at the Hattiesburg campus. The survey also did not distinguish LBS from BS so all data is combined.

**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 is working to determine how to assess calculus knowledge.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2005-2006
- **Implementation Status:** In-Progress
- **Priority:** Medium
- **Implementation Description:** May 2014
- **Responsible Person/Group:** John Perry 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:** Finished
- **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: In-Progress
Priority: Medium
Implementation Description: May 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Mathematics education committee

Exit survey data collection
Improve collection procedure for exit survey of graduating seniors.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low
Implementation Description: Summer 09
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Chen and the faculty

Calculus assessment
For the calculus assessment, the department will form a committee to put a new Calculus assessment in place no later than January 2015, as per department vote at meeting on May 2, 2014.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Responsible Person/Group: Whole department, led by Dr. Perry.

Exit survey
Exit survey has been put in survey monkey and has been added to the requirements when completing the application for degree. This has increased the number of surveys being completed. Also, this was added as a measure for assessment in the licensure program.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High

MAT 305
The department restructured the undergraduate curriculum and in the process also revised MAT 305. It continues to be a course the licensure majors are required to take and it provides students experience in using technology to learn mathematics. It is assessed through the portfolio.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: Low

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The target was partially met because the group completing the alumni survey includes teachers. The expected salary of $45K is high for teachers and makes it almost impossible to meet this target. The target was modified to a salary of at least $30K which is a more reasonable target for teachers. This does not provide information about the programs strengths or weaknesses.
The alumni survey and the exit survey were put online in survey monkey. This nearly doubled the number of surveys that were returned by alumni, which provides us with more data to assess the objectives.

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

The data for the partially met objective showed that the target salary was set too high for a population of teachers. Beginning teachers' salaries is around $33,400 and teachers with five years of experience is around $35,000. With the salary range of $45,000, the survey question did not provide valid information about the licensure program and thus does not provide information about the programs strengths or weaknesses. The target salary was adjusted to $40K which is more in the salary range for teachers.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The department of mathematics has a staff of 14 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 6 instructors, and one visiting instructor. One faculty member was on sabbatical this past fall. The department is expanding next year, having hired a new, full-time instructor on the Gulf Park campus, and a new, permanent chair. The previous chair had stepped down in 2010 and we have had two interim chairs since then.

Research specialties include a broad mix of algebraic topology, complex analysis, computational algebra, graph theory, linear algebra, mathematics education, numerical analysis, optimization, partial differential equations, probability and statistics, symbolic computation, and theoretical physics. Department faculty disseminate their research in international, peer-reviewed journals, as well as conferences that range from the general, such as AMS Section meetings and MathFest, to field-specific meeting such as Sage Days. Two faculty have contributed code to the computer algebra system Sage.

Two groups of faculty received external funding for teacher enhancement programs: Dr. Tian with Dr. Herron in Science and Mathematics Education, and Dr. Ross with Dr. Osborne from the College of Education. Both groups received funding for summer mathematics institutes with middle school teachers. Also, Dr. Ding received the College's Teaching Award.

At present, the College of Science and Technology reports that we have 32 majors in Hattiesburg and 10 on the gulf coast, for a total of 42 altogether. Over the last two years, the BS program has been phasing out an older curriculum and implementing a newer one, designed to prepare students better for graduate school. The old program required a minor while under the new program, this requirement has been replaced by more mathematics courses, covering a broader range of subjects in the field.

Eleven students graduated with a BS in Mathematics and eight with a BS in Mathematics with Licensure during the 2013-2014 academic year, an increase over the past years. Two of this year's past graduates completed undergraduate research projects, with four students presenting a research prospectus at the end of June. The department routinely funds travel for a small group of students to the annual meeting of the LA/MS Section of the Mathematical Association of America. This year, six students attended, with one group performing far better in the team competition than in past years. One student presented her undergraduate research at the same meeting.

The department’s outreach has included visiting local high schools, hosting high school math clubs that visit, and hosting the annual American Mathematics Competition for our region.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

The department’s outreach initiatives have brought nearly 200 high school students to visit the campus this year. Over 160 students from 13 high schools participated in the American Mathematics competition. After taking the exam, they enjoyed lunch while listening to a Science Café lecture on our Musical Minds and toured both the main campus and the Accelerator. Another 20 students came on a separate trip to visit the school. Many of these schools, such as Forrest Hills High School, Quitman High School and West Harrison High School,
travel significant distances in order to participate. Their teachers indicated that the students are impressed by the time they spend on campus. The university’s welcome initiative helped to identify students who were falling behind in their progress to graduation and helped us move two students toward graduation, one in the fall of 2013 and one in the spring of 2014.

Closing the Loop

After learning that the 2012-2013 report was deemed inadequate, the department held a meeting on May 2, 2014 to address some outstanding Action Plans. We agreed to change the action plan on the calculus assessment. The department will form a committee to put a new calculus assessment in place no later than January 2015. Also, the exit survey and the alumni survey have been put online through survey monkey. It is expected that this will increase the number of responses and therefore increase the amount of data to assess the program. The exit survey data was added as a measure in the licensure program assessment.
Mission / Purpose

The purpose of this degree is to prepare students for the teaching of instrumental or choral music (wind, percussion, strings, and/or choir) to K-12 music students. To prepare students for this task, students engage in a course of study that includes instrumental and choral techniques courses, pedagogical instruction, and advanced performance studies in solo, chamber, and large ensemble courses. Common to all BME students is training in functional piano, music theory and history, and professional education curricula. The student experience culminates in a student teaching experience in which synthesis and application are emphasized by a variety of experienced music educators. Upon the successful completion of coursework and passing of standardized testing mandated by the Mississippi Department of Education, students are eligible for a single-A Mississippi professional teaching license.

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 a C or better 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met

80% (51 out of 64) of the students scored 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.

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 a C or better on the MUS 202L Dictation Test 3 demonstrating the ability to take aural dictation.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
85% (51 out of 64) of the students scored a C or better on the MUS 202L Dictation Test 3 demonstrating the ability to take aural dictation.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
81% (107 out of 128) of the students averaged B or better on the three MUS 302 analysis projects, thus demonstrating their understanding of musical forms, processes and structures.

**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 a B or better on their composition projects.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
92% (65 out of 70) of the students scored a B or better on their composition projects.

**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 Examination**
Students' ability to comprehend, evaluate, and compare musical periods will be measured by the average of three exams grades in each MUS 307 (fall) and MUS 308 (spring).

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
70% will average C or better, demonstrating the students' overall ability to comprehend, evaluate, and compare musical periods.

**Findings** (2013-2014) - Target: **Met**
75% (114 out of 152 students) earned a C or better, demonstrating the students' overall ability to comprehend, evaluate, and compare musical periods.

**M 6: Music History Class Discussion**

Students will demonstrate their comprehension of specific historical concepts based on in-class participation/discussion in both MUS 307 (fall) and MUS 308 (spring).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
70% of the students will earn a participation/discussion grade of a C or better.

**Findings** (2013-2014) - Target: **Met**
85% (129 out of 152 students) earned a C or better.

**M 7: Music History Term Paper**

Students will demonstrate their ability to research appropriately and discuss a specific historical concept in prose by being assessed on their overall written term paper. Sample will be taken from our 400-level music history courses, which are taught in the fall and the spring.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
70% will earn a C or better, demonstrating their ability to research appropriately and discuss a specific historical concept in prose.

**Findings** (2013-2014) - Target: **Met**
70% (17 out of 24) earned a C or better, demonstrating their ability to research appropriately and discuss a specific historical concept in prose.

**SLO 3: Applied Performance**

Students will have refined fundamental technical ability and increased musical maturity on their major instrument.

**Related Measures:**

**M 8: Sophomore Proficiency Exam**
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, averaged over both the fall and spring semesters, will pass the Sophomore Proficiency Exam.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
80% (63 out of 79) of the students taking the proficiency, averaged over both the fall and spring semesters, passed the Sophomore Proficiency Exam.

**M 9: Juries**

Students will demonstrate a solid comprehension and application of their semester's work on their applied instrument in a final exam called a Jury. The sample will be an average of both the fall and spring semesters.

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

**Target:**
80% of the students taking the Jury will score B or better.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
80% (480 out of 600) of the students scored a B or better.

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

**Separate by Major**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
We need to separate the jury results by major.

**SLO 4: Conducting**

Students will improve knowledge of and proficiency in conducting patterns, standardizing ensemble intonation, preparing an effective rehearsal plan, and identifying musical terms in foreign languages.

**Related Measures:**

**M 10: Conducting: Technique and Rehearsal**

Students will demonstrate a satisfactory ability to conduct all main conducting patterns and show a solid rehearsal plan via an in-class conducting presentation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of the students will demonstrate a satisfactory ability to conduct all main conducting patterns and show a solid rehearsal plan via an in-class conducting presentation.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
85% (92 out of 108) demonstrated a satisfactory ability to conduct all main conducting patterns and show a solid rehearsal plan via an in-class conducting presentation.
M 11: Conducting: Intonation and Foreign Language Skills

Students will discuss how to correct main causes of intonation deficiencies in a rehearsal, define musical terms and instruments in English as well as commonly used foreign languages, and define terms and instruments on a written exam. The sample will be an average of the fall and spring semesters.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

**Target:**
80% will achieve a B or better on the written exam.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
85% (92 out of 108) scored a B or better on the written exam.

SLO 5: Music Education

Students will be trained in instrument-specific music pedagogy (age- and development-appropriate methodology, classroom management, curriculum development, assessment and evaluation) that licenses them to teach in a public school setting.

**Related Measures:**

M 12: Music Education: Oral Demonstration

Students will demonstrate knowledge of pedagogy through teaching demonstrations, and their ratings will be averaged over both the fall and spring semesters.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students in our Methods and Student Teaching courses will receive satisfactory ratings on their ability to teach a lesson.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
80% (153 out of 192) of the students received satisfactory ratings on their ability to teach a lesson.

M 13: Music Education: Written Demonstration

Students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals through written lesson plans, which will include 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:**
80% of the students will demonstrate the ability to plan and execute rehearsals through written lesson plans.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
80% (153 out of 192) of the students demonstrated the ability to plan and execute rehearsals.

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

O/O 6: Program Objective: Student Achievement
Strong retention and graduation rates will reflect student achievement.

**Related Measures:**

**M 14: Retention**
The degree will maintain an adequate retention of last year's students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
The degree will retain at least 60% of last year's students.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Degree retained at a rate of 67.5% (139 students) in the fall semester.

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

**Increased Retention**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
It would be fantastic to retain at a higher level next year, for example 65% or 70%.

**M 15: Graduation**
Students will graduate from this degree at a rate that is adequate to overall retention in the fall semester.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
Students will graduate from this degree at a rate of 10% of retained students in the fall semester.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
10% (20 students) graduated in the fall semester.

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

**Increased Retention**
It would be fantastic to retain at a higher level next year, for example 65% or 70%.

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
*Measure: Retention | Outcome/Objective: Program Objective: Student Achievement*

**Implementation Description:** Check IR website in spring 2015
**Responsible Person/Group:** Music Education faculty
**Additional Resources Requested:** IR

**Separate by Major**
We need to separate the jury results by major.

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
*Implementation Status: Planned*
*Priority: High*
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Juries | Outcome/Objective: Applied Performance

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

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

This assessment shows a strong number of learning outcomes, and it includes a new program outcome. We assess on almost every aspect of the degree, in order to fairly determine the breadth of our students' achievement.

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

We need to spend more time and energy on making sure our measures and targets better follow the Academic Assessment Report Evaluation Rubric.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

We assessed this degree on a variety of outcomes, and we think that is good and needed. We are happy that we continue to align our outcomes with the National Association of the Schools of Music, our main accrediting organization. We took this year’s opportunity to try to improve upon last year’s poor "Review of Reviews" score, for example, by improving the accuracy of our findings and eliminating outcomes that were more or less measured by attendance alone.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

We are hoping to retool our Assessment and Accreditation Committee, elect a new committee chair, and address our assessment earlier and more often than in recent years, and we hope that this will result in better assessment review scores. Another goal is to set up better assessment rubrics for most of our outcomes.

We also should take advantage of more time to improve upon the new "Program Outcome: Student Achievement." This year, we assessed based solely on retention and graduation. Next year, we could benefit from measuring student job success rate, in-program achievements (competitions, research awards, etc), and similar ways to show how are students are doing overall.

Closing the Loop

Unfortunately, last year's BME degree assessment included no action plans.
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:**

90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**

90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
90% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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:**
95% of students will earn a course grade of B or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: 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: Program Objective: Student Achievement**

Strong retention and graduation rates will reflect student achievement.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Retention**

The degree will maintain an adequate retention of last year's students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
The degree will retain at least 25% of last year's students.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Degree retained at a rate of 26.5% (9 students) in the fall semester.

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

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

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

We should retain at a much higher rate.

M 5: Graduation

Students will graduate from this degree at a rate that is adequate to overall retention in the fall semester.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Students will graduate from this degree at a rate of 20% of retained students in the fall semester.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met

58.8% (20 students) graduated in the fall semester.

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

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

Increased Retention

We should retain at a much higher rate.

  Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
  Implementation Status: Planned
  Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Retention | Outcome/Objective: Program Objective: Student Achievement

Implementation Description: Retain at 50% by next year
Responsible Person/Group: MME Faculty
Additional Resources Requested: Graduate Music Faculty and Graduate School

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

This assessment shows a strong number of learning outcomes, and it includes a new program outcome. We assesses on almost every aspect of the degree, in order to fairly determine the breadth of our students' achievement.

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

We need to spend more time and energy on making sure our measures and targets better follow the Academic Assessment Report Evaluation Rubric.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

We assessed this degree on a variety of outcomes, and we think that is good and needed. We are happy that we continue to align our outcomes with the National Association of the Schools of Music, our main accrediting organization. We took this year's opportunity to try to improve upon last year's poor "Review of Reviews" score, for example, by improving the accuracy of our findings and eliminating outcomes that were more or less measured by attendance alone.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

We are hoping to retool our Assessment and Accreditation Committee, elect a new committee chair, and address our assessment earlier and more often than in recent years, and we hope that this will result in better assessment review scores. Another goal is to set up better assessment rubrics for most of our outcomes.

We also should take advantage of more time to improve upon the new "Program Outcome: Student Achievement." This year, we assessed based solely on retention and graduation. Next year, we could benefit from measuring student job success rate, in-program achievements (competitions, research awards, etc.), and similar ways to show how are students are doing overall.

Closing the Loop

We did manage to improve findings.
Mission / Purpose

The purpose of this terminal degree in music education is to provide students with knowledge and skills to become leaders in the field of music education and to advance the culture of music teaching and learning forward. Graduates of this degree will exhibit high levels of pedagogical skill, musical abilities, and knowledge, research skills including data analysis, and an intrinsic and insatiable curiosity as it relates to music teaching and learning.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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 (2013-2014) - Target: 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: Program Objective: Student Achievement**

Student achievement will be measured by retention and graduation rates.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: Retention**

The degree will maintain an adequate retention of last year's students.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
The degree will retain at least 50% of last year’s students.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Degree retained at a rate of 50% (4 students) in the fall semester.

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

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

**Increased Retention**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

We should retain at a higher rate.

**M 7: Graduation**

Students will graduate from this degree at a rate that is adequate to overall retention in the fall semester.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
Students will graduate from this degree at a rate of 10% of retained students in the fall semester.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

12.5% (1 students) graduated in the fall semester.

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
**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

**Increased Retention**

We should retain at a higher rate.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Retention | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Objective: Student Achievement

**Implementation Description:** Retain 60% next year

**Responsible Person/Group:** Graduate Faculty

**Additional Resources Requested:** Graduate School

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

This assessment shows a strong number of learning outcomes, and it includes a new program outcome. We assesses on almost every aspect of the degree, in order to fairly determine the breadth of our students' achievement.

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

We need to spend more time and energy on making sure our measures and targets better follow the Academic Assessment Report Evaluation Rubric. This degree needs a complete over-haul.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

We assessed this degree on a variety of outcomes, and we think that is good and needed. We are happy that we continue to align our outcomes with the National Association of the Schools of Music, our main accrediting organization. We took this year's opportunity to try to improve upon last year's poor "Review of Reviews" score, for example, by improving the accuracy of our findings and eliminating outcomes that were more or less measured by attendance alone.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

We are hoping to retool our Assessment and Accreditation Committee, elect a new committee chair, and address our assessment earlier and more often than in recent years, and we hope that this will result in better
assessment review scores. Another goal is to set up better assessment rubrics for most of our outcomes.

We also should take advantage of more time to improve upon the new "Program Outcome: Student Achievement." This year, we assessed based solely on retention and graduation. Next year, we could benefit from measuring student job success rate, in-program achievements (competitions, research awards, etc), and similar ways to show how are students are doing overall.

**Closing the Loop**

We did manage to improve findings.
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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
8 of 17 of graduating students’ (47%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
21 of 21 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
10 of 10 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
11 of 11 students (100%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
77 of 101 students (76%) authored at least one conference paper or presentation.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
17 of 17 students (100%) successfully completed the dissertation within seven 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
14 of 101 students (13.8%) 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.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
49 of 101 students (48.5%) either authored or co-authored a peer reviewed 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
60 of 61 students (98%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
6 of 6 students (100%) were matched with an APA accredited doctoral internship.

M 5: Assessment Proficiency
Students who have obtained a grade of B or higher in didactic assessment and intervention courses relevant to their emphasis areas will be rated on their ability to successfully administer intelligence and achievement tests for children and adults and to demonstrate basic clinical and interviewing skills appropriate for their level of graduate training. Students will be rated 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.

Target:
100% of students who have obtained a grade of B or higher in didactic 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
14 of 15 students (93%) obtained a grade of B or higher in didactic assessment and intervention courses and were rated as proficient by their supervising faculty.

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

Data monitoring
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
These targets were not achieved, however this may be due to 1-2 students failing to meet program expectations rather than eviden...

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
30 of 31 students (96.7%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
14 of 14 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 of 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
6 of 6 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
82 of 84 students (97%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
12 of 12 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
78 of 78 students (100%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
24 of 25 students (96%) identified a research mentor prior to the end of their second semester of graduate training.

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

**Research mentoring**
*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014
Incoming graduate students should be matched with a mentor early in their training program. During the 2013-14 year, one student...

**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 dissensions 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 dissensions and conflicts among theorists, and discuss the implications of the era for current trends in psychology.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
18 of the 18 (100%) 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 pre-internship/pre-candidacy students will hold membership in a scientific society.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
11 of 11 students (100%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
11 of 11 students (100%) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
13 of 15 students (86.6%) successfully passed their Doctoral Comprehensive Exams.

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

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

**Data monitoring**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
These targets were not achieved, however this may be due to 1-2 students failing to meet program expectations rather than eviden...

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

**O/O 7: Licensure Rate**
Student Achievement Objective focused on licensure rates.

Related Measures:

**M 23: Licensure Rates**
This measure will provide documentation of the licensure rates of graduates when applicable.

Source of Evidence: Administrative measure - other

**Target:**
85% of all eligible program graduates in the applied emphasis areas will achieve licensure.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
72 of 94 (76.6%) recently graduated PhD students who were eligible for licensure, earned their license.

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

**Licensure Rates**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
Licensure rates fell below the expected levels (77%; target = 85%). The reason for this is not clear. It could be for some stude...

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: Planned*
*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.

**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

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: Finished  
Priority: High

Projected Completion Date: 09/26/2013  
Responsible Person/Group: Graduate committee  
Additional Resources Requested: none

Data monitoring
These targets were not achieved, however this may be due to 1-2 students failing to meet program expectations rather than evidence of a department-wide shortcoming. These data will be monitored in the coming year to ensure a pattern of success with this objective. Targets may need to be adjusted.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014  
Implementation Status: Planned  
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Assessment Proficiency | Outcome/Objective: Proficiency in Assessment and Intervention  
Measure: Doctoral Comprehensive Exams | Outcome/Objective: Sufficient Knowledge in Core Areas

Implementation Description: Nicholson to monitor program data.

Projected Completion Date: 05/29/2015  
Responsible Person/Group: Nicholson & Training Directors.
Licensure Rates
Licensure rates fell below the expected levels (77%; target = 85%). The reason for this is not clear. It could be for some students that licensure was not necessary (e.g., those in academic positions), whereas others may have pursued different forms of credentialing (e.g., school psychologists). Licensure information will be regularly distributed to all program graduates and reasons for non-licensure will be tracked in the coming year to determine what types of action may be helpful to increase licensure rates closer to the target levels.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Licensure Rates | Outcome/Objective: Licensure Rate

Implementation Description: TD's in accredited programs to solicit licensure information from recent graduates and develop list of reasons for non-licensure.

Responsible Person/Group: Nicholson & TD's

Research mentoring
Incoming graduate students should be matched with a mentor early in their training program. During the 2013-14 year, one student failed to meet this target. As this is unlikely indicative of a department-wide concern, this measure will be monitored in the upcoming reporting year to ensure no consistent problems are noted in this area.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Low

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Mentor Identification | Outcome/Objective: Socialization in the Profession

Implementation Description: Nicholson to monitor data in the upcoming reporting year.

Projected Completion Date: 05/29/2015
Responsible Person/Group: Nicholson & Training Directors

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The Department continues to demonstrate positive outcomes associated with doctoral level training. Annual evaluations, practicum and internship evaluations consistently offer positive evaluations of our students’ performance. We are particularly pleased to see that almost 50% of students were engaged in the publication process this year and that 100% of students completed their dissertation within the 7 year timeline. This is a strong testament to our research mentoring and training. Additionally, students demonstrated positive outcomes associated with coursework and other didactic training components.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Findings show that the doctoral program continues to fail to meet targets for licensure rates and external funding. The department is committed to continuing to address these issues and will re-evaluate action plans moving forward to ensure greater attention to these objectives in the next reporting cycle. Additionally, there were some surprising findings related to assessment and research competencies however these are likely associated with 1-2 struggling students and may not be indicative of department-wide short-comings. As such, the department will continue to closely monitor these data in the next reporting cycle and adjust targets or objectives as needed.
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 doctoral 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 suggest 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. We are pleased that almost 50% of our students are engaging in the publication process and believe that this speaks to the research mentoring in the program. There were some minor setbacks which were reported this year (e.g., comprehensive exam, assessment competencies) that were unexpected. These data will continue to be monitored to determine whether this is related to a department wide trend or the result of a few students’ challenges. Recurrent problems with obtaining research funding were also reported despite increased efforts to address this objective. The Department will work to collaborate with emphasis areas to more systematically distribute information related to student funding and to track student’s participation in these opportunities more consistently. Overall, the Department has been pleased with the 13-14 outcomes. While we increased admissions in this cycle, the 2014 cycle will reflect a slight reduction in admissions due to the lack of increased GA support available from the Graduate School. This year a new program objective was added which assesses licensure rates of our graduated doctoral students in the accredited programs. The reasons for not meeting this target are not clear, however additional assessment of recent graduates will determine the reasons for non-licensure and allow the program to pursue targeted action plans to assist graduates in meeting the targets (or adjust the targets to account for reasons for non-licensure). The next year should reflect continued success with program objectives and outcomes.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

The PhD program is engaged in ongoing assessment. Several initiatives are underway. First, the department intends to collect more data on the assessment competencies, doctoral comprehensive exams and licensure rates to determine the extent of this years’ findings and to target action plan initiatives toward those that reflect a pattern of poor performance. Next, the program will continue to work toward increases in graduate student pursuit of external funding by collaborating with the emphasis area directors to systematically disseminate information to graduate student and track their participation in these opportunities. Program objectives, measures and findings will be re-evaluated in this coming year to determine whether adjustments should be made. It is noteworthy that the Department reported some success with internship placements rates which may be the result of previous efforts at continuous improvement.

Closing the Loop

The Department has enjoyed a good deal of success and has met several of the objectives. Some successes are the result of previous attempts at continuous improvement (e.g., internship placement rates; graduate student publication rates). Additionally, the department continues to strive toward increased research funding for graduate students and improvements with licensure rates. We continue to strive for balance in terms of quality training and the push toward increased growth and have determined that without additional resources, our doctoral admissions will likely remain stable. We expect that minor decreases in assessment proficiencies and with doctoral comprehensive examination performance are likely to correct themselves in the coming year, however data collection in these areas will remain ongoing and adjustments made if needed.
Mission / Purpose

The University of Southern Mississippi's School Counseling and Guidance Services 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: Content Knowledge
Cohort will demonstrate competence in the core course work in the School Counseling and Guidance Services program. This course work includes micro skills, organization/administration of guidance, counseling theory and practice, testing and individual analysis, group counseling/guidance, career development and information services, and consultation.

Related Measures:

M 1: Comprehensive Exam
The comprehensive exam is a 175 objective question exam that measures student's knowledge on the courses for School Counseling in the areas of Foundations, Testing and Analysis, Counseling Theories, Micro Skills, Consultation, Career Services, and Group Processes.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
Cohort will pass the comprehensive exams on the core content areas (Foundations, Counseling Theories, Testing and Analysis, Micro Skills, Consultation, Career Orientation, and Group Processes) courses with a 70% pass score.
Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
This data is only reported in the summer semester as School Counseling candidates take comprehensive exams each summer. The exam covers seven content areas related to school counseling content knowledge.

Summer 2014 Gulf Coast - 100% of students (N=6) passed the comprehensive exam with a minimum pass score of 70%.
Hattiesburg - 100% of students (N=10) passed the comprehensive exam with a minimum pass score of 70%.

M 2: Internship Evaluation
Cohort members will demonstrate content mastery in the internship experience by successfully completing a minimum of 38 of the 41 competencies required.

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

Target: 80% of students will successfully complete a minimum of 38 of the 41 competencies required during the internship experience.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg 100% (N=9) of students successfully completed a minimum of 38 of the 41 Mississippi Department of Education related competencies required during the internship experience of fall 2013-14.

Gulf Coast - No Gulf Coast students were enrolled in the internship experience during the fall/spring semesters of 2013-14.

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

Related Measures:

M 5: Mentor’s Evaluation of Counseling Skills
Mentor’s complete a rubric to measure counseling students' mastery of a variety of counseling skills in the practicum experience. Each student must master 10 of 12 skills in the areas of silence, reassurance, restatements, open-ended questions, reflection of feeling, clarification, summarization, immediacy, confrontation, challenge, interpretation, and self-disclosure.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

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

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The counseling skills are assess during the students' practicum experience in fall semester. These skills are initially assessed in the final taping of the skills class offered in the summer semester.

Fall 2013 Hattiesburg - 100% of students (N=12) mastered the counseling skills at 80% or greater.

Spring 2014 Gulf - 100% of students (N=7) mastered the counseling skills at 80% or greater.

M 6: Mock Session Counseling Skills Evaluation
The instructor of record evaluates the students to measure students' mastery of skills learned during the Skills class. Students use appropriate skills during the final taping of a counseling session. Each student
must master 80% of appropriate skills in the areas of silence, reassurance, restatements, open-ended questions, reflection of feeling, clarification, summarization, immediacy, confrontation, challenge, interpretation, and self-disclosure.

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

**Target:**
80% of school counseling students will master 80% of appropriate skills during mock counseling session.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

These skills are evaluated during the Microskills class (SCS 617).

Summer 2013 Hattiesburg - 92% of students (11/12) mastered 80% of appropriate skills during the mock counseling session. One student mastered 75% of the skills.

Fall 2013 Gulf Coast - 100% of students (N=8) mastered 80% of appropriate skills during the mock counseling session.

**SLO 4: Research Competence**

Cohort members demonstrate competence in understanding and conducting educational research.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: CITI Training**
Students will demonstrate understanding and knowledge of research related competencies in legal, ethical, and professional conduct in research by successfully completing the prescribed level of mastery prior to enrolling in the research course.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Target:**
80% of students will demonstrate mastery in legal, ethical, and professional conduct by successfully completing the CITI training module at 85% accuracy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Hattiesburg 100% (N=10) students demonstrated mastery in legal, ethical, and professional conduct by successfully completing the CITI training modules at 85% accuracy.

Gulf Coast 100% (N=6) students demonstrated mastery in legal, ethical, and professional conduct by successfully completing the CITI training modules at 85% accuracy.

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

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

**CITI Training**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

School Counseling and Guidance Services students all completed CITI Training prior to enrollment in the research course. Our g...

**M 8: Research Project**

Cohort members will demonstrate competency in gathering, interpreting, and presenting research
through completion of organized research project.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
80% of students will successfully gather, interpret, and present research data as outlined in rubric criteria through class presentation at a level of mastery (3) or better (4).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg 100% (N=9) of the students scored mastery or better on the research project/presentation.
No Gulf Coast students were enrolled in the research course 2013-14.

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

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Mentor’s Evaluation of Professional Dispositions**
Mentors evaluate students’ dispositions during their practicum experience. They are assessed on their professional dispositions in dealing with students, teachers, staff, and parents as measured by the competency rating.

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

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

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg Summer 2013 - 100% of school counseling students (N=12) were evaluated at a level of "mastery" or higher on the dispositions as measured in the Competency Rating.

Gulf Coast Spring 2014 - 100% of school counseling students (N=7) were evaluated at a level of "mastery" or higher on the dispositions as measured in the Competency Rating.

**M 10: Self-Assessment of Professional Dispositions**
School counseling candidates will self-evaluate their professional dispositions in a TK20 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Hattiesburg Summer 2013 - 92% of school counseling students (11/12) indicated a level of "mastery" or higher on the dispositions survey as measured in the Self-Assessment Rating. One student indicated all questions at the one level. It is believed that the student reversed the scale. However, the overall ratings for the groups were still 3.5 or higher.

Gulf Coast Spring 2014 - 100% of school counseling students (N=7) indicated a level of "mastery" or higher on the dispositions survey as measured in the Self-Assessment Rating.

**Other Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**
O/O 2: Licensure
Cohort members will demonstrate competence in preparation for licensure requirements as outlined by the state department of education. This includes successful scoring on the Praxis exam and completing the program requirements outlined by the School Counseling and Guidance Services program.

Related Measures:

M 3: Praxis Exam
School counseling candidates whose states require the Praxis will complete the Praxis exam with the required minimal score. Mississippi requires 156 for a pass.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The Praxis scores are reported for all current and prior students who took the exam during the reporting cycle 2013-2014. 100% (N=14) earned a passing score as required by the state of Mississippi during the reporting cycle.

M 4: American School Counseling Association Standards
Cohort members will master the American School Counseling Association's (ASCA) standards by scoring mastery or better on the Internship final evaluation. This requirement is mandatory prior to fulfilling graduation requirements and applying for licensure.

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

Target:
80% of students will score mastery or better on the American School Counseling Association’s standards as measured in the internship experience.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
HB100% (N=9) of students scored mastery or better on the American School Counseling Association’s standards as measured in the internship experience.
Fall/Spring 2013-14
GC No students were enrolled in the internship experience during the fall/spring semesters of 2013-14.

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: Planned
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:** Planned  
**Priority:** High  
**Implementation Description:** Send out the survey instrument in the spring semester when students.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 04/30/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Ursula Whitehead

**CITI Training**

School Counseling and Guidance Services students all completed CITI Training prior to enrollment in the research course. Our goal is to have all students complete the training within the first semester of admissions. 80% of students will complete the CITI training within the first semester of coursework.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** Medium  
**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** CITI Training  
**Outcome/Objective:** Research Competence  
**Projected Completion Date:** 09/30/2015  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Program Coordinator

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The program had more students taking the Praxis exam this year. It is not a requirement that the students take the exam prior to graduation. In years past many students took it early in the program or later after they were perhaps offered a position. The discussion has been to take the exam after comprehensive exam time or during the internship experience. We also encourage reporting all attempts to USM. The research competence objective is a positive work. The students indicate that they dedicate a lot of time to the research project. It is good to see that the hard work results in mastery of the project.

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

A continued focus will need to be on ensuring that students understand the reporting instructions for TK20. The system in the past has been less than user friendly. Students have needed much assistance during the reporting process. We are having a former graduate who showed advanced understanding in the technology of TK20 come online during one the Collaborate sessions to offer a student's perspective for effectively inputting all required documentation. Also TK20 implemented some changes that is proposed to make the process more student-friendly. We will monitor the process over the next year and report findings in the next report.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The program has been successful this year. Program coursework was offered this past fall, spring and summer semesters. Our Gulf Coast offerings started in the fall with eight students. Six to nine hours are offered each semester and is on a different rotation than the Hattiesburg group. The Gulf Coast group has done well with adjusting and meeting the demands.
We were successful at raising $1575.00 for the Gwen Hitt scholarship (it was initiated last year). We will give the first scholarship out this upcoming year for $500.00. The recipient will exemplify the qualities and characteristics of a professional school counselor who is (preferably) a member of the Mississippi Counseling Association or other professional counseling organizations. The criteria have been set and a committee will proudly choose the first candidate.

Once again current and former school counseling students accepted an invitation from Educational Field Experiences (EFE) to facilitate their focus group during professional development for the teaching candidates. The school counseling students provided feedback to EFE to improve and continue to meet the needs of their teacher candidates. The collaboration between programs is an important theme in the mission of the college.

The program coordinator and one of the students from the program presented at the MCA conference in November and also the program coordinator co-presented with a fellow colleague at the conference. One of the unspoken goals for the program has been to improve research competence and opportunities for presentations and publications. The research and collaboration efforts required produced quality work recognized by peer-reviewed colleagues in the profession. Conscious efforts were made to move forward with the department's and college's mission statements.

One of the most valuable changes in the program was the hiring of a full time tenure-track professor in the program. We are looking forward to the expertise and insight she brings with her.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

There were some necessary changes made in the measures for the program. Research Competence has been a continuous effort embraced by the program to ensure the appropriate growth. The new measure is a basic analysis tool to assist us in moving forward with our unspoken goal of students' refereed presentations and publications. Also the research class is taken outside the department so this Student Learning Outcome keeps us abreast to relevant areas of improvement based on school counseling needs as well as the department who teaches the course.

Continuous work goes into keeping our adjuncts well-trained and knowledgeable about the university and department expectations. With a small faculty base the school counseling program we depend heavily on adjunct faculty. We have been fortunate to have many of our faculty remain with us for over the years. The new cohort model required additional adjuncts which has kept this conversation going. This will continue to be an area for discussion.

**Closing the Loop**

We have successfully started the course offerings on the Gulf Coast campus. That was a positive move for the program and university. Goals have been set to increase the enrollment on that campus. The first graduating group will be in May of 2015.

The professional dispositions survey has been a great tool. Reviewing the mentors' overall perceptions and the students' self-reporting has been great. The questions allow students to really self-reflect on their strengths and challenges in dealing with others.

The program's collaborative efforts with EFE have been appreciated and useful. The information is provided to the Professional Education Council in the college. The students are able to really tap into valuable feedback for field experiences to consider and use to improve the experiences of their students.

The School Counseling program continues to take under consideration the Advisory Board's suggestions. The internship experience has now increased in the number of required hours. This allows for the students' experiences to be greater and to cover more areas in depth. We will also use representatives of the Advisory Board to assist in the selection of the 1st Gwen Hitt Scholarship recipient.

There are so many positive notes to add concerning the adjuncts. Although using adjuncts is not the primary
method of delivery we would choose for our students. The current adjuncts have done good work and consistently worked closely with the program to ensure adequate and up-to-date instruction.
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: 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 a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the content knowledge sample in their disciplines.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the content knowledge sample in their disciplines during summer semester 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.

M 4: Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio
Students demonstrate mastery of program learning outcomes by taking written and oral comprehensive exams or completing a portfolio and an oral defense at the end of their program. A full description of the measures, including evaluation criteria and methods is included in the linked document in WEAVE titled SME Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio Measure Description.

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

Connected Document
- SME Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio Measure Description

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.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students received a minimum rubric score of 4 on a 5-point rubric on the discipline section of written and oral comps on their first attempt during the summer 2013 through spring 2014 semesters: 1 in summer 2013; 1 in fall 2013; and 2 in spring 2014 on the Hattiesburg campus.
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 2: 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 learning process from the constructivist perspective.

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

**Target:**
80% of students will receive a minimum score of 4 on a 5 point rubric on the integration and application of content that incorporates both instruction and assessment as advanced by the constructivist learning theory.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the SME 601 writing assignment during summer semester 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.

**M 4: Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio**
Students demonstrate mastery of program learning outcomes by taking written and oral comprehensive exams or completing a portfolio and an oral defense at the end of their program. A full description of the measures, including evaluation criteria and methods is included in the linked document in WEAVE titled SME Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio Measure Description.

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

**Connected Document**
- SME Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio Measure Description

**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.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or higher on the integration section of written and oral comps on their first attempt.

SLO 3: Analyze educational research

Students will analyze results of educational research conducted in the science and math disciplines.

**Related Measures:**

**M 2: 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 learning process from the constructivist perspective.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the teaching philosophy writing assignment.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or higher on the teaching philosophy writing assignment that had to incorporate educational research during summer semester 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.

M 4: Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio
Students demonstrate mastery of program learning outcomes by taking written and oral comprehensive exams or completing a portfolio and an oral defense at the end of their program. A full description of the measures, including evaluation criteria and methods is included in the linked document in WEAVE titled SME Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio Measure Description.

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

Connected Document
• SME Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio Measure Description

Target:
80% of students to receive a rubric score of 4 or higher on first attempt of research section of written comps.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or higher on the research section of written and oral comps on their first attempt.

SLO 4: Demonstrate master’s level communication skills
Students will demonstrate master’s level writing and speaking skills.

Related Measures:

M 2: 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 learning process from the constructivist perspective.

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.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the SME 601 writing assignment during summer semester 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.

M 3: SME 601 Oral Presentation
The oral presentation on current teaching philosophy in SME 601.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:
80% will receive a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the presentation components of the assignment including visual aids, verbal skills, nonverbal skills, etc. that are used to support ideas.
Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students received a rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the SME 601 writing assignment during summer semester 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.

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

O/O 5: Graduation rate
Graduation Rate

Related Measures:

M 5: Graduation Rate
Graduation rate of students accepted into the program during the 2009/2010 AY to the time of graduation by spring semester 2014.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
60% of students will graduate within 4 years. (# of students accepted into the program in fall, spring summer of AY 2009-10 divided into the number of those students graduating in the past 4 AYs.)

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
82% (9 out of 11) students who were admitted during 2009/2010 AY had graduated by spring 2014. The other two students were dismissed from the program; one due to non-enrollment and the other moved to another program.

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

TK20
Beginning fall semester 2012, our new graduate students will be required to enroll in TK20 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: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: New graduate students will enroll in the USM TK20 program.
Projected Completion Date: 05/30/2012
Responsible Person/Group: Sherry Herron

Service-learning
Each year, USM hosts each of these competitions for K-12 students: the Science and Engineering Fair (SEF), Science Olympiad (SO), and the Hurricane Bowl. The M.S. in Science Education requires students to take one (1) hour of Seminar (SME 789). A service-learning component consisting of helping prepare for or implement one or more of the outreach competitions will be incorporated into Seminar each semester. This will ensure that all graduate students will be impacted, and will effectively institutionalize their participation in these events. Our graduate students are pre-service or in-service secondary science teachers or informal science educators. They are often unaware of the learning and scholarship opportunities available to their own students by participating in these competitions. Alternatively, they may not know how to implement these efforts into their own schools and classrooms. SEF impacts >800 students from 22 surrounding counties (and from across the state every 5th year); SO impacts >600 students (teams of 17) from across Mississippi; and the Hurricane Bowl impacts 100 students (20 teams of 5 students) from Alabama, Arkansas, the Florida panhandle, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Winners from each of these competitions go on to national or international events. Students from Mississippi have won the top awards at the International SEF.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Implementation Description: A total of 25% of the time and effort of the course will be allocated to the service-learning project. Students will be prepared for the tasks to be done, supervised during the task, and will submit a 1-page single-space reflection on the experience within 1 month of the event. During the summer semester, they will assist in organizing materials and planning the fall teacher/coach workshops. During fall semester, they will assist in conducting the workshops and preparing for the competitions. Du
Responsible Person/Group: Sherry Herron and Sheila Hendry

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
The students who enroll in this program are dedicated, hard-working educators who strive to do their best. They have access to courses taught by professors in their disciplines and a program guided by stringent accreditation standards (NSTA, NCTM, NCATE). They matriculate in a timely manner and graduate, thereby commanding higher salaries. The new requirement to register for TK20 is being enforced and has proven helpful in documenting the work of our diverse student population.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Based on students' performance and graduation rates, the program provides a rigorous graduate program that can be completed by working professionals. Rubrics used for comprehensive exams and writing assignments will be reviewed.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
During the 2013-2014 academic year, five (5) students were admitted to the master's degree program in Science Education, thus increasing the total to 17. Four (4) students passed their comprehensive exams and graduated. They are all employed in public school systems: one in Tennessee, one in Texas, and two in Mississippi. Many of the M.S. students take a biology field course that is offered each year, thus expanding their educational experience beyond the classroom and laboratory settings. Between June 9 to June 29, 2013, the class explored the Pascagoula River Watershed and collected hydrologic, land cover, soil, and atmosphere data for input into the GLOBE database (http://www.globe.gov/). The watershed provides critical habitat for fish and wildlife within its boundary and is the largest unimpeded watershed by volume in the continental United States (TNC, 2013). The class kayaked or canoed stretches of the Chunky and Chickasawhay Rivers, the Leaf River and Black Creek, and the Pascagoula River while camping near or beside the rivers (Chunky River Campground, Paul B. Johnson State Park, and Shepard’s State Park). Water quality assessments included turbidity, pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen. Cloud cover and type, soil quality, flora and fauna, canopy and ground cover, and tree height and circumference measurements were taken. Pre-trip meetings were held to prepare, and post-trip class meetings were held to compile and input data, craft abstracts for submission to the Mississippi Academy of Sciences, submit journals, and present reflections of the course and the book "A Sand County Almanac" by Aldo Leopold. Many of the master's students help organize and/or judge the Science and Engineering Fairs and/or Science Olympiad competitions that are held each year, thus expanding their professional leadership experiences. The USM Region I Science and Engineering Fairs are held each spring: for approximately 200 secondary students in February in the Thad Cochran Building and for approximately 600 elementary students in April in the Reed Green Coliseum. This program provides scholarships or cash awards to deserving students. Many of the master's students help organize and/or lead events for the annual Mississippi Science Olympiad that is held at USM each spring, thus expanding their professional leadership experiences. Teams which have advanced from the regional Science Olympiads compete for scholarships and honors at the state competition.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives
Most of our students are full-time educators and part-time students. They need to take science (biology, chemistry, geology, etc.) and math courses in the summer and in the evening (or in hybrid format) during the academic year. The master’s program may or may not grow in the future due to the widespread availability of online graduate programs for teachers. USM values face-to-face experiences in the sciences; there is only one online biology course. There are some math courses, one chemistry course, and one biology course that are offered in the late afternoon, thus allowing local teachers to make it to class. We will continue to lobby to have more science and math courses to be offered in the evening (or in hybrid format) during the academic year in order to grow enrollment. We will update the rubric used for comprehensive exams and portfolios.

**Closing the Loop**

In 2011-2012, the TK20 Action was developed, stating that all students would be required to purchase TK20. This action plan is now closed. Graduate students are now being required to register for TK20 and upload documents from coursework in their disciplines, from their statistics courses, and from their SME courses. Because we have a rolling admission policy, students are at different points in their programs. Therefore, it will take some time before every student has materials uploaded in each category. However, this feature will enable us to more accurately report our students’ progress.
Science Education MS Written Comprehensive Exam or Portfolio WEAVE Measure

Program Outcome:

Master's degree students should demonstrate

- development of firm, graduate-level background knowledge in your emphasis area.
- the ability to integrate content knowledge into curricular, instructional, and assessment strategies for students at different educational levels
- the ability to formulate, implement, and sustain changes in science and mathematics education at a school level

Students demonstrate mastery of these three goals by taking written and oral comprehensive exams or completing a portfolio and an oral defense at the end of their program.

Comprehensive Exam: The student will request 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. 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.

Portfolio will include:

Introductory Material

- A two-page summary of the contents of the portfolio that highlights evidence that the goals have been met.
- A list (including course numbers and titles) of all graduate courses taken as part of the degree
- A statement of between 3 and 5 pages explaining how experiences in each course helped or did not help you to achieve the three program goals
- Artifacts with a one-page explanation of how each work serves as evidence that relates to achieving one or more of the program goals

Evidence for Content Mastery

- A copy of the results on a nationally standardized content examination in your area of specialization
- At least two papers that are at least 3 pages in length in which topics in your area of specialization are discussed with references
- A concept map from the area of specialization that contains between 20 and 50 concept labels and their appropriate relations
- At least two other pieces of work that serve as evidence of your mastery of the content in your area of specialization

Evidence of Integration of Content with Instruction

- A statement of your teaching philosophy, one page minimum, before you start the master's program. (This statement will be required for admission to the master's program and will be incorporated in Center for Science and Mathematics Education files.) The statement should address issues of content, instruction, and assessment of learning.
- After completion of at least 21 graduate hours, prepare a second statement of your teaching philosophy accompanied by an analysis, one page minimum, in which you compare your initial and current philosophies of teaching in the areas of content, instruction, and assessment of learning
- A sample unit plan with a minimum of five lessons fully developed that integrates a new content area into an existing high school science course. Specify how the content is different and how it will contribute to the
course goals. Include a sample assessment-of-learning module for the unit that would measure student learning of the material. It should contain a paper and pencil test as well as performance-based task(s). Scoring or rubrics should be included

- At least two other pieces of work you have produced that serve as evidence of your mastery of the ability to integrate content in your area of specialization into existing high school curricula

Evidence of Integration of Classroom Innovations into School-Level Changes

- Develop a set of materials to be used in a school district staff development workshop that would focus on using new instructional and assessment techniques for the teaching of science or computer science. You should specify the goals for the workshop, how it will be implemented, how it will be evaluated, and how follow-up will be provided. If possible, present the workshop in your school district.
- The completed evaluation forms from a workshop you present and a summary of the results can be used as one piece of work to satisfy requirement #3 below
- Develop a set of materials (letter to parents, PTA program, packets of material, etc.) to be used by administrators and teachers to educate parents about using new instructional and assessment techniques

At least two other pieces of work that you have produced that serve as evidence of your mastery of the ability to formulate, develop, and sustain instructional reform at a school level. If a workshop is presented, the evaluation of that workshop (as described in #1 above) can be considered as one piece of this evidence.
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 science education
Students will demonstrate doctoral-level mastery of knowledge in science education.

Related Measures:

M 1: Class curriculum project
Literature Review in SME 701 and SME 703.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
90% will receive 80% or greater on the science content component of the literature review in SME 703 summer 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.
90% will receive 80% or greater on the science content component of the literature review in SME 701 spring 2014 on the Hattiesburg campus.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (15 out of 15) earned 80% or greater on the science content component of the literature review in SME 703 summer 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.
100% (12 out of 12) earned 80% or greater on the science content component of the literature review in SME 701 spring 2014 on the Hattiesburg campus.

M 2: Qualifying Exam
Students will pass a qualifying exam after 12 hours of SME graduate coursework.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
90% will pass (4 or 5 on a 5-point rubric) the qualifying exam upon first attempt.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (4 out of 4) students passed the qualifying exam on their first attempt during the summer 2013 through spring 2014 semesters on the Hattiesburg campus.

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 3: Unit lesson plan
Students 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 rubric score of 80% or greater on a unit lesson plan that integrates content, instruction, and assessment in SME 700.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
SME 700 was not offered during summer 2013 through spring 2014.

M 4: Oral Presentation
Students will give an oral presentation on contemporary reform movements in SME 703, Foundations in Science and Mathematics Education, and earn a minimum of 4 out of 5 based on the course rubric.

Students will give an oral presentation on their meta-analysis paper in SME 701, Issues in Science and Mathematics Education, and earn a minimum of 4 out of 5 based on the course rubric.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

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.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
SME 700 was not offered during summer 2013 through spring 2014.

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

Minor in Educational Research
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Many of our students find that they have an aptitude for statistics during this program and wish to take more than the require...

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 5: 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 rubric score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the science content of a meta-analysis paper submitted in SME 703, Foundations of Science and Mathematics Education.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (15 out of 15) of students in SME 703 earned a score of 4 or 5 out of 5 on the science content of their meta-analysis paper during the summer 2013 semester at the Hattiesburg campus.

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

**Minor in Educational Research**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

Many of our students find that they have an aptitude for statistics during this program and wish to take more than the require...

**M 6: Qualitative Project**
Students in SME 761 develop a qualitative project, and submit an application to IRB. After obtaining IRB approval, students in SME 762 conduct their study and analyze results.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target:**
90% of students will achieve 4 or 5 out of 5 on the analyze and synthesis components of the qualitative project.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
93% (14 out of 15) students achieved 4 or 5 out of 5 on the analysis and synthesis components of their qualitative project in SME 762 during spring semester 2014 on the Hattiesburg campus.

**SLO 4: Oral and written communication skills**
Students will demonstrate PhD level oral and written communication skills.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Oral Presentation**
Students will give an oral presentation on contemporary reform movements in SME 703, Foundations in Science and Mathematics Education, and earn a minimum of 4 out of 5 based on the course rubric.

Students will give an oral presentation on their meta-analysis paper in SME 701, Issues in Science and Mathematics Education, and earn a minimum of 4 out of 5 based on the course rubric.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

**Target:**
90% of students will earn a minimum of 4 out of 5 on the course rubric related to oral communication skills in SME 703 and SME 701

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% (15 out of 15) students earned a minimum of 4 out of 5 on the course rubric related to oral communication on their contemporary reform movement presentation in SME 703, Foundations in Science and Mathematics Education, during summer 2013 on the Hattiesburg campus.
100% (12 out of 12) students earned a minimum of 4 out of 5 on the course rubric related to oral...

M 6: Qualitative Project
Students in SME 761 develop a qualitative project, and submit an application to IRB. After obtaining IRB approval, students in SME 762 conduct their study and analyze results.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:
90% of students will achieve 4 or 5 out of 5 on the written and oral components of the qualitative project.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
93% (14 out of 15) students achieved 4 or 5 out of 5 on the written and oral components of their qualitative project in SME 762 during spring semester 2014 on the Hattiesburg campus.

SLO 5: Graduation rate
Graduation rate

Related Measures:

M 7: Graduation rate
Students who pass their qualifying exams will graduate in 6 years.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
60% of students who pass their qualifying exams will graduate in 6 years.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% (3 out of 3) students who took the qualifying exam in the AY ’07-’08 graduated within 6 years (by spring 2014).

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

Minor in Educational Research

Many of our students find that they have an aptitude for statistics during this program and wish to take more than the required Educational Research (REF) courses. Indeed, one of our students recently switched to Educational Research. The minor will increase the likelihood of diversifying their careers. Upon consultation with Dr. Kyna Shelley, Professor and Program Coordinator of Educational Research, the Plan of Study for the Ph.D. in Science Education will be modified to include the option for a minor in Educational Research.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Meta-analysis paper | Outcome/Objective: Analyze and synthesize educational research
Measure: Oral Presentation | Outcome/Objective: Integrate content, instruction, and assessment

Implementation Description: The program currently requires students to take REF 761 and 762 to satisfy their research tools. Three (3) additional hours (REF 830) will be added to the research tools category. The other three recommended REF courses for the minor (770, 824, and 720 or 792 for a total of 9 hours) will be included under the 24-hour core content area. Thus, adding the minor will only increase the total number of
hours by 3, bringing the total number of hours required (including dissertation) to 66.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Sherry Herron

**Tk20**

Beginning fall semester 2012, our new graduate students will be required to enroll in TK20 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:** 2013-2014
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** New graduate students will enroll in TK20.
- **Projected Completion Date:** 05/31/2012
- **Responsible Person/Group:** Sherry Herron

**Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers**

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

The students who enroll in this program are dedicated, hard-working educators who strive to do their best. They have access to courses taught by professors in their disciplines and a program guided by stringent accreditation standards (NSTA, NCTM, NCATE). They interact with science educators in other disciplines in the required SME courses and learn much by sharing work experiences, content knowledge, and discipline perspectives with each other. Most matriculate in a timely manner and graduate, thereby commanding higher salaries or new positions. Those who struggle with proposing a dissertation study are advised on an individual basis and provided additional mentoring. The new requirement to register for TK20 is beginning to be enforced and is proving to be helpful in documenting the work of our diverse student population.

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

Based on students' performance and graduation rates, the program provides a rigorous graduate program that can be completed by working professionals. Rubrics used for comprehensive exams and writing assignments will be reviewed. Lobbying for discipline courses to be offered during the evening and summer and in a hybrid format will continue. Mentoring will continue for those who struggle during the dissertation process. Expectations for publication will continue to be made explicit.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

During the 2013-2014 reporting period, the following achievements were met. Ten (10) students were admitted to the program, making a total of fifty (50) doctoral students in Science Education. Four (4) students took their qualifying exams and all passed. Nine (9) students completed their 54 hours of course work and passed their comprehensive exams. Five (5) students successfully defended their prospectus. Three (3) students successfully defended their dissertations. Therefore, the program is growing and students are matriculating in a timely fashion. Thankfully, more math courses are being offered in the summer, on the coast, and in the evening (or in hybrid format) during the academic year. In addition, a new math educator has been hired in the Department of Mathematics. She is now teaching SME courses and serving on committees. Our students need more science courses to be offered in the summer and in the evening (or in hybrid format) during the academic year. Doctoral students are encouraged to present at professional conferences and to submit abstracts and manuscripts. Our students attend and/or present at state, regional, national, and international conferences every year. Many of the doctoral students take a biology field course that is offered each year, thus expanding their educational experience beyond the classroom and laboratory settings.

Between June 9 to June 29, 2013, the class explored the Pascagoula River Watershed and collected hydrologic, land cover, soil, and atmosphere data for input into the GLOBE database (http://www.globe.gov/). The watershed provides critical habitat for fish and wildlife within its boundary and is the largest unimpeded watershed by volume in the continental United States (TNC, 2013). The class kayaked or canoed stretches of
the Chunky and Chickasawhay Rivers, the Leaf River and Black Creek, and the Pascagoula River while camping near or beside the rivers (Chunky River Campground, Paul B. Johnson State Park, and Shepard’s State Park). Water quality assessments included turbidity, pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen. Cloud cover and type, soil quality, flora and fauna, canopy and ground cover, and tree height and circumference measurements were taken. Pre-trip meetings were held to prepare, and post-trip class meetings were held to compile and input data, craft abstracts for submission to the Mississippi Academy of Sciences, submit journals, and present reflections of the course and the book "A Sand County Almanac" by Aldo Leopold. Many of the doctoral students help organize and/or judge the Science and Engineering Fairs and/or Science Olympiad competitions that are held each year, thus expanding their professional leadership experiences. The USM Region I Science and Engineering Fairs are held each spring: for approximately 200 secondary students in February in the Thad Cochran Building and for approximately 600 elementary students in April in the Reed Green Coliseum. This program provides scholarships or cash awards to deserving students. Two finalists from the Region I SEF compete at the International Science and Engineering Fair each year. Many of the master’s students help organize and/or lead events for the annual Mississippi Science Olympiad that is held at USM each spring, thus expanding their professional leadership experiences. Teams which have advanced from the regional Science Olympiads compete for scholarships and honors at the state competition.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives
Most of our students are full-time educators and part-time students. They need to take science (biology, chemistry, geology, etc.) and math courses in the summer and in the evening (or in hybrid format) during the academic year. The doctoral program may or may not grow in the future due to the widespread availability of online graduate programs. USM values face-to-face experiences in the sciences; there is only one online biology course. There are some math courses, one chemistry course, and one biology course that are offered in the late afternoon, thus allowing local teachers to make it to class. We will continue to lobby to have more science and math courses to be offered in the evening (or in hybrid format) during the academic year in order to grow enrollment. We will update the rubric used for comprehensive exams and portfolios. We will continue to mentor students who struggle during the dissertation process. We will continue to both encourage and support students’ efforts to publish abstracts, manuscripts, and give presentations. We will continue to offer field courses at a time convenient for them to take. We will continue to adjust course schedules in an effort to accommodate as many students as possible.

Closing the Loop
The new Ph.D. students are now paying for TK20 as required by SME 700 and other SME required courses. They will be advised to upload research papers written in their discipline courses to TK20 in order to add additional data to our reporting.
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: Demonstrate basic literacy and mathematical skills.

TMI candidates will demonstrate basic literacy and mathematical skills.

**Relevant Associations:**

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

**Related Measures:**

**M 1: Praxis I Basic Skills Licensure Examination**

Praxis I (CORE) is the teacher licensure examination, developed by Educational Testing Services (ETS), that measures the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. Passing of the Praxis I (CORE) is required for admission into teacher education programs in Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning (IHLs).

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

**Target:**

100% of TMI candidates will pass the Praxis I (CORE) basic skills licensure examination.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) passed Praxis I demonstrating basic literacy and mathematical skills.

Fall 2013
2/2 (100%) passed Praxis I demonstrating basic literacy and mathematical skills.

Spring 2014
11/11 (100%) passed Praxis I demonstrating basic literacy and mathematical skills.

SLO 2: Demonstrate content-specific knowledge.

TMI Candidates will demonstrate a content-specific knowledge base. NBPTS 1, 2

**Relevant Associations:**

NBTS 1, 2
Related Measures:

M 2: Praxis II: Content Specific Licensure Examination
Praxis II (specific to the content area) is the licensure examination, developed by Educational Testing Services (ETS) that must be passed to receive a teaching 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:**
100% of TMI candidates will pass the Praxis II content specific licensure examination for their teaching area.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
3/3 (100%) passed Praxis II demonstrating content-specific knowledge for their secondary education teaching area.
Fall 2013
2/2 (100%) passed Praxis II demonstrating content-specific knowledge for their secondary education teaching area.
Spring 2014
11/11 (100%) passed Praxis II demonstrating content-specific knowledge for their secondary education teaching area.

M 3: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument
The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) is a performance evaluation administered by the university clinical mentor during the first semester of mentorship. 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:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) on demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge (Domain III Indicator 15 TIAI).

The TIAI is currently administered only in the fall for TMI candidates.

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

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Review assessment system to ensure content specific standards are met.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
TMI faculty to review the assessment system to ensure that candidates from each content area meet the standards of their specific...

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. Candidates rate each of the program outcomes on a five-point rating scale.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

- Fall 2013
  - 1/2 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.
  - 1/2 (50%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.
- Spring 2014
  - 1/1 (100%) rated 2 on a 5-point scale for demonstrating content-specific pedagogical knowledge.
- Total
  - 2/3 (67%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for articulating a content-specific pedagogical knowledge.

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

**Relevant Associations:**
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 mentor during the first semester of mentorship. 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:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for using assessment-driven instruction.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

- Fall 2013
  - 3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) on using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population (Domain I Indicator 5 TIAI).

The TIAI is currently administered only in the fall for TMI candidates.

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

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

Review assessment system to ensure content specific standards are met.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
TMI faculty to review the assessment system to ensure that candidates from each content area meet the standards of their specifi...

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. Candidates rate each of the program outcomes on a five-point rating scale.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met

Fall 2013
1/2 (50%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.
1/2 (50%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100% rated 3 on a 5-point scale for using assessment driven instruction for a diverse student population.
Total
3/3 (100%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for using assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population.

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 mentor during the first semester of mentorship. 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:**
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for providing a supportive learning environment.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) on providing a supportive learning environment (Domain III Indicator 23 TIAI).

The TIAI is currently administered only in the fall for TMI candidates.

**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: 2013-2014*
Incorporate classroom management strategies into each of the three summer TMI courses. Bring in practitioners from school distr...

**Review assessment system to ensure content specific standards are met.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
TMI faculty to review the assessment system to ensure that candidates from each content area meet the standards of their specifi...

**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. Candidates rate each of the program outcomes on a five-point rating scale.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

**Target:**
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Fall 2013
1/2 (50%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment.
1/2 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for providing a supportive learning environment.
Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for providing a supporting learning environment. Total
3/3 (100%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale 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: 2013-2014
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 mentor during the first semester of mentorship. 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:
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for integrating technology into teaching and learning.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 2013
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) on integrating technology into teaching and learning (Domain I Indicator 3 TIAI).

The TIAI is currently administered only in the fall for TMI candidates.

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: 2013-2014

Collaborate with instructional technology faculty in CISE to incorporate more cutting-edge technology into the summer TMI cour...

Review assessment system to ensure content specific standards are met.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
TMI faculty to review the assessment system to ensure that candidates from each content area meet the standards of their specifi...
**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. Candidates rate each of the program outcomes on a five-point rating scale.

*Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers*

**Target:**

90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

- Fall 2013
  - 1/2 (50%) rated 3 on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning.
  - 1/2 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning.
- Spring 2014
  - 1/1 (100%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning.
- **Total**
  - 3/3 (100%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for integrating technology into teaching and learning.

**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: 2013-2014*
  
    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 mentor during the first semester of mentorship. 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:
90% of candidates will score mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the TIAI for valuing professional development and service to the community.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 2013
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3)
Total
3/3 (100%) scored mastery (3) on valuing and participating in professional development and service to the community (Domain V Indicator 25 TIAI).

The TIAI is currently administered only in the fall for TMI candidates.

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

Recruit students across disciplines for the JUMP START program.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
CISE faculty and content area faculty will collaborate to recruit students for the JUMP START program.

Review assessment system to ensure content specific standards are met.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
TMI faculty to review the assessment system to ensure that candidates from each content area meet the standards of their specific.

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. Candidates rate each of the program outcomes on a five-point rating scale.

Source of Evidence: Exit interviews with grads/program completers

Target:
90% of candidates will rate 3 or higher on the 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Fall 2013
1/2 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community.
1/2 (50%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community.
Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 2 on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community.
Total
2/3 (67%) rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale for valuing professional development and service to the community.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Recruit students across disciplines for the JUMP START program.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

CISE faculty and content area faculty will collaborate to recruit students for the JUMP START program.

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

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: Finished
Priority: High

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: 2013-2014
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: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology into teaching and learning.
- Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Integrate technology into teaching and learning.

Projected Completion Date: 05/01/2015
Responsible Person/Group: CISE TMI faculty and Instructional Technology Faculty

Recruit students across disciplines for the JUMP START program.

CISE faculty and content area faculty will collaborate to recruit students for the JUMP START program.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Value professional development and service to the community.
  Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Value professional development and service to the community.

Responsible Person/Group: CISE secondary education faculty and content faculty.

Review assessment system to ensure content specific standards are met.
TMI faculty to review the assessment system to ensure that candidates from each content area meet the standards of their specific content area.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate content-specific knowledge. | Integrate technology into teaching and learning. | Provide a supportive learning environment. | Use assessment-driven instruction for a diverse student population. | Value professional development and service to the community.

Implementation Description: Faculty review specialty professional association (SPA) standards from each discipline and develop appropriate assessments.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?
Assessment results reveal that TMI candidates met basic literacy and mathematics skills requirements as indicated by 100% of candidates passing Praxis I, and that candidates have mastered content knowledge as indicated by 100% of candidates passing Praxis II in their specific content areas. The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) performance-based teaching assessment further indicated that TMI candidates were mastering program outcomes. Qualitative results from the exit interview reveal that TMI completers believe that the strengths of the program include the strong emphasis on assessment-driven instruction and an emphasis on current social issues that affect education today. Changes to the program based on past internship assessment data resulted in an improved internship experience with a more comprehensive performance evaluation based on the TIAI.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
This is the second cycle that assessment data disaggregated from the MAT program have been reported for the TMI certificate. Continued attention will be required to collect all data from the TMI program disaggregated from the MAT program. Qualitative data from exit interviews indicate that more emphasis should be placed on evidence-based methodology for content delivery and on developing effective classroom management procedures. Since TMI candidates have limited pedagogical course work, continued attention must be given to enhancing mentorships of the TMI completers as they enter into their initial teaching experiences.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary
The Teach Mississippi Institute (TMI) is a program initiated by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) that provides a pathway to teacher licensure outside the traditional, accredited programs 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. A baccalaureate degree from an accredited college/university and acceptable Praxis I (CORE) and Praxis II scores indicating mastery of basic skills and specific content knowledge must be attained to be admitted to the program. The graduate certificate program focuses on instructional delivery of content knowledge.

TMI is an option for individuals who want to seek a certificate leading to teacher licensure rather than a master’s degree leading to licensure. The plan of study includes 12 credit hours. Content areas include biology, business, chemistry, English, French, German, home economics, marketing, mathematics, physics, social studies, Spanish or speech communication.

A new TMI initiative is the JUMP START option which was developed for current USM undergraduate students who wish to begin the TMI certificate program while completing a content-specific undergraduate degree. A junior or senior may apply to enter as a non-degree graduate student and take one teacher education course each semester while completing his/her bachelor’s degree to easily transition into the TMI program upon graduating.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**

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. CISE has employed a new secondary education faculty person to add additional expertise to the program, and courses have been approved for online delivery to allow for better access for both campuses. Additionally, the JUMP START program has been added to allow early entrance into the program through a number of content areas.

**Closing the Loop**

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. Online delivery has provided for better supervision of the intern experience.
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 MAT in Secondary Education candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive examination on the first attempt.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) passed the comprehensive examination 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.
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...

Review program plan for MAT.
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

### 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 MAT candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding articulating content and theoretical knowledge.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
- Summer 2013
  - 0 graduates
- Fall 2013
  - 0 graduates
- Spring 2014
  - 2/2 (100%) rated 4 on a 5-point 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.

**Review program plan for MAT.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

### M 5: 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 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 (2013-2014) - 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 2014
2/2 (100%) rated (4) target on D1-1 to demonstrate 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.

**Review program plan for MAT.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

**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 MAT in Secondary Education candidates will successfully complete the comprehensive examination on the first attempt.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Fall 2013
0 candidates at this transition point.
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) passed the comprehensive examination 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.

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...

Review program plan for MAT.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

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 MAT candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding articulating secondary education pedagogy.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met

Summer 2013
0 graduates
Fall 2013
0 graduates
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for articulating secondary education pedagogy.

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

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

Review program plan for MAT.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

M 5: 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 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 (2013-2014) - 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 2014
2/2 (100%) rated (4) target on D1-4 to demonstrate articulating secondary education pedagogy.

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

**Review program plan for MAT.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

**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 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 MAT candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding using research to improve teaching and learning.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
0 graduates
Fall 2013
0 graduates
Spring 2014
1/2 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for using research to improve teaching and learning
1/2 (50%) rated 5 on a 5-point scale for 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.

**Review program plan for MAT.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

**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 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 MAT candidates answering the exit survey will average three or higher on a five-point scale regarding participating in professional development.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

- Summer 2013
  - 0 graduates
- Fall 2013
  - 0 graduates
- Spring 2014
  - 1/2 (50%) rated 4 on a 5-point scale for participating in professional development.
  - 1/2 (50%) 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.

**M 5: 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 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 (2013-2014) - 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 2014
2/2 (100%) rated (4) target on D1-4 to demonstrate 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.

Review program plan for MAT.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and...

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 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 in secondary education graduates will obtain employment in a secondary school upon graduation.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Spring 2014
2/2 (100%) obtained employment in a secondary school.

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 determin...

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 CISE 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 are 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:** This is an ongoing initiative.  
**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:** Finished  
**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:** 12/14/2011

**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:** On-Hold  
**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:** 12/14/2011  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Marge Crowe and Dr. Perrin Lowrey

**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:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

**Implementation Description:** This will begin in the fall of 2012. The rubrics have been distributed to internship supervisors.

**Review program plan for MAT.**

As part of the CISE curriculum audit, the graduate faculty will review the MAT program to ensure that it is aligned to state and national standards.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**  
**Measure:** Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate secondary education pedagogy  
**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  
**Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate content and theoretical knowledge | Articulate secondary education pedagogy | Participate in professional development

**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 that offers an alternate route to teacher licensure with pedagogical courses being offered through CISE and content specialty courses 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 classroom management and lesson planning procedures. Additionally, because MAT candidates may hold teaching positions that are in distant areas, travel back to the campuses is not possible; therefore, attention needs to be given to offering online classes.

**Annual Report Section Responses**

**Program Summary**

The Educational Curriculum and Instruction (Secondary Education) M.Ed. was previously merged with the Teach for Mississippi (TMI) and the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) in Secondary Education program which provides an alternate route to teacher licensure in Mississippi. Coursework and assessments are aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). There were nine candidates from diverse secondary content areas who were at various transition stages of the program in 2013-2014. The program is strengthened by the diverse content and experiential backgrounds of the candidates.

CISE faculty received over $4,000,000 in external funding in 2013-2014. 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**

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 revised in the past cycle to transition from the M.Ed., and the MAT program will continue to be reviewed in the next academic year. New clinical elements and on-line graduate courses have been developed as continuous improvement initiatives.

**Closing the Loop**

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 IVN and online delivery of coursework have improved recruitment efforts and allowed both Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students access to the program. Assessments and data collection have been improved.
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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.

Special Education teacher candidates will demonstrate content knowledge in general and special education.

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. This licensure examination serves as both a program measure and an individual student outcome measure. Mississippi Department of Education requires an 80% program pass rate for teacher education programs in Mississippi.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast (SPE K-12 combined online program)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
10/10 (100%) passed

Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast (Dual licensure program)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
9/9 (100%) passed

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

Fall 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)

Fall 2013
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
7/19 (37%) scored mastery (3)
12/19 (63%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
19/19 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12)
2/4 (50%) scored mastery (3)
2/4 (50%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

Spring 2014
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
1/9 (11%) scored marginal (2)
5/9 (61%) scored mastery (3)
3/9 (28%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
8/9 (89%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education content knowledge (Indicator A1 TCPE)

**SLO 2: Demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge.**
Special Education teacher candidates will demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge reflecting best practices in general and special education

**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. This licensure examination serves as both a program measure and an individual student outcome measure. Mississippi Department of Education requires an 80% program pass rate for teacher education programs in Mississippi.

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast (SPE K-12 combined online program)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
7/10 (70%) passed

Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast (Dual licensure program)
Fall 2013/Spring 2014
26/28 (93%) passed

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

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

**Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.**

*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014

In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

**Review Praxis II PLT subscores for candidates.**

*Established in Cycle:* 2013-2014

CISE special education faculty will review the subscale scores from the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching to determi...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 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 pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

Fall 2013
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
6/19 (32%) scored mastery (3)
13/19 (68%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
19/19 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on demonstrating special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12)
4/4 (100%) scored mastery (3)
Total
4/4 (100%) scored .mastery (3) on demonstrating special education pedagogical knowledge (Indicator A2 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
8/9 (89%) scored mastery (3)
1/9 (11%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
9/9 (100%) scored .mastery(3) or 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.

Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

SLO 3: Use assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences.
Special Education teacher candidates will use student assessment results to plan individualized instructional experiences that accommodate students’ unique learning 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. 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:**
Ninety percent (90%) of special education teacher candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the rubric for the criteria of using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Fall 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 assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI).

Fall 2013
Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure)
4/19 (21%) scored mastery (3)
15/19 (79%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
19/19 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program)
4/4 (80%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
4/4 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Domain I Indicator 6 TIAI).

Spring 2014
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 using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (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.

**Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

**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 planning individualized instructional experiences (Indicator C3 TCPE).

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

**Fall 2013**
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12)
5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Indicator C3 TCPE).

**Fall 2013**
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
19/19 (100%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
19/19 (100%) scored exemplary(4) on using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Indicator C3 TCPE).

**Spring 2014**
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12)
2/4 (50%) scored mastery (3)
2/4 (50%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
4/4 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Indicator C3 TCPE)

**Spring 2014**
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 mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences (Indicator C3 TCPE)
Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

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

Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

SLO 4: Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
Special Education teacher candidates will utilize current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.

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. 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:
Ninety percent (90%) of special education candidates will receive a rating of mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the rubric for the criteria using current instructional technology to support and enhance instruction (Domain I Indicator 3 TIAI).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Fall 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 integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 3 TIAI)

Fall 2013
Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure)
3/19 (16%) scored mastery (3)
16/19 (84%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
19/19 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 3 TIAI)

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg and Gulfport (online SPE K-12 combined program)
2/4 (50%) scored mastery (3)
2/4 (50%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
4/4 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 3 TIAI)

Spring 2014
Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulfport combined program-special education dual licensure)
1/9 (11%) scored marginal (2)
3/9 (33%) scored mastery (3)
5/9 (56%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
8/9 (89%) scored (3) mastery or (4) exemplary on integrating technology in instruction (Domain I Indicator 3 TIAI)

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

Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

Integrate current technology into special education curriculum.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
CISE faculty are collaborating to enhance instructional technology in all CISE programs. Faculty are meeting to plan a model te...

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 on the criteria of using current instructional technology to support and enhance instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Fall 2013
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12)
2/5 (40%) scored mastery (3)
3/5 (60%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
5/5 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using current instructional technology to support and enhance instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE).

Fall 2013
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
5/19 (26%) scored mastery (3)
14/19 (74%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
19/19 (100%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using current instructional technology to support and enhance instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE).

Spring 2014
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 using current instructional technology to support and enhance instruction (Indicator A8 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
1/9 (11%) scored marginal (2)
1/9 (22%) scored mastery (3)
7/9 (67%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
8/9 (89%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using current instructional technology to support and enhance 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.

**Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

**Integrate current technology into special education curriculum.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
CISE faculty are collaborating to enhance instructional technology in all CISE programs. Faculty are meeting to plan a model te...

**SLO 5: Use family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning.**

Special Education teacher candidates will use family and/or community resources (human or material) in lessons to support and enhance student learning.

**Relevant Associations:**
Council for Exceptional Children

**Strategic Plan Associations:**
President’s Office
2.3 Connection with Community
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. 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:**

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 TIAI)

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**

**Fall 2013**
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast (online SPE K-12 combined program)
- 2/5 (40%) scored mastery (3)
- 3/5 (60%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total
  - 5/5 (100%) scored exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI)

Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast combined program-special education dual licensure)
- 4/19 (21%) scored marginal (2)
- 5/19 (26%) scored mastery (3)
- 10/19 (53%) scored exemplary (4)
- Total
  - 15/19 (79%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI)

**Spring 2014**
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast (online SPE K-12 combined program)
- 1/4 (25%) scored unacceptable (1)
- 2/4 (50%) scored marginal (2)
- 1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3)
- Total
  - 1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons (Domain III Indicator 19 TIAI)

Dual program (Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast combined program-special education dual licensure)
- 3/9 (33%) scored unacceptable (1)
- 5/9 (56%) scored marginal (2)
- 1/9 (11%) scored mastery (3)
- Total
  - 1/9 (11%) 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.

Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

Emphasize using family and community resources in clinical courses.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The use of family and community resources has been an emphasis in didactic classes, but has not been indicated to be used effect...

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 or exemplary on the rubric for the criteria of using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE).

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
Fall 2013
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 2013
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
3/19 (16%) scored marginal (2)
5/19 (26%) scored mastery (3).
11/19 (58%) scored exemplary (4).
Total
16/19 (84%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast online (SPE K-12)
2/4 (50%) scored marginal (2)
1/4 (25%) scored mastery (3)
1/4 (25%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
2/4 (50%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE).

Spring 2014
Special Education and Elementary Education Dual Licensure (Dual)
1/9 (11%) scored marginal (2)
6/9 (67%) scored mastery (3)
2/9 (22%) scored exemplary (4)
Total
8/9 (89%) scored mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on using family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning (Indicator A4-7 TCPE).

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

Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the...

Emphasize using family and community resources in clinical courses.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The use of family and community resources has been an emphasis in didactic classes, but has not been indicated to be used effect...

SLO 6: Create learning environments that foster active engagement in learning.
Special Education teacher candidates will create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs (ELN) that foster positive social interactions with typical peers and active engagement in learning.

Relevant Associations:
Council for Exceptional Children Standard 5 Learning Environments and Social Interactions

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: In-Progress
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

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
Projected Completion Date: 05/15/2015

Align the indicators for the special education performance assessments with new CEC standards.
In accordance with directives from the CEC SPA report, special education faculty will revise the indicators for the TCPE and the TIAI to align with current standards.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge.
- Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge. | Use assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning. | Use family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning.
- Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Use assessment information to plan individualized instructional experiences. | Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning. | Use family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning.

Emphasize using family and community resources in clinical courses.
The use of family and community resources has been an emphasis in didactic classes, but has not been indicated to be used effectively in the clinical experiences. The university supervisor and the mentor teacher will discuss and model to the teacher candidate ways of bringing in family and community resources to the clinical experience.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | Outcome/Objective: Use family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning.
- Measure: Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | Outcome/Objective: Use family/community resources in lessons to enhance learning.

Integrate current technology into special education curriculum.
CISE faculty are collaborating to enhance instructional technology in all CISE programs. Faculty are meeting to plan a model technology classroom and to integrate current technology into all syllabi.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High
Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.
**Measure:** Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument | **Outcome/Objective:** Use current instructional technology to support and enhance student learning.

Review Praxis II PLT subscores for candidates.
CISE special education faculty will review the subscale scores from the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching to determine areas of candidate strengths and weaknesses.

**Established in Cycle:** 2013-2014  
**Implementation Status:** In-Progress  
**Priority:** High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
**Measure:** Praxis II: Principles of Learning and Teaching | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate special education pedagogical knowledge.

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 and pedagogical 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. Strengths were also noted in the use of assessment data to inform differentiated instruction which is an essential skill for successful special education practitioners. Improvement from previous results was noted in the integration of current technology into instruction. Both assessment and technology outcomes were given special emphasis in professional development workshops throughout the year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although outcomes were met or partially met for 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 and to use family and community resources in teaching. 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. programs in special education are strong teacher licensure programs that provide 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 pre-service 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 course work. The online options also provide an opportunity for students who cannot attend classes on the two campuses to obtain a special education degree and teacher licensure. The special education initial licensure programs have been awarded national recognition, with no conditions, by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) for the next seven years.

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, the Mississippi Hearing-Vision Project, the Statewide Vision Workshops Grant, the Supports for Transition Grant, the Bridge to Independence Grant and the Assisting with Transition to Community Life Grant, special education faculty have participated in collaborative work with P-12 school districts, the Mississippi Council on Developmental Disabilities, and the Mississippi Department of Education. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 40 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received over four million dollars in external funding in 2013-2014. 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
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 online 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.

In the CISE special education meetings, special education faculty 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 students with disabilities have been included in course work to bring family perspectives; and online courses have been increased in number and enhanced with innovative online methodology.

Closing the Loop
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 course work 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 and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge.

Master's candidates will articulate and demonstrate special education content and theoretical knowledge in their specialty 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 two special education faculty and an external reviewer 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 and demonstrating special education content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Summer 2013
1/13 (15%) rated marginal (2)
11/13 (70%) rated mastery (3)
1/13(15%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 12/13 (85%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of articulating and demonstrating special education content and theoretical knowledge.

Fall 2013
1/14 (7%) rated marginal (2)
2/14 (14%) rated mastery (3)
11/14(79%) rated exemplary (4)
Total
13/14 (93%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of articulating and demonstrating special education content and theoretical knowledge.
Spring 2014
1/8 (12%) rated marginal (2)
3/8 (38%) rated mastery (3)
4/8 (50%) rated exemplary (4)
Total
7/8 (88%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of articulating and demonstrating 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.

**Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

**Review special education M.Ed. program plan.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Summer 2013
5/5 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating content and theoretical knowledge.
Fall 2013
4/4 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating content and theoretical knowledge.
Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating 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.
Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

Review special education M.Ed. program plan.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

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 articulating and demonstrating content and theoretical knowledge.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Summer 2013
5/5 (100%) rated 4
Total
5/5 (100%) rated 4 on articulating and demonstrating content and theoretical knowledge.

Fall 2013
2/4 (50%) rated 5
2/4 (50%) rated 4
Total
4/4 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating and demonstrating content and theoretical knowledge

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 4
Total
1/1 (100%) rated 4 on articulating and demonstrating 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.

Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

Review special education M.Ed. program plan.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

SLO 2: Articulate and demonstrate 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 two special education faculty and an external reviewer 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 and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**

Summer 2013

1/13 (15%) rated marginal (2)
10/13 (54%) rated mastery (3)
2/13 (31%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 12/13 (85%) rated mastery(3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

Fall 2013

1/14 (7%) rated marginal (2)
4/14 (29%) rated mastery (3)
9/14 (64%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 13/14 (93%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

Spring 2014

4/8 (50%) rated mastery (3)
4/8 (50%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 8/8 (100%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of articulating and demonstrating 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.

**Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

**Review special education M.Ed. program plan.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
5/5 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

Fall 2013
4/4 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated > 3 on the rubric for articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

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

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

**Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

**Review special education M.Ed. program plan.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

**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 articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
5/5 (100%) rated 4

Total
5/5 (100%) rated 4 on articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.

Fall 2013
2/4 (50%) rated 5
2/4 (50%) rated 4

Total
4/4 (100%) rated 4 or higher on articulating and demonstrating special education pedagogy.
Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

Review special education M.Ed. program plan.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

SLO 3: Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate 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 two special education faculty and an external reviewer 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met

Summer 2013
1/13 (1%) rated unacceptable (1)
3/13 (21%) rated marginal (2)
4/13 (36%) rated mastery (3)
5/13 (42%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 9/13 (70%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of using research to improve teaching and learning.

Fall 2013
1/14 (8%) rated marginal (2)
3/14 (21%) rated mastery (3)
10/14 (71%) rated exemplary (4)
Total
13/14 (98%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of using research to improve teaching and learning.
Spring 2014
4/8 (48%) rated mastery (3)
4/8 (52%) rated exemplary (4)
Total
8/8 (100%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of using research to improve teaching and learning.

This program is now online with Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students combined into one program.

*Percentages are rounded.

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

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

**Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

**Review special education M.Ed. program plan.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ... 

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
5/5 (100%) rated 4
Total
5/5 (100%) rated 4 on using research to improve teaching and learning.

Fall 2013
2/4 (50%) rated 5
2/4 (50%) rated 4
Total
4/4 (100%) rated 4 or higher on using research to improve teaching and learning.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 5
Total
1/1 (100%) rated 5 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.

**Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.**
*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

**Review special education M.Ed. program plan.**

*Established in Cycle: 2013-2014*

As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that...

**SLO 4: Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.**

Master's candidates will value and participate in professional development and service to the community as a career-long opportunity and responsibility.

**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 two special education faculty and an external reviewer 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
4/13 (31%) rated marginal (2)
2/13 (15%) rated mastery (3)
7/13 (54%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 9/13 (69%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of participating in professional development.

Fall 2013
2/14 (13%) rated mastery (3)
12/14 (86%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 14/14 (100%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of participating in professional development.

Spring 2014
4/8 (50%) rated mastery (3)
4/8 (50%) rated exemplary (4)
Total 8/8 (100%) rated mastery (3) or exemplary (4) on the outcome of participating in professional development.

This program is now online with Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast students combined into one program.

*Percentages are rounded.

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

For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.
Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

Review special education M.Ed. program plan.
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that ...

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Summer 2013
4/5 (80%) rated 4
1/5 (20%) rated 5
Total
5/5 (100%) rated 4 or higher on participating in professional development.

Fall 2013
3/4 (75%) rated 4
1/4 (25%) rated 5
Total
4/4 (100%) rated 4 or higher on participating in professional development.

Spring 2014
1/1 (100%) rated 5
Total
1/1 (100%) rated 5 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.

**Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.**
Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

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

**O/O 5: Obtain employment in a leadership position.**

Master’s graduates will obtain employment in a special education leadership position in a K-12 school or agency.

**Relevant Associations:**
CEC

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

- Summer 2013
  - 5/5 (100%) obtained employment in a special education position.

- Fall 2013
  - 4/4 (100%) obtained employment in a special education position.

- Spring 2014
  - 1/1 (100%) obtained employment in a special education position.

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

**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

**Upload all assessments/measures to TK20.**

Upload all NCATE, CEC and SACS assessments to TK20 in order to have an efficient way to collect and analyze data.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2006-2007
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **Responsible Person/Group:** SPE lead faculty and TK20 staff

**Input graduate assessment data in TK20.**

All graduate assessments for CEC SPAs and for SACS will be input into TK20.

- **Established in Cycle:** 2007-2008
- **Implementation Status:** Finished
- **Priority:** High

- **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.
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: SPE lead faculty and adjunct 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

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: In-Progress
Priority: High
Responsible Person/Group: CISE Special Education and IT faculty

Align new CEC standards with M.Ed. courses.
The special education faculty will align the new CEC standards with the M.Ed. courses.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measurement: Comprehensive Examination | Outcome/Objective: Articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogy.
Measurement: Exit Interview/Survey | Outcome/Objective: Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogy. | Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.
Measurement: Professional Portfolio | Outcome/Objective: Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogy. | Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.
Review special education M.Ed. program plan.
As part of the CISE curriculum audit initiative, graduate faculty will review the special education program plan to ensure that it is aligned with current CEC standards.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure:** Comprehensive Examination | **Outcome/Objective:** Articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogy.
- **Measure:** Exit Interview/Survey | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogy.
- **Measure:** Professional Portfolio | **Outcome/Objective:** Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate research to improve teaching and learning. | Articulate and demonstrate content and theoretical knowledge. | Articulate and demonstrate special education pedagogy. | Value and participate in professional development and service to the community.

**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 or partially met for 2013-2014. The emphasis in the course work 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. SPE portfolio results revealed an overall mean range of 3.37 to 3.54 on a 4-point scale (n=35) for meeting each of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) foundational standards. Exit interview results noted strengths in the areas of improvement of classroom teaching resulting from the practical assignments and course work 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 relevance to the classroom 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. Since the CEC standards have been revised, it will be necessary to re-align the CEC standards to the M.Ed. courses in the next academic year.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?
Although all outcomes were met or partially met, continued attention will be given to providing candidates more technical assistance with Blackboard and other online technologies. Ongoing emphasis is needed for individualized instructional planning and understanding learning differences. 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 course work and assessments for each emphasis area are aligned to Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) standards, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and NCATE/CAEP standards.

The increased enrollment in the program is attributed to the increased availability and enhanced quality of online 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, the Mississippi Hearing-Vision Project, the Statewide Vision Workshops Grant, the Supports for Transition Grant, the Bridge to Independence Grant and the Assisting with Transition to Community Life Grant, special education faculty have participated in collaborative work with P-12 school districts, the Mississippi Council on Developmental Disabilities, and the Mississippi Department of Education. CISE faculty are active researchers, having produced 40 publications in peer-reviewed journals and having received over four million dollars in external funding in 2013-2014. 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, is fully accredited by NCATE/CAEP, and the initial licensure programs in special education are nationally recognized by the Council for Exceptional Children.

**Continuous Improvement Initiatives**
CISE graduate faculty meet monthly to review program data and provide for continuous improvement for both candidates and the overall M.Ed. program. Comprehensive examination and exit interview results are reviewed and evaluated each semester. Program plans were reviewed and have been revised in the past cycle with continuing monitoring of their effectiveness planned in the next academic 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/CAEP and NBPTS standards.

**Closing the Loop**
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 course work 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: 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.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

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 (2013-2014) - 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.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
88 % (8/9) students enrolled in SHS 369 attained 80% or better in their final teaching portfolio.
11% (1) student did not attain 80% on the 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students (n=9) enrolled in SHS 653 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: Assessment and Analysis of Listening, Speech, and Spoken Language**

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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met
100% of students enrolled in SHS 651 (n=9) 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.

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 (2013-2014) - 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 691 (n=9) 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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 691 (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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 651 (n=9) successfully completed a case study in which they plotted the acoustic characteristics of the Ling Six Sound Test on a child's audiogram and determined the suitability of a child's hearing technology with a score of 80% or better. This was accomplished in a case study test question format.

**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 (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
100% of students enrolled in SHS 651 (n=9) successfully completed a project including: 1. Phonetic transcription of the speech of a child with sharing loss using the IPA; 2. Analysis of the child's speech errors; and, 3. Selection of speech targets with a score of 80% or better.