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I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of Southern Mississippi (USM) was founded in 1910 as the Mississippi Normal College. Hattiesburg, with a population of nearly 50,000, is home to USM’s main campus located 2.5 miles west of downtown Hattiesburg. The University includes 191 buildings on a 315-acre main campus and is organized into six colleges and a Graduate School. The colleges include Arts and Letters, Business, Education and Psychology, Health, Honors, and Science and Technology. USM on the Gulf Coast includes the Long Beach campus and four teaching sites: Keesler AFB, Gulf Coast Research Laboratory (GCRL), Stennis Space Center, and the Student Service Center.

USM is a comprehensive doctoral and research-extensive university and is governed by the Board of Trustees of the State Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL). Dr. Martha D. Saunders, USM’s ninth president, is the chief executive officer and principal educational officer. The provost is the chief academic officer and senior university officer. The University is organized into six divisions: Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Advancement, Gulf Coast, Research, and Student Affairs.

USM’s primary mission is to “cultivate intellectual development and creativity through the generation, dissemination, application and preservation of knowledge. This mission is supported by the follow values that have been formed through the history and traditions of the institution and are widely and deeply held beliefs of faculty, staff, students, and administrators:

The Professional Education Unit (Unit) for USM includes Professional Education Faculty (PEF), academic programs, and administrative offices associated with professional education. PEF and academic programs are housed in the College of Arts and Letters, College of Education and Psychology,
College of Health, and College of Science and Technology. Twelve academic departments within the four colleges offer teacher education programs at the initial preparation level. Program areas include: biology, chemistry, physics, technology, English, foreign languages, mathematics, social studies, art, dance, music, physical education, deaf education, elementary education and special education. Eight academic departments within the four colleges offer advanced programs. Advanced program areas include: curriculum and instruction, elementary education, educational leadership, human performance, school counseling, special education, speech and hearing, library science, school psychology and music education.

The Professional Education Council (PEC) is the official governance body for the Unit. The Unit head, the Dean of CoEP, has the responsibility and authority to provide direction and leadership to the PEC. The purpose of PEC is to ensure that professional education programs are quality programs that comply with the standards of NCATE, other accrediting agencies, and the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE). Membership on the PEC includes faculty representatives from each department housing teacher education programs, representatives from Educational Field Experiences (EFE), and members of the Dean's administrative staff.

Headcount enrollment in the CoEP totaled 1796 candidates in spring 2012 (1319 undergraduate and 477 graduate students). The total number of full and part-time faculty serving the unit is 140 (Table 1). Tables 2 and 3 of the IR accurately reflect specific information about programs, degrees, enrollment, and accreditation and recognition of programs.

2. Describe the type of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This NCATE review was a continuing visit for initial and advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals. As per the protocol guidelines for professional education units in Mississippi, this was a joint visit. The visiting team consisted of co-chairs (one appointed by NCATE and one appointed by the Mississippi Department of Education[MDE]), three additional NCATE team members, two additional state team members, a state consultant, and an IHL (liaison between institutions of higher learning and the MDE) representative.

A pre-visit was conducted via phone conference in February of 2012 and included the team co-chairs, the state consultant, the USM NCATE Coordinator and the unit head. During the previsit, discussion focused on clarification of IR contents and electronic evidence, determining individuals to include in onsite interviews, and completing logistical plans for the onsite visit.

During the on-site visit, all team members shared equal roles and responsibilities for the review process including conducting interviews and site visits, sharing findings, making decisions as to whether or not standards were met, and writing drafts of pre-assigned standards.

There were no deviations from the state protocol.

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

As noted in the overview, USM on the Gulf Coast includes the Long Beach campus and four teaching sites: Keesler AFB, Gulf Coast Research Laboratory (GCRL), Stennis Space Center, and the Student Service Center. The programs offered through the unit are housed on the Long Beach campus primarily within the Fleming Educational Center (a building that was refurbished after Hurricane Katrina) and the
Student Service Center. Both provide classroom space, computer space, student services. The library is located on the Long Beach campus which is approximately 1 mile from the Student Service Center and available to all candidates. Additionally, candidates may request library materials from the main USM campus. Construction continues on the Long Beach Campus and once completed, all services related to the unit's programs on the Gulf Coast will be moved from the older Student Service Center to the Long Beach Campus.

The following programs are offered at the branch campus on the Gulf Coast or on-line:

Initial Teacher Education Programs Offered on the Gulf Coast:
* Biological Sciences (Licensure) B.S. (9 candidates)
* Elementary Education B.S. (167 candidates)
* Elementary Education/Special Education (dual licensure) B.S. (29 candidates)
* English (Licensure) B.A. (13 candidates)
* History (Licensure in Social Studies) B.A. (29 candidates)
* Mathematics (Licensure) B.S. (12 candidates)

Initial Teacher Education Programs Offered Online:
* Elementary Education B.S. (Teacher Assistant Program) (58 candidates)
* Special Education (Licensure) B.S. (2 candidates)
* Advanced Professional Education Programs Offered Online
* Educational Administration and Supervision M.Ed. (1 candidate)
* Special Education M.Ed. (0 candidates)
* Library and Information Science (Licensure) M.L.I.S. (0 candidates)
* Music Education M.M.Ed. (0 candidates)

The team chair toured the facilities for programs offered on the Gulf Coast. Faculty and candidates from the off-campus site and on-line programs were interviewed via face-to-face and phone conference.

4. Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

No unusual circumstances were noted.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

1. Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

An overarching goal of the unit, building on its tradition as a normal college, is to prepare candidates "to engage in creative, bold, and determined actions that positively influence a culturally diverse, global
community." The unit's conceptual framework reflects this goal and is aligned with the mission and vision of the university as well as the following fivefold mission of the unit:

1. Prepare high quality teachers and education leaders for the state;
2. Conduct innovative, relevant research that informs decision-making in education;
3. Establish strong relationships with local school districts and the Mississippi Department of Education to improve education in the state;
4. Promote a healthier populace; and
5. Enhance cultural understanding among our citizens.

These five elements provide the underpinning that supports governance within the unit, the delivery of instruction and the learning outcomes for candidates at all levels.

The conceptual framework is designed around the following four core themes that align with the missions of the university and unit; state; Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and other professional standards; and NCATE Standards: the power of knowledge to inform, the power to inspire, the power to transform lives, and to empower a community of learners. Within each theme a list of expected outcomes for all professional candidates is delineated:

1. Power of Knowledge to Inform
   Candidates will:
   • Apply a content and theoretical knowledge base supported by technological and pedagogical skills to enhance learning in the classroom.
   • Develop appropriate assessments, monitor student progress, and use data to make instructional decisions.
   • Apply knowledge, awareness, and understanding of their own culture and other cultures in and beyond the classroom to enhance student learning.
   • Use state curriculum models as well as local, state, and national standards to advance identified knowledge and skills in the classroom.
   • Develop knowledge, awareness, and understanding of student learning processes and apply that knowledge to support learning in the classroom.

2. Power to Inspire
   Candidates will:
   • Demonstrate through their actions a belief that all individuals can learn and benefit from a quality educational experience.
   • Demonstrate through their use of best practices, actions and interactions with others, the ability to foster learning for all persons.
   • Demonstrate personal and professional resolve by embracing and addressing challenges, supporting and assisting others in difficult situations, and displaying respect and value for others at all times.
   • Serve as role models of lifelong learning, professionalism, civic responsibility, and commitment to education the others.
   • Demonstrate professional values and high moral principles by conforming to accepted professional standards of conduct and ethics that distinguish them as professional educators pursuing excellence and equity for others.

3. Power to Transform Lives
   Candidates will:
   • Demonstrate general technological, content, and pedagogical skills in the classroom.
   • Critically consider data-driven evidence to solve problems and to improve the learning process in order to improve learning outcomes in the classroom.
• Provide differentiated instruction to address and meet the needs of all students in order to enable them to succeed in a complex, changing society.
• Reflect, communicate, and act in a manner that supports and inspires successful learning.
• Create a safe physical environment that promotes learning and positive dispositions.

4. Empower a Community of Learners
Candidates will:
• Reflect on their own practices and engage in professional development activities to improve their abilities.
• Institute the highest standards by acting as stewards to the profession.
• Actively participate in their community and foster an environment that promotes teamwork and collaboration.

Each of the outcomes is discussed in detail in the conceptual framework document and includes information related to research and best practice as well as descriptions of the ways candidates learn about and demonstrate meeting the outcomes.

The unit's Conceptual Framework (CF) was developed in 2003 in concert with Professional Education Faculty (PEF) and unit stakeholders. In 2009, an ad hoc CF Committee was formed by the Professional Education Council (PEC) to review the CF and discuss possible revisions. After a full review, the CF Committee determined that the CF and its constructs accurately reflect the shared vision of the Unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 settings. The committee updated the knowledge base and added information about Mississippi's Blue Ribbon Commission for the Redesign of Teacher Preparation (BRC). The BRC was formed to increase both the quality and quantity of teachers for Mississippi's schools through a collaboratively developed redesign initiative targeted for all teacher preparation programs. The PEC reviewed the conceptual framework document and approved its revisions in December 2010.

A random review of syllabi demonstrates that the conceptual framework themes and outcomes are addressed and aligned with appropriate state, Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), and program standards. Interviews with administrators, faculty and students and confirm the importance of the themes and constructs to the unit.

III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)
If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

There are 16 initial teacher preparation programs (ITP) identified at the university. Ten are nationally recognized by their respective Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs): Biology Licensure, Chemistry Licensure, Elementary Education, English Licensure, Foreign Language (Spanish and French Secondary) Licensure, Mathematics Licensure, Physical Education, Physics Licensure, Social Studies Licensure, and Special Education. Four are accredited by other accrediting organizations: Art Education, Dance Education, Education of the Deaf, Music Education. Two are approved by the state" Business Technology and the Master of Arts Teaching: Secondary Teacher Education which is offered through alternate route. It is not clear whether this program should have been submitted to the Initial License Post Baccalaureate (ILPB) SPA for review. In AIMS, the program was not selected for either state or SPA review. However, Table 2 in the Institutional Report lists it as state approved and data related to meeting Standard 1 elements are included in that report.

Initial teacher education programs offered on the Gulf Coast include Biology Licensure, Elementary Education, Elementary Education/Special Education (dual licensure), English Licensure, History (Licensure in Social Studies), Mathematics Licensure. Initial teacher education programs offered online are Elementary Education (Teacher Assistant Program) and Special Education.

State licensing test data (Praxis II) for 2008-09 through 2010-11 reflect an overall average of 97 percent for the following programs: Art Education, Science Education, Business Technology Education, Elementary Education, English Education, Foreign Language Education, Mathematics Education, Music Education, Physical Education, Social Studies Education, and Special Education. The university and professional education unit did not require candidates to report Praxis II and PLT scores prior to spring 2010. Beginning spring 2010 candidates are required to have scores reported to the university. Candidates do not have to pass Praxis II or PLT as a graduation requirement.

All programs except Business Technology Education and Master of Arts in Teaching complete specialized professional association (SPA) reviews. Four, Spanish and French, Science Education, Social Studies Education, of the nine reviews are nationally recognized. (Science Education encompasses Biology Licensure, Chemistry Licensure, and Physics Licensure.) Four (English Licensure, Math Education, Physical Education, and Special Education) are recognized with conditions. The review for Elementary Education is in progress; however, in the most recent report of 8/01/2011 the program is recognized with conditions.
Part C.1 (candidates' knowledge of content) for seven of the nine SPA reviews notes sufficient data is evident to demonstrate candidates' have adequate content knowledge. Two programs, English Licensure and Special Education, note limited evidence, however, recognize passing Praxis II content knowledge rates of 80% or better for the past three years.

Data are available for the Business Technology Education (BTE). Data from three unit-wide assessments are used to assess content knowledge: the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) which is aligned with the National Association of Business Teacher Education Standards, the statewide Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), and the In-class Evaluation instrument, used during student teaching, which has rating components for InTASC standards. The three assessments use the following rubric rating scores: Exemplary=4, Mastery=3, Marginal=2, Unacceptable=1. TCPE data from 2008-2011 indicate 100 percent (14/14) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than 3 on content knowledge indicators. TIAI data indicate 100 percent (9/9) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than 3 on content knowledge indicators. In-class Evaluation data from 2008-2011 indicate 57 percent (8/14) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than on content knowledge indicators.

Data are available for the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) to assess content knowledge. Candidates complete a professional portfolio that is scored on a three-point rubric (Exemplary=3; Mastery=2; Unacceptable=1) aligned to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). From 2008-2011, 100 percent (7/7) of candidates scored equal to or greater than 2 on content knowledge indicators.

Candidates in initial programs complete an exit survey at the end of student teaching. Response rates on the Teacher Preparation Program Exit Survey averaged 75 percent from 2008-2011. Indicator 1 states, "I am adequately prepared to teach in the content/subject area(s) of my degree." In spring 2008, 38 percent strongly agreed; in fall 2011, 83 percent strongly agreed.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

There are 10 advanced programs at the university consisting of: Elementary Education, Physical Education, Science Education, Special Education (SPED), and Music Education at the master's level; Elementary Education and Special Education at the specialist level; and Elementary Education, Special Education, and Music Education, at the doctoral level. Three of these programs are accredited by other accrediting agencies. The following programs have been approved through 2015: ASHA (American Speech-Language Hearing Association for Deaf Education) and NASM (National Association of Schools of Music for Music education at both the master's and doctoral levels). The Early Childhood Education program at the master's level has been dropped since the last review due to lack of enrollment.

Advanced candidates in the unit have in-depth knowledge of the content they teach, with the exception of those in the Physical Education (master's) program. Program entrance requirements (grade point average, Praxis II PLT and Specialty Area scores, years of teaching experience) ensure a basic level of content knowledge at the beginning of the programs. Evidence in the Elementary Education master's, specialist, and doctoral programs' reports prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reports for the university confirms that candidates have adequate content knowledge. Annually, each program submits Student Learning Outcome (SLO) data as a part of the university's assessment system which is reported to SACS. These assessments are aligned to the National Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Five Core Propositions. SLOs include the following types of outcomes: "articulate content and theory, articulate pedagogy, conduct and use research to improve teaching and learning, value and participate in professional development, synthesize and articulate learning theories, and
integrate technological resources." Data are provided for fall 2010 through spring 2011 on several assessments in the SACS reports including comprehensive examination, portfolio, exit/follow up survey, field project, qualifying examination, and dissertation results. The first Student Learning Outcome (SLO) is directly related to content knowledge. Although the Ns for these three semesters of data are quite small, interviews with faculty, graduates, and candidates provide additional support that candidates in these programs know their content. For example, 100 percent (4 of 4) of the candidates in the Elementary Education master's level program passed the portfolio at the exemplary level for summer 2010; there were no candidates who submitted the portfolio in fall 2010 or spring 2011. For summer 2010, 100 percent (12 of 12) of the candidates in this program passed the comprehensive examination above the marginal level; no candidates took the comprehensive exam in fall 2010; and 100 percent (3 of 3) of candidates passed in spring 2011. There are a total of 58 candidates in this program.

The SACS reports and interviews with faculty and candidates also confirm that candidates in the Science Education, master's level and the Special Education (master's, specialist, and doctoral levels) programs have in-depth knowledge of the content they teach. For example, 100 percent (4 of 4) of candidates in the SPED master's program passed the content and theoretical knowledge section of the portfolio in summer 2010, 100 percent (1 of 1) in fall 2010, and 100 percent (11 of 11) in spring 2011.

As expressed by unit administrators, lines between the Doctor of Education (EdD) and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) programs are blurred; candidates in both programs may or may not plan to work in P-12 school settings. Therefore data for those programs are combined.

Example candidate portfolios were reviewed for the Physical Education (master's) program, but no data were provided.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Part C.2 (candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions) for six of the nine SPA reviews note sufficient data is evident to demonstrate candidates have met this element. Two program reports, English Licensure, and Special Education, note the need for refinement of assessments to provide clear evidence that this standard is met. The Physical Education report stated that candidates appear to need work in the area of lesson planning. The review for Elementary Education is in progress; however the 2010 report stated the need for assessments that would provide evidence of candidate proficiency in each content area.

Data are available for the Business Technology Education (BTE). Data from three assessments are used to assess pedagogical content knowledge and skills: the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) which is aligned with the National Association of Business Teacher Education Standards, the statewide Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), and the In-class Evaluation instrument. The three assessments use the following rubric rating scores: Exemplary=4, Mastery=3, Marginal=2, Unacceptable=1. TCPE data from 2008-2011 indicate 100 percent (14/14) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than 3 on pedagogical content knowledge and skills indicators. TIAI data indicate 100 percent (9/9) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than 3 on pedagogical content knowledge.
and skills indicators. In-class Evaluation data from 2008-2011 indicate 57 percent (8/14) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than 3 on pedagogical content knowledge and skills indicators.

Data are available for the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) to assess pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Candidates complete a professional portfolio that is scored on a three-point rubric (Exemplary=3; Mastery=2; Unacceptable=1) aligned to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). From 2008-2011, 100 percent (7/7) of candidates scored equal or greater than 2 on pedagogical content knowledge and skills indicators.

The Mississippi Department Education (MDE) First-Year Teacher Survey data show that from 2008-2011 148 principals responded with overall satisfaction of 97 percent; 100 percent satisfaction was reported on Item 16 (pedagogical content knowledge and skills) for first-year teachers prepared at the university.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Advanced candidates, with the exception of those in the Physical Education (master's) program, demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning. Data from the portfolio, comprehensive examination, and exit/follow up survey for the master's programs in both Elementary Education and SPED as well as interviews with faculty, candidates, and recent graduates confirm these candidates' ability to apply their pedagogy. Artifacts presented for the portfolio, responses to scenarios in the comprehensive exam, and responses to survey questions after graduates have been working in the field provide evidence that candidates have this ability. For the specialist level Elementary Education and SPED programs, these candidate data result from the portfolio, field project and oral defense, and the exit/follow up survey. At the doctoral level for both the Elementary Education and SPED programs, data from the qualifying exam, portfolio, comprehensive examination, dissertation, and exit/follow up survey are presented to provide this evidence.

The SACS Student Learning Outcome # 2 addresses the candidate's ability to integrate content, instruction, and assessment for the Science Education (master's) program. The comprehensive examination and SME 601 written assignment and oral presentation assessments are linked to this Student Learning Outcome.

Sample candidate portfolios were reviewed for the Physical Education (master's) program, but no data were provided.

Sample candidate portfolios were reviewed for the Physical Education (master's) program, but no data were provided.

**1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**
Part C.2 (candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions) for six of the nine SPA reviews note sufficient data is evident to demonstrate candidates have met this element. Two program reports, English Licensure, and Special Education, note the need for refinement of assessments to provide clear evidence that this standard is met. The Physical Education report stated that candidates appear to need work in the area of lesson planning only. The review for Elementary Education is in progress; however the 2010 report indicates that adequate evidence is provided to demonstrate candidates have met this element.

Data are available for the Business Technology Education (BTE). Data from two assessments are used to assess professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills: the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) which is aligned with the National Association of Business Teacher Education Standards and the statewide Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI). The two assessments use the following rubric rating scores: Exemplary=4, Mastery=3, Marginal=2, Unacceptable=1. TCPE data from 2008-2011 show candidates scored an average of 3.49 on the Knowledge and Skills section indicating that candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills to facilitate learning. TIAI data from fall 2009-fall 2011 show candidates scored an average of 3.69 on the Teaching for Learning section indicating that candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills to facilitate learning.

Data are available for the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) to assess professional and pedagogical knowledge. Candidates complete a professional portfolio that is scored on a three-point rubric (Exemplary=3; Mastery=2; Unacceptable=1) aligned to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). From 2008-2011, 100 percent (7/7) of candidates scored equal to or greater than 2 on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills indicators.

The MDE First-Year Teacher Survey data show from 2008-2011 that 148 principals responded with 99 percent indicating satisfaction related to Indicator 32 (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills) for first-year teachers prepared at the university.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Advanced candidates, with the exception of those in the Physical Education (master's) program, are engaged in professional activities and are aware of current research and policies. Faculty and candidates describe multiple opportunities for candidates to conduct action research, reflect upon national research, and discuss current issues such as Common Core Standards, charter schools, and state teacher and principal evaluation changes. In addition to faculty, candidate, and graduate responses to interviews, evidence from the SACS reports for Student Learning Outcomes # 3 and # 4 confirms that advanced candidates are using current research and policies to inform their practice and are active in professional activities. Specifically, evidence is provided by the comprehensive examination and the exit/follow up survey for the SPED master's level program; the portfolio and exit/follow up survey for the Elementary Education (master's) and the SPED (doctoral) programs; the portfolio, field project and oral defense, and the exit/follow up survey for the Elementary Education and SPED programs (specialist); and the portfolio, dissertation, and exit/follow up survey for the Elementary Education (doctoral) program.

SACS Student Learning Outcomes # 3 and # 4 also provide data for the Science Education (master's) program from the comprehensive examination. Additional data from the SME 601 written assignment and oral presentation confirm candidates' awareness of current research and policies. However, these assessments do not clearly show that these candidates are engaged in professional activities.

Sample candidate portfolios were reviewed for the Physical Education (master's) program, but no data
were provided.

### 1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Part C.3 (candidate effects on P-12 student learning) for six of the nine SPA reviews note sufficient data is evident to demonstrate candidates have met this element. Two program reports, English Licensure, and Special Education, note the need for refinement of assessments to provide clear evidence that this standard is met. The Physical Education report stated that candidates appear to need work in the area of selecting/creating assessments and implementing changes based upon student performance but also note the results are trending upward. The review for Elementary Education is in progress; however the 2010 report indicates that some evidence is provided to demonstrate candidates have met this element.

Data are available for the Business Technology Education (BTE). Data from two assessments are used to assess impact on student learning: the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE) which is aligned with the National Association of Business Teacher Education Standards and the statewide Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI). The two assessments use the following rubric rating scores: Exemplary=4, Mastery=3, Marginal=2, Unacceptable=1. TCPE data from 2008-2011 indicate 100 percent (14/14) of BTE candidates scored equal or greater than 3 on impact on student learning indicators. TIAI data indicate 100 percent (9/9) of BTE candidates scored equal to or greater than 3 on student learning indicators.

Data are available for the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) to assess impact on student learning. Candidates complete a professional portfolio that is scored on a three-point rubric (Exemplary=3; Mastery=2; Unacceptable=1) aligned to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). From 2008-2011, 100 percent (7/7) of candidates scored equal to or greater than 2 on student learning indicators.

Indicators from the Teacher Preparation Program Exit Survey provide candidate assessment on student learning. Data from spring 2008 through fall 2011 reflect an increase in teacher candidate confidence with implementation of student learning strategies.

#### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit reports 100 percent pass rates (mastery or exemplary) on the Professional Portfolio for the Elementary education, and SPED programs at the master’s, specialist, and doctoral levels. The Professional Portfolio Rubric is aligned to the National Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Five Core Propositions at all levels for both areas. Requirements for this assessment include field projects, classroom simulations, lesson planning projects, research papers, professional organization participation, and action research projects. Summary data as well as example portfolios confirm these results.

Interviews with advanced candidates in programs confirm that they are able to describe major concepts of theories and student learning and give examples of the use of student assessment data to make decisions about learning, and collaboration with school and community resource personnel to support
student learning. Data are provided in the SACS reports for the Elementary Education (master's) and the SPED (doctoral) programs in the portfolio and exit/follow up survey to demonstrate candidates' ability to use student data and community resources. Candidates, when interviewed, were able to give multiple examples of utilization of community resources in their classrooms and with their students and parents. In addition to the portfolio and exit/follow up survey data, the specialists programs in Elementary Education and SPED provide data from the field project and oral defense to support evidence of accomplishment of these skills. The Elementary Education doctoral program candidates complete the portfolio, dissertation, and exit/follow up survey to ensure that they have gained these skills. The comprehensive examination and exit/follow up survey provide this evidence for the SPED (master's) program.

Data from the SACS reports for the Science Education (master's) program do not clearly show that these candidates are able to analyze student assessment data to make decisions or to utilize community resources to support student learning.

Sample candidate portfolios were reviewed for the Physical Education (master's) program, but no data were provided.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

There are 8 other school personnel programs at the university consisting of: Educational Administration and Supervision, Counseling and Personnel Services, Deaf Education, Reading Specialist, and Library and Information Science at the master's level; Educational Administration at the specialist level; and Educational Administration and School Psychology at the doctoral level. Two of these programs are accredited by other accrediting agencies. The following program has been approved through 2012: APA (American Psychological Association for School Psychology); and most recently, the Library and Information Science program was approved by ALA (American Library Association) in March 2012. The Reading Specialist (master's level) program is recognized by IRA through 12/31/2018; all elements of all standards are met. The Master of Education in Educational Administration and Supervision program (building level) and the Educational Administration program at the doctoral level (district) were recognized with conditions by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) on 8/1/2011.

Evidence is provided to show that candidates in the School Counseling (master's) program know their field, know students, families, and communities, and can explain concepts in their standards. Data for the portfolios (SCS 651, Practicum) from fall 2010 and fall 2011 as well as interviews with faculty, candidates, and recent graduates confirm this knowledge. Although data are not provided, support that these candidates use research and technology to improve practice is provided in the candidate work from the CPS 617, Career Education Projects and from candidate and faculty interviews.

For the Educational Administration programs that submitted reports to ELCC (Master's, building level and Doctoral, district level) data from only one application of assessments were provided. Numbers of candidates were omitted from assessments and licensure exam data were combined in a way that made it impossible to determine whether or not the 80 percent pass rate requirement was met.
Since the Educational Administration Program (specialist level) was recognized through 12/31/13 by ELCC from the previous review cycle, no additional data were provided.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning for Other School Professionals</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Interviews with faculty, candidates, and recent graduates and a review of data and documents from the SCS 651, Practicum, portfolio confirm that candidates in the School Counseling program are able to create positive school environments; build on students' developmental levels; understand student, family, and community diversity; and understand the policy context in which they work. Portfolio data are provided for fall 2010 and fall 2011.

For the Educational Administration programs (master's, specialist, and doctoral levels), please refer to comments in section 1e above.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

At the initial level, the Dispositions of Teacher Candidates Matrix identifies the indicators related to dispositions on which candidates are assessed at varied transition points. The following assessments, identified in the matrix, are used to provide evidence of candidates' dispositions: the Cooperating Teacher Summative Evaluation, the In-Class Evaluation, the TCPE, and the TIAI.

The TCPE and TIAI include wording specific to the idea of fairness. While no direct language was found relating to a belief that all students can learn some items in the assessments appear to measure this disposition. For example, item 18 in the TIAI states, "Provides learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of diverse learners (i.e., learning styles, multiple intelligences and enrichment/remedial needs)." Item Q5 in the TCPE states, "Candidate's plans and practices adapt instruction for individual needs."

These assessments are scored on a four-point scale, and data from 2008-2011 show that candidates scored equal or greater than 2 (mastery and exemplary) on all indicators. The TIAI data indicate that initial teacher candidates scored an average of 3.70 on indicators related to candidates' demonstration of professional dispositions as compared to the employer survey data which reported an average of 99 percent satisfaction on candidates' professional dispositions.

Additionally, all ITP candidates assess themselves across four non-academic categories: Communication/Interpersonal Skills, Emotional and Physical Abilities, Cognitive Dispositions, and Personal and Professional Requirements. Data show that 99% of candidates believe they possess the
dispositions outlined in each of the categories.

Finally, the MDE First-Year Teacher Survey uses 45 competency-based affirmations developed from the TIAI. In 2008-09, 152 first-year teachers responded with 97 percent satisfaction with the teacher education program, and 64 principals responded with 95 percent satisfaction with teachers prepared at the university. In 2009-10, 89 first-year teachers responded with 100 percent satisfaction and 43 principals responded with 98 percent satisfaction. In 2010-11, 60 first-year teachers responded with 100 percent satisfaction and 41 principals responded with 98 percent satisfaction.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

| Interviews with faculty and candidates confirm that candidates in advanced programs are familiar with expected dispositions. Data from the portfolios and exit/follow up surveys confirm that advanced candidates in the Elementary Education (master's) and SPED (doctoral) programs demonstrate behaviors consistent with fairness and the belief that all students can learn, and these dispositions are reflected in their work with students, families, and communities. These dispositions are evident in the data from comprehensive examinations and exit/follow up surveys for the SPED (master's) program, the field projects and oral defense, portfolios, and exit/follow up surveys for the Elementary Education (specialist) and SPED (specialist) programs; the portfolios, dissertations, and exit/follow up surveys for the Elementary Education (doctoral); and the comprehensive examinations and the written assignments and oral presentations in SME 601 for the Science Education (master's) programs. The Unit Alumni Survey, first administered in January 2012, addresses dispositions for all programs; these data are not yet available. |

### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

| Interviews with faculty, candidates, and recent graduates provide ample examples of candidates' knowledge of expected dispositions and the implementation of multiple assessments related to their dispositions throughout the leadership and counseling programs. Dispositional data are addressed in one of the 13 areas of the portfolio rubric for Educational Administration and Supervision programs and the instructions state that candidates must include for dispositions "Any documents that support the experiences you list in this essay." Candidates in the School Counseling (master's) know their fields, students, families, communities, research, and technology to and apply that knowledge to improve practice. They create positive learning environments by building on students' developmental levels and understanding the diversity and policy context in which they work. The Unit Alumni Survey, first administered in January 2012, addresses dispositions for all programs; these data are not yet available. |

### Overall Assessment of Standard

| The unit has demonstrated that the initial programs prepare teacher candidates to work in schools. Candidates demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The assessments used indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidate data are provided for advanced program assessments, with the exception of those from the Physical Education (master's) program. Assessments, scoring guides, and standard alignment are provided in the SACS reports to the university. Data for summer 2010, fall 2010, and spring 2011 are included. With the exception of those from the Physical Education (master's) program, advanced program candidates are prepared to work in schools and can demonstrate their content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. They appear to be meeting |
institutional, state, and professional standards. Insufficient data are provided to determine whether or not candidates in Educational Administration and Supervision programs possess content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions and meet institutional, state, and professional standards.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. With the exception of student teaching, the unit has not compiled, aggregated, or analyzed data to demonstrate that the candidates have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to help all students learn.</td>
<td>The unit has complied, aggregated and analyzed data using multiple assessments across program transition points to demonstrate that candidates have the knowledge skills and dispositions to help all students learn. Interviews, individual SPA reports as well as Institutional Report exhibits provide evidence that candidates are assessed using multiple indicators and multiple measure. The Professional Education Council annually compile, aggregate, and analyze data. Also data from the university's annual academic program assessments reports are reviewed annually by the Unit Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The unit lacks a sufficient amount of data to demonstrate that candidates meet institutional, national, and professional standards.</td>
<td>With the exception of the Physical Education (master's) program and the Educational Leadership program, the unit now provides sufficient data to demonstrate that candidates meet institutional, national and professional standards. Assessments are aligned to standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Educational Leadership programs lack sufficient data to demonstrate that all candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.</td>
<td>As noted in the ELCC SPA report, data from only one application of assessments were provided, numbers of candidates were omitted from assessments and licensure exam data were combined in a way that made it impossible to determine whether or not the 80 percent pass rate requirement was met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Physical Education program lacks evidence that candidates possess the content and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.</td>
<td>Sample candidate portfolios were reviewed for the Physical Education (master's) program, but no aggregated data were provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation | Met
Advanced Preparation

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes
No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

2a. Assessment System

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit assessment system was developed in 2007 to collect and analyze data relative to candidate performance and unit operations. The assessment system reflects the conceptual framework for the unit and encompasses outcomes identified in content specific professional and Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards. Currently the unit is aligning the Common Core State Standards and the Mississippi Educator Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct, adopted by the state of Mississippi in 2011, with assessment instruments. Tk20, an electronic data management system offered through a commercial vendor, is utilized to systematically collect and aggregate data for review of initial programs. Other sources of data include, the Mississippi State Department of Education's assessment of first year teachers and their employers to determine effectiveness of program completers as well as data collected within Southern's Online Accessible Records (SOAR), WEAVEonline, and Institutional Research (IR).

The transition points and key assessments are clearly identified for the initial preparation programs. The four transition points for the initial programs are: Admission to Program, Midpoint, Teacher Candidacy
Completion, and Licensure. Conceptual framework constructs assessed at each point are specified in Table 6 along with important benchmarks to be met at each transition point. In addition, the assessment tools used and the process used to track candidates through the transition points of the program are well defined. Examples of assessment tools are standardized test scores, transcripts, construct-specific rubrics, field experience assessments, and a program exit survey.

Program improvement is based on data included in reports written for SPAs and the annual academic program assessments. Specific assessments and evaluation measures used in program improvement include Praxis II content area examinations, assessment of dispositions, course-based assignments, field experience assessments, and post graduation surveys. Data used to assess unit operations include: student admissions, graduation rates, Title II data, the Professional Education Data System (PEDS), program enrollment, retention rates, faculty workloads, budget, external funding and grant productivity. This information is compiled from within the unit as well as from university administrative offices.

The Professional Education Council (PEC) is the governing body for the unit and membership includes Professional Education Faculty (PEF) representatives from each department with teacher education programs, representatives from Educational Field Experiences office, and members of the College of Education and Psychology administrative staff. The PEC established the Unit Review Committee (URC) to review unit operations and analyze aggregated data on candidate performance. URC members include representatives from each program in the unit and URC is open to all PEF. Professional Education Committee (PEC) Bylaws indicated that P-12 stakeholders and program candidates were included in membership of the PEC when established in 2007; however, these two groups are not included in current membership groups identified in the Bylaws.

The unit has established processes to ensure the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment procedures. Assessment procedures and rubrics for course assignments are included in course syllabi and distributed at the first of the semester. Each section of a specific course in teacher education uses the same syllabus that includes the alignment of assessments with national, state, and professional standards. Guidelines for completing assignments are discussed and a review of rubrics is completed in class to ensure that all candidates have the same understanding of expectations. Unit-wide assessments are reviewed by the URC for accuracy and freedom from bias.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The transition points and key assessments for all advanced programs (ATP and OSP) are similar to the initial programs. The four transition points for the advanced programs are: Admission to Program, Midpoint, Program Exit, and Post Graduate. Conceptual framework constructs assessed at each point are specified along with important benchmarks to be met at each transition point. In addition, the process used to track candidates through the transition points of the program is identified. Examples of assessment tools utilized are standardized test scores, transcripts, Specialized Professional Organizations (SPAs) or program specific assessment rubrics, portfolios, research projects, an oral defense, a comprehensive examination and an interview or program exit survey.

Only the educational leadership and counselor education programs submit their data to Tk20 at this time. In fall 2011, the Graduate Caucus recommended that all graduate programs utilize Tk20 to assist with data collection and linkage of standards/competencies with program assessments. This recommendation was presented on the PEC agenda in February 2012 with a final decision pending. Advanced programs, not storing data in Tk20, maintain their records with in the department on Excel spreadsheets and within the university assessment system for Southern Association of Colleges and
Schools (SACS) reporting called WEAVEonline. Assessments for each transition point are identified on Table 6-Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments.

### 2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The unit has a systematic process for collecting and analyzing data as indicated in the Assessment System Timeline. The Unit's Assessment System Timeline identifies individuals, offices, and programs responsible for providing data and where the data are stored. Data are maintained in four electronic systems for the initial program candidates: Tk20, Southern's Online Accessible Records (SOAR), WEAVEonline, and Institutional Research (IR).

The SOAR system provides the unit information on required standardized test scores (ACT, SAT, and PRAXIS I and II), admission data, student and faculty demographic data, enrollment data, grades, and advising transcripts. Aggregate student performance data on unit-wide assessments and assessments aligned with special professional association (SPA) standards, as well as field placement information are reported from the Tk20 electronic data management system. In addition, the annual program reports developed and submitted by program coordinators to WEAVEonline through the university assessment process for SACS accreditation, provide an opportunity to review program effectiveness through the assessment of specific student learning outcomes. Action plans related to analysis of outcome data are developed for each program. Institutional Research (IR) provides information related to program enrollment, program retention rates, student credit-hour generation, faculty workload, and data for the completion of the Title II IHEA report and the PEDS report. Results of data analysis are shared with the Unit Review Committee (URC) who, in turn, makes recommendations to the Professional Education Committee (PEC) for program and unit operations changes.

Assessment data are disaggregated by alternate route (Master of Arts in Teaching), off-campus (Gulf Coast Campus), and online programs (Teacher Assistant Program, etc). Personnel in the NCATE office are responsible for disaggregating candidate assessment data stored in Tk20 (initial licensure, as well as educational leadership and counselor education at the advanced level). Other advanced programs store data within Excel spreadsheets, disaggregate data according to traditional programs, off-campus and online programs before disseminating data to faculty, the URC, and the PEC. The URC reviews aggregate data related to candidate performance and uses the results to recommend changes for programs and unit operations to the Professional Education Committee (PEC), the governing body for the unit. The URC is also responsible for the evaluation of the unit's assessment system to determine whether the unit operations and candidate performance are being assessed properly and whether unit-wide improvements are occurring as a result of the assessment system. The Professional Education Faculty (PEF) are invited to attend monthly PEC meetings where data-driven decisions are discussed. Evidence of review and recommendations for changes are provided in minutes to meetings along with the PEC decisions related to the recommendations.

Initial and advanced candidates who wish to file a formal complaint are directed to university procedures outlined in the Student Survival Guide. The Recruitment, Admission, Dismissal, Appeals, and Retention (RADAR) Committee reviews formal appeals or requests made by initial candidates who are denied admission to teacher education or student teaching and/or removed from teacher education.
This committee makes a recommendation to the unit head for a final decision. Records of all paperwork and/or complaints are maintained in the CoEP Dean's office with the original copies filed in the student's curriculum folder. If a candidate alleges a difficulty related to such areas as gender, disability, race, national origin, the candidate follows the procedures set by the Office of Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity or the Office of Disability Accommodations.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Data collection and analysis in the advanced programs follows the same procedures as initial programs.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data are systematically collected, aggregated, and disaggregated for analysis of course, program, and clinical experience effectiveness. The process for applying data-driven decisions to programs and unit operations is outlined in the Professional Education Unit Data Flow Chart. In addition, the Assessment System Timeline and the Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments table provide evidence that the unit regularly and systematically reviews data to determine program areas that may need to be reexamined or refined.

Data-driven changes are identified in the reports presented to the special professional associations, minutes of PEC meetings, and through interviews with departmental faculty and the PEC representatives. Changes that have occurred as a result of data review include changes in portfolio assignments, realignment of assessment instruments with standards, and choices of professional development workshops. Qualitative data from elementary students led to a change in curriculum in a mathematics methods course. Data from the Praxis II test in social studies led to a change in curriculum in a history methods course. Scores from the TIAI resulted in a change in the sequence of courses so that the classroom management course is completed later in the program.

Candidates and faculty members who teach and supervise initial candidates have immediate access to individual candidate data within the Tk20 electronic data management system. Supervisors meet periodically with candidates to discuss their progress. Faculty also have access to program assessment reports within WEAVE online assessment reporting. At the program and unit levels, data are shared with advisory groups to highlight program strengths and to solicit feedback for program improvements.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The process and procedures for use of data at the advanced level is the same as for initial programs; however, data are not maintained in Tk20 for all advanced level programs. Those who maintain data in Excel spreadsheets provide the data to faculty and others for review.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has developed and is implementing an assessment system that reflects both the conceptual
framework and proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. Assessment system data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, summarized, analyzed, and reported on candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The unit demonstrates the capacity to use data to make changes that will improve program and unit operations. The unit makes use of appropriate technology to support its assessment system. In addition, the unit has taken steps to establish and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its performance assessment procedures.

**Strengths** [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

The assessment system clearly reflects elements contained within the conceptual framework and professional and state standards. Multiple assessments incorporated at multiple transition points are used to determine candidate performance and program effectiveness in initial programs. Data are regularly and systematically collected, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance and program quality in the initial programs.

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unit does not involve P-12 stakeholders in the development of the assessment system nor regularly or systematically involve them in the evaluation of its assessment system.

There is no indication in the institutional report, in on-site documentation, or through data gathered from interviews that the P-12 stakeholders were involved in the development of the assessment system or are included in review of data. Professional Education Committee (PEC) Bylaws did indicate that P-12 stakeholders and program candidates were included in membership of the PEC when established in 2007; however, these two groups are not included in current membership identified in the Bylaws.

**Recommendation for Standard 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report** [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables,
percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes  No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Although there are numbers of collaborative activities and indirect collaborative links, council minutes and interviews with faculty and practitioners do not provide evidence that school partners have systematic involvement in the design, delivery and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. The 2007 Professional Education Council (PEC) bylaws required representation from school partners and candidates; however current bylaws deleted both. The unit reported the formal school/unit link as the state mandated P-16 Council. The council is a function of the two area Superintendents Consortia. Superintendents reported that 'principals and/or teachers are invited to their meeting on an as needed basis.' Interviews and minutes reflect no regular agenda item related to the design, development and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. Superintendents are unaware of any discussions of effectiveness data or their use to improve the clinical/intern experiences.

There are multiple informal collaborations, events and some program advisory groups. There are also individual faculty efforts to develop stronger relationships with schools. However these are limited and uneven across unit programs. The unit developed a USM Blue Ribbon Implementation Plan (2009) in response to state-mandated partnership guidelines, which would strengthen partnerships.

Initial candidates participate in three semesters of field experiences and two seven-week student teaching placements.

All initial and advanced placements for clinical and field experience at both campuses are administered through the Educational Field Experience (EFE) office and are jointly determined by school partners,
unit faculty and staff. EFE staff request placements through school administrators/contacts. As university faculty and clinical supervisors develop relations with school faculty, they provide input on placements to the office of field experiences. Principals screen teachers to determine that mentor teacher criteria are met and recommend specific placements. The unit provides the appropriate handbooks to cooperating teachers and offers orientation training for cooperating teachers, covering the conceptual framework, candidate/cooperating teacher expectations, policies, assessment measures, reporting forms and the use of the Tk20 data management system.

Mentor teachers assist students in field placements and collaborate in the evaluation of clinical experiences and student teaching. University faculty members visit the partner school sites six times for field experiences and for student teachers, to observe and discuss lesson planning, reflections, and experiences with candidates and to collaboratively review candidates’ progress. Currently, seventy-seven school districts (359 schools) accept candidates at both the initial and advanced levels.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Advanced teaching and other school personnel programs have two integrated components—coursework and field experiences. Program candidates often complete their field experiences in their home schools with properly certified faculty who meet the unit's minimum requirements. The required clinical experiences have clearly identified outcomes aligned with national and state standards in which candidates identify an area in a school for inquiry and have an opportunity to research and/or provide leadership in that area. In order to ensure diverse settings, candidates are assigned clinical experiences and research projects in their home schools as well as other settings that differ from the home school population demographics. Rubrics are used to assess the projects and to ensure diversity program outcomes are met.

**3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

All initial and advanced programs have clearly defined and monitored criteria for admission and exit. Entry criteria for all programs include multiple measures that include satisfactory grade point averages, acceptable ratings on dispositions, and demonstrated readiness for in-school application of content and pedagogy. Initial program admission also requires a subscription to the Tk20 data management system, criminal background check, and satisfactory completion of early field experiences that require students to observe in schools, tutor individuals and small groups, participate in community and school events, and assist mentor teachers with instruction.

Criteria for school faculty are outlined by program in mentor handbooks, mentor training, and/or candidate application processes—Cooperating Teacher Manual, Teacher Candidate Contract, Educational Leader Mentor Handbook, Mentor Teacher Training Workshop (initial) and Mentor Training Seminar for Education Leadership.
Prior to the final student teaching experience, traditional initial candidates enroll in three field experience blocks and are visited four times by mentors who support candidate development, assess progress and collaborate with the teacher mentor. These experiences range from 40 to 120 hours in schools. In addition, the traditional initial candidates are enrolled in two student teaching placements during one semester, completing from 535 to 610 in school hours.

Master of Arts in Teaching candidates are practicing teachers. Field experience assignments from coursework are carried out in their classrooms or school. A minimum of 90 hours of course-based experiences is required for each candidate, conducted in the schools in which he/she is teaching. The culminating teaching experience is required that includes a 6 semester supervised internship experience.

For both traditional and MAT initial certification routes, in school supervision is jointly conducted by experienced teachers and program faculty who provide feedback. Lesson plan rubrics and assessments focus on modification of instruction to address the instructional needs of all learners, and the integration of instructional technology. For initial programs, students enter the formative and summative data resulting from the clinical experiences into Tk20. All program exit criteria include an assessment of technology to support teaching and learning.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

All candidates in advanced programs for teachers are required to complete course imbedded field experience assignments in each of the required courses. These requirements focus on the application of learning in the classroom, analysis of student learning, use of technology, and reflection on classroom and candidate practices. Since the candidates are full time teachers, the field experiences are carried out in their classrooms. In addition, some programs have a required residency period with additional defined experiences.

Candidates in other school professional programs are required to participate in course-based field experiences and clinical practice. The course-based experiences require the use of data to improve instruction, integration of technology into teaching and research, in order to improve teaching and learning. The required internships range from two to four semesters and support the application of research and theory into practice with a focus on improve student learning.

The benchmarks and assessments for all programs are reflected in multiple documents including: portfolio rubrics, SACS reports, mentor handbook, and student teacher handbook, and course sequence sheets. Candidate, faculty and educational field experiences interviews support the application and assessment of criteria.

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:
There is ample evidence from test data, interviews, portfolio entries and student work samples to determine that candidates from all programs develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to help all students learn. Admission criteria to clinical practice, along with candidate interview data, indicate that readiness for clinical practice is carefully monitored and enforced.

For initial candidates, each phase of field experiences and clinical practice is assessed using the following: In-Class Evaluation Instrument, the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, and the Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation, and portfolio artifacts. The summative data reflect candidates' ability in planning and preparation, communication and interaction, teaching for learning, management of the learning environment, and assessment of student learning, all focused on effective instruction for all students. Candidates are assessed in clinical practice by university supervisors/clinical faculty and teacher mentors using the rubrics for lesson planning, long-range and short-range planning, instruction, creating an environment that promotes learning, managing a classroom, and professionalism. Candidates also complete self-evaluations and reflections, following consultations with the cooperating teacher and university supervisors. At the end of each placement, the cooperating teachers and university supervisors complete a summative assessment.

Candidate placements for all programs are secured and monitored by the EFE office to ensure a diversity of placements and experiences that include P-12 students with exceptionalities, diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Interviews with candidates and mentor teachers, as well as superintendent and school principal input, indicate that graduates have mastered and can apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Interviews and reviews of files indicate that candidates in advanced teaching and other school personnel programs are required to keep reflections on clinical experience assignment/projects and to develop a portfolio with artifacts and reflections for each state and national standard as well the appropriate conceptual framework themes—"Believes all can learn," and "Is able to teach so that all can succeed in a complex, changing society". The reflections and artifacts provide the program and school mentors with the background and development of the candidate's knowledge and skills as the field experience progresses. Mentors have conversations with candidates using the reflections, and review of portfolio artifacts. This ongoing feedback and communication ensures that the candidate is supported throughout the field experience. Comprehensive exams, research projects, and other assessment measures ensure mastery of candidates, development and application of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to help all students learn.

### Overall Assessment of Standard

Field experiences and clinical practice experiences are substantive, monitored by program/clinical faculty and teacher mentors, and aligned with state, national standards and the units conceptual framework. Though there are extensive ad hoc collaborative efforts initiated by individual faculty, there is a lack of evidence of a strong, ongoing, structured partnership between the unit and school partners. Assessments to ensure that candidates have the content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and dispositions to teach all children, are clearly aligned to the conceptual framework, unit, state, and professional standards and are explicitly communicated to candidates, cooperating teachers, and supervisors.

The unit ensures that students are provided feedback from peers and supervisors that help them reflect on their ability to meet the needs of all learners. Candidates at all levels work with English language learners, students with disabilities, and both genders during their field experiences and clinical practice
experiences. They are assessed to ensure that they have developed and can apply in the school setting the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary for working with all students. The assessments include rating instruments, portfolio rubrics, and for advanced programs comprehensive exams and applied research and projects.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The unit's school partners do not participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. Though there are a number of collaborative activities and indirect collaborative links, there is no evidence to suggest that school partners have a systematic and intentional vehicle to be involved in the design, delivery and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice.

Recommendation for Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]
Standard 4: Diversity
The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes  No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation
Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Evidence is present that the professional education faculty is maintaining an awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning. The development of the knowledge, skills and dispositions to adapt instruction for and service to diverse populations is also evident. The professional education unit's conceptual framework and the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards describe unit-wide proficiencies. In the unit's conceptual framework, diversity is emphasized in two of the four themes. In one theme, the "Power of Knowledge to Inform" it is stated: Candidates will understand the implications of the diversity in the classroom. Candidates will apply knowledge, understanding, and awareness of themselves and others in and beyond the classroom to enhance student learning. In the other theme, the "Power to Inspire" it is stated: candidates will demonstrate through their actions a belief that all individuals can learn and benefit from an equal educational experience. The unit strives to produce candidates as educational professionals who have the power of knowledge to inform and inspire.

All candidates are required to take classroom management courses (CIE 302, CIS 302, SHS 451 or SPE 451) based on the candidates major. These courses equip candidates to create and provide healthy learning and teaching climates that identify and address the diverse needs and strengths and abilities of students. Additionally, Data Analysis and Evaluation (CISE 403 or REF 469) teaches candidates to monitor student progress and make decisions based on available data. SPE 400 Special Education provides candidates a strong foundation in the characteristics and needs of learners with exceptionalities and focuses on curricula, discipline, and cultural diversity. In the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program course CIE 603 Management and Organization of Diverse Classroom, candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for teaching students from diverse backgrounds. Candidates
are encouraged to communicate and demonstrate sensitivity to diverse students. Candidates interviewed shared a variety of experiences such as tutoring at the DuBard School on campus which deals with children with special needs. Some candidates described how this experience made them aware of strengths as future educators.

Candidates are evaluated in a variety of ways to ensure they demonstrate awareness of different learning styles and differentiate instruction for all students including exceptional and gifted students. Candidates must demonstrate the ability to connect lessons, instructions, and service to student experiences and culture. Diversity is assessed throughout the program using the following assessments: cooperating teacher summative evaluations, In-Class Evaluation, Teacher Candidate Performance Evaluation (TCPE), Teacher Internship Assessment Instrument (TIAI) and candidates' self-assessment using technical standards and dispositions. For example, the TCPE is aligned to the conceptual framework to assess the conceptual framework constructs. Indicators 3, 4, 5, 6, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 43 of the TCPE assess diversity. From 2008-2011, data indicate that candidates scored an average of 3.69 on a four-point scale demonstrating candidates' proficiency regarding diversity.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Advanced candidates complete a series of field experience and portfolio assignments documenting their experiences in diverse settings, culminating with master, specialist and doctoral courses. Below are examples of curriculum experiences that relate to diversity.

Educational Leadership coursework emphasizes the development of school leaders for diverse student populations. The candidates develop a building community paper, administer and analyze the Principal's Disposition Rating Scale, and complete case studies and reflections on ethnic/racial diversity. EDA 602, Leading Diverse School Populations is a newly designed course that introduces leadership concept for effective teaching and learning among diverse adult and student population.

In the School Counseling program candidates assess the school culture and develop a curriculum that addresses the student needs. In the Internship candidates identify students with special needs, assist with special education referrals and placements, and assist with school behavior issues. Also, interns provide individual, group, and career counseling services to students of diverse backgrounds.

The professional portfolio rubric for advanced candidates in Elementary Education Ed.S.and Special Education Ed.S. is also aligned with National Board Professional Teacher Standards. Outcome 3 is aligned to Proposition 1 related to diversity. From 2008-2011, 100 percent (6/6) of Ed.S.candidates scored 2 at the mastery or exemplary levels on the outcomes. The professional portfolio rubric for advanced candidates in Elementary Education PhD. And Special Education PhD. is also aligned to the NBPTS. Outcome 3 is aligned with Proposition 1 related to diversity. The team examined candidates' portfolios which demonstrated their ability to plan and focus on meeting students' diverse needs.

**4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty**

**Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation**

**Acceptable**

**Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation**

**Acceptable**

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation**
The Professional Education Unit faculty (initial and advanced) is less diverse than the student population in spite of departmental diversity plans that have guidelines for recruiting and maintaining minority faculty. The unit also has a plan that emphasizes the desire to have a diverse faculty. Onsite evidence supports the IR, Table 8 demographics, that only two percent of faculty represent diverse ethnic or racial groups. According to faculty demographics for the 2011-2012 academic year, there are 34 full-time professional education faculty, (which include 1 Black, non-Hispanic and 1 Hispanic or Latino). In an interview with the unit dean, she reported that the unit has been approved to hire 16 new lines. Efforts are being made to recruit a diverse pool of candidates.

Candidates encounter very limited faculty diversity during field-based and clinical experiences and while working on various research projects. Of the 310 most recent field and clinical placements, only 21 were with non-white school-based faculty. Although candidate placements ensure they work with diverse students who reflect the general diversity of the state and region, the diversity among university faculty, Professional Education Faculty and school based faculty is limited.

Efforts to recruit ethnic minority faculty include listing vacancies with The Chronicle of Higher Education, the USM Website, Psycareers.com and Higher Ed Jobs. The unit strategically recruits faculty for positions and students at minority recruiting fairs. Additionally, the unit attended the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) conference held in New Orleans in 2010 and Birmingham in 2011 to market USM programs and recruit minority faculty. The unit recently established a partnership with Linyi University in China to exchange research, share teaching experiences, and establish possible collaborations in the areas of educational technology.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

See discussion under 4b Initial - Table 8 reflects diversity of initial and advanced faculty.

**4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates**

| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The University of Southern Mississippi attracts students of varying ages and backgrounds. The current University student enrollment consists of 27 percent of students who are Black African Americans and 62 percent who are female (according to the 2010-2011 USM Fact Book). Female students outnumber male students in all ethnic categories. The current Professional Education Unit minority enrollment (Black/African American & Hispanic or Latino) in initial programs is 22 percent.

Candidates in the professional education unit have numerous opportunities to participate in experiences with diverse groups across numerous campus activities based on interview data. Collaboration is included as one of the essential components of the unit's conceptual framework and is emphasized throughout the initial and advanced curricula. Documents and interviews indicate that candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic backgrounds work collaboratively on committees and on other academic projects in the unit.

Evidence indicates that both the university and the unit, through campus and off-campus activities, make
a concerted effort to increase and maintain candidate diversity at the initial level. The university host activities for the Student Council for Exceptional Children, Together Enhancing Autism Awareness in Mississippi, and the Gay/Straight Alliance. The unit candidates and members of Kappa Delta Pi work together to host a reading fair in which local K-6 students present skits about popular children's books and teach specific literacy skills. Candidates interact with each other at the Annual Science Olympiad and events at the Biological Science Learning Center. The unit recruits students from area community college and high schools. Also, the university offers TEACH Grants to students pursuing degrees in education of the deaf, foreign languages, mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, and special education.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools**

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Evidence from data and interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, principals, and faculty members indicate that all candidates are provided field experiences and clinical practice in settings with students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. Candidates at the initial and advanced programs have field experiences or clinical practice in settings with exceptional populations to develop and practice knowledge acquired in classroom settings. Partner districts that serve as sites for these field experiences are located throughout the state of Mississippi. The diverse population of these placement sites include students with special needs, diverse ethnic and racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Onsite team visits to schools, and exhibited documents provide evidence that socioeconomic diversity percentages range from 21 percent to 95 percent of students who receive free and/or reduced lunches. Likewise ethnic diversity ranges from 27 percent to 98 percent non-white. An increasing number of international residents are providing more opportunities for candidates to work with linguistic diversity. The majority of candidates interviewed report working with students whose native language is not English.

Onsite review team members visited three of the partnership schools during the visit and found evidence of diversity among the student population. Candidates file a placement request form with the director of field experiences before each experience. Even though this form allows the candidate to express an interest in a particular school or district, it does not guarantee the request will be honored, as the unit requires a variety of grade levels and types of settings as well as tracking diversity of placements. The candidates indicated during interviews that feedback from peers, university supervisors and cooperating teachers helped them to reflect on their abilities to help all students. The candidates utilize journals to reflect on student teaching experiences and further develop skills working with diverse groups.
Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in the advanced programs explained how they participate in group projects and group presentations to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working effectively with diverse populations. Candidates complete activities at multiple sites including appropriate organizations such as social services groups and local businesses. Due to the diverse nature of populations represented by Mississippi P-12 schools, each candidate works with students who have exceptionalities or are from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic groups. In addition, many of the candidates' home schools represent diverse populations.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit is committed to providing candidates with meaningful experiences in diverse settings. The unit designs, implements and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate knowledge, skills and disposition necessary to help all students learn.

Candidates experiences with diverse higher education faculty and clinical faculty is limited. Also, the Professional Education unit faculty is less diverse than the student population in spite of departmental diversity plans that have guidelines for recruiting and maintaining faculty.

Appropriate evidence of experiences in working with diverse candidates and diverse students in P-12 settings is provided. The unit's comprehensive set of field-based courses ensures that candidates are provided meaningful and diverse experiences in P-12 student populations. The unit continues to develop and implement diverse experiences which enhance teacher effectiveness in the classroom.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity for candidates to interact with diverse faculty is limited.</td>
<td>All full time faculty with the exception of two faculty members in the program are white, non-Hispanic. Additionally, candidates encounter very limited faculty diversity during field-based and clinical experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report** [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

**Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes | No
jn | jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

**5a. Qualified Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The unit employed 140 full-time and part-time professional education faculty during the spring 2011 school year. There are 75 full-time faculty in the unit, 54 of whom are tenure/tenure-track. All tenure/tenure-track faculty have a terminal degree and are expected to maintain a record of scholarship and service to the P-12 field. Beginning in FY 09, university leadership imposed a hiring freeze on all
faculty and staff that was lifted in FY 12. During the hiring freeze, the university offered an early retirement incentive, and four staff and five college faculty participated. In sum, over the last two years, the unit has experienced a net loss of five tenure/tenure-track faculty. Data show that the college is searching for 16 new full-time faculty (10 lines will be unit faculty) to begin in the 2012-13 academic year (with four related positions being searched for in other colleges). New faculty hires go through a traditional search process approved by the institution's Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Office to insure a diverse pool of applicants.

According to the IR, the unit employed 57 part-time faculty in the last academic year. Forty-eight faculty have a specialist or doctoral degree in their field, and nine hold a master's degree. The part-time faculty consist of full-time faculty in the institution, but part-time in the unit; instructors; clinical or adjunct faculty. The unit has quality controls in place for part-time faculty, including an annual review as well as student evaluations. Candidate interviews confirmed that there is not an over-reliance on the use of part-time faculty in the advanced programs.

The unit also utilizes cooperating teachers in its partner schools to supervise student teachers. Data show there are 310 cooperating teachers, and all are licensed in the field they teach. These teachers are only assigned to supervise where they have experience and can document content expertise.

Unit policies and procedures for promotion/tenure and evaluation (including annual review for all faculty ranks) are in place to help provide excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Unit faculty strive for teaching excellence. The evidence demonstrates that assignments for initial candidates assess candidate understanding, prior knowledge, and interest by assigning projects that encourage students to reflect on their learning. Faculty members also utilize performance-based assessments that enable them to gauge how candidates translate content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge into practice. Candidates at the advanced level are also expected to reflect on their learning and practice in their own settings.

A review of faculty scholarship and service demonstrates that faculty have an understanding of their teaching content. Sample syllabi show course assignments are focused on the development of initial and advanced candidates' proficiencies outlined in state and national standards. Faculty are encouraged to utilize multiple strategies to engage the candidates, including use of current technology and small group instruction to promote candidate discussions. Faculty offer both online and traditional classroom instruction to meet candidates' needs. Faculty engage in self-assessment of the candidates' evaluation and feedback regarding their teaching.

Unit faculty members participated in the selection and implementation of the unit's commercial management system –Tk20. A significant portion of the unit's key performance assessments for initial programs are administered and supported by Tk20, in which faculty electronically document candidate performance and communicate assessment results to their students.
5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation
Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Tenure/tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in various types of scholarship based upon their discipline and interest. They remain current in their disciplines through active research that not only enhances their own knowledge and the knowledge of the candidates, but also contributes to the expanding knowledge base in professional education. Consequently, they not only conduct educational research, but they also are expected to publish results of their studies in refereed journals and present at professional meetings and conferences.

CoEP policies do not set a quantifiable standard within the unit regarding the number of publications or level of expected scholarship. However, exhibits show that during the last three years faculty have authored over 322 journal articles, 23 books, 30 book chapters, and 55 book reviews. Productivity reports also show that faculty have made numerous state and national presentations.

Policies and procedures are in place to evaluate the progress of full-time faculty regarding their level of scholarship.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation
Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The university expects all tenure/tenure-track faculty to engage in service to the education profession. Faculty members regularly provide service to and engage with colleagues in other colleges, the P-12 schools in the region, and to the profession (locally, state-wide, and nationally). Productivity reports show some faculty serve on editorial boards or as reviewers and most are affiliated with a state or national organization in their academic discipline. Data indicate that most faculty service is to the unit, local school districts or state organizations, while a lesser percentage is involved with international or national associations. Faculty service productivity is measured by annual evaluations and tenure review.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation
Acceptable
Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit and departments systematically and regularly assess faculty performance in conformity with institutional policy. The faculty evaluation process uses a combination of self-reflection and peer/committee review to improve teaching, scholarship, and service.

Department chairpersons complete an annual review of each faculty member's performance in scholarship, teaching and service. Overall faculty performance is based on each faculty member's agreed upon work assignment with the department chairperson for each academic year. The annual review as well as a third-year review also provide tenure-track faculty with a progress report toward promotion and tenure.

A major component of reviewing faculty's classroom teaching is initial and advanced candidates' evaluations of each course. Faculty interviews indicate such feedback is utilized to adjust course delivery to enhance candidate learning. Interviews with the department chairs reveal that they review and act upon the results of these evaluations as appropriate. Part-time faculty are evaluated by their department chairperson as well as the candidates.

Data show that in the last three academic years, the unit has had 28 faculty considered for tenure/promotion, of whom 25 were approved. During this same time, four faculty have been promoted from associate to full professor and two were denied. The university also has a provision for "post-tenure" review, details of which are stipulated in the University Handbook.

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Evidence shows that each department supports professional development for its full-time faculty. Professional development includes attendance or presentation at professional meetings and mentoring for new faculty. During this fiscal year, departments were given a $1,100 budget for professional travel for its full-time faculty, which signifies a total unit funding decrease of $127,820 since FY 2009. However, other professional development resources are available from the dean's office based upon budgetary savings within each department. Additionally, funds are made available to individual faculty through a competitive process. The unit also provides professional development activities to faculty based upon faculty goals and identified areas for growth.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

| Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit is staffed with qualified full-time and part-time faculty who prepare candidates to become professional educators. The faculty demonstrate quality in the traditional areas of assignment: teaching, scholarship and service. The unit is commended for the number and quality of faculty's scholarly papers and presentations. The departments and unit systematically evaluate faculty performance and provide for professional development. It is apparent that the faculty are committed to candidates' success.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is
Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Table 11 has the numbers in the first two columns switched. It should read 75 (full-time in the unit) and 41 (full-time in the institution, but part-time in the unit). The rest of the table is accurate.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes  No

jñ           jñ
6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The University of Southern Mississippi (USM) recognizes the College of Education and Psychology (CoEP) as the unit with governance responsibility for teacher education, and the dean is the designated head of the teacher education program. As unit head, the dean oversees six departments within the college and has two half-time associate deans (one of which serves as liaison to the education program at the Gulf Coast campus). In 2011, the interim CoEP dean was named as the permanent dean, of which there have been three in the last six years. The dean oversees 12 undergraduate and eight graduate education programs that lead to initial or advanced licensure and are housed in the College of Arts and Letters, the College of Health, the College of Education and Psychology, and the College of Science and Technology. Interviews with the CoEP, CoAL, CoH, and CoST department chairpersons reflect a strong working relationship and demonstrate coherence between the programs.

Within the CoEP, the dean has a Dean's Council -- consisting of the department chairs, associate deans, and various directors [Educational Field Experiences (EFE), Center for Gifted Studies, and Center for Research in Learning & Education] – that advises the dean on various matters. There is also a Professional Education Council (PEC), which serves as the official governance body for the unit. Its purpose is to ensure the quality of the professional education programs and includes membership from each academic area in the unit, the EFE office, and the dean's office. The CoEP also has standing committees that serve the following areas: Bylaws; Advisory; Curriculum; Research; Recruitment, Retention and Public Relations; and Scholarship and Awards.

The unit's recruitment and admission practices are coordinated by the Office of Undergraduate Admission. The university has an "open admission policy" for all undergraduate students; however, admission to the university does not guarantee candidates admission into the unit. The university has all its undergraduate/graduate admission requirements and procedures listed online and in hard copy, which includes information not only for prospective students, but also for transfer students, out-of-state students, and international students. The unit does not cap enrollment and has experienced over an eight percent enrollment growth since fall 2010. Graduate recruitment is done primarily within the program or department, and candidates must meet the admission requirements determined by the Graduate College. Review of the USM and unit websites and publications reveals that the academic calendar, catalogs, and publications are accurate and current.

Candidate advisement is handled by the various departments within the unit and is mandatory each semester. Specifically, the CISE department has its own professional advisor to serve undergraduate candidates in the department, while faculty are available for advisement in all unit programs for candidates admitted into an initial professional education program. Interview data show the primary reason for students seeking advisement assistance is to discuss class scheduling. There is no formal, annual assessment of the academic advisement process, only questions on a candidate's exit survey upon
graduation. The unit is considering a new system (AdvisorTrac) whereby all advisement appointments are logged electronically to monitor student use of the services, which affords for better use of resources, while improving support for students' educational needs. The unit also has an Office of Student Support Services, which is primarily responsible for educator certification, background checks, degree audits, and records management.

6b. Unit Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The university had a $309,485,000 overall annual budget in FY 11. In that year, 30 percent of the institution's budget was from student tuition, while 23 percent came from state appropriations (down from 30% in FY 09) and the remaining percentage was comprised of private giving, external funding, and revenues from auxiliaries and athletics. Of the budget for instruction, the CoEP receives approximately 11 percent (or $8.19 million), which is fourth of the five degree-granting colleges, and represents a $540,600 decrease from the previous year. Over the last three fiscal years, undergraduate student tuition has increased twice for a total of 12 percent (7.0 percent in FY 11 and 5.0 percent in FY 12). The institution did expend over $15.67 million in student scholarships (above that given by private donors) in FY 11 to help offset the cost of attendance.

Another component of the unit budget is indirect overhead costs from external grants and contracts. Over the last three years, the unit received a total of approximately $9.4 million in internal and external grant funding. The college as well as the individual departments each receives 10 percent of any indirect costs from externally-secured CoEP grants.

Like most public institutions throughout the state and nation, the condition of the economy has resulted in university as well as unit budget reductions. In FY 12, the percentage of the reductions varied throughout the five colleges, ranging from 1.07 percent (CoH) to 9.76 percent (CoB), with the CoEP receiving a reduction of 6.19 percent. Financial data for the last three years indicate that all five colleges experienced budget reductions, with the CoEP taking the third largest cut at 13.04 percent. An example of the impact of these cuts is that the CoEP dean's office has taken budgetary reductions in staff positions totaling over $286,000. Extensive analysis could not reveal the basis for the budgetary reductions given that it did not appear to be based upon enrollment, size/percent of budget, or other usual criterion. But nevertheless, even with these decreased allocations, the dean concluded that university administration provides sufficient budgetary allocations to support the preparation of the candidates.

6c. Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced
Preparation):

University policy sets a full-time faculty workload at a maximum of 12 credit hours of teaching per semester. The actual number of instructional hours depends upon each faculty member's teaching, research, and service. Reductions from this level are determined on an individual basis by the faculty member, department chairperson, and the dean. Typically, tenured/tenure-track faculty have a 3/3 teaching load, while full-time lecturers usually have a 4/4 teaching load. Unit faculty have the opportunity to teach up to nine credit hours, and a course overload is possible during the academic year. The interviews indicated that some clinical supervisors may be assigned between 19-23 student teachers per semester; although policy appears to require an 18-1 ratio. Credit for supervision of candidates taking methods courses varies, depending upon factors unique to the specific course.

With university budget reductions, there has been a university loss of 36 tenured/tenure-track faculty positions during this time. The interim provost indicated that 35 of these faculty positions are presently being searched for – with 16 of the searches occurring in the CoEP this academic year.

The unit effectively utilizes part-time faculty, who contribute to the integrity and quality of the various programs. There are 57 part-time faculty teaching in the unit. Interviews confirm there does not appear to be an over-reliance on the part-time faculty in either initial or advanced programs.

Regarding support staff, interview data provide that the college has seven full-time support staff members, who undertake the secretarial or support work for the departments as well as administrative offices. There are another 10 professional staff members who function in specialized services or through grant programs. There are student employees who provide a valuable service to the unit as well. Interviews with faculty confirm there is an adequate level of support personnel.

The university and unit provide multiple opportunities for professional development for faculty. The Learning Enhancement Center, provided by the Office of the Provost, is available to faculty for technology-related professional development training and learning opportunities. The Centers offers assistance with use of Blackboard, Smartboard, course development, instructional design, and interactive video network support. The university also offers sabbatical leaves and financial awards to promote faculty's continued development.

6d. Unit Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The CoEP offers programs on the Hattiesburg and Gulf Coast campus. The Hattiesburg facilities for the unit are contained within six buildings on campus: Owings-McQuagge Hall, McLemore Hall, Johnson Science Tower, Liberal Arts Building, Fritzscbe-Gibbs Hall, and the Speech and Hearing Building. Though somewhat dated, the classrooms and main offices in Owings-McQuagge, Fritzscbe-Gibbs Hall, and the Speech and Hearing Building meet the candidates' academic needs, while the other buildings are newer construction and equipped with state-of-the-art equipment. There is a renovation project to add a new computer laboratory in the Speech and Hearing Building, which is projected to be completed by fall 2012.
Currently, each full-time faculty member has a private office equipped with telephones/voicemail, computers with high-speed Internet, and part-time faculty often share office space. All faculty have access to secretarial assistance, printers, copiers, and fax machines.

The Gulf Coast education courses are taught in Long Beach, primarily in the Fleming Education Center, a facility refurbished after Hurricane Katrina. A tour of that facility shows multimedia-enhanced classrooms, equipped with video conferencing and computer connections as well as a 500-seat auditorium. There are also classrooms, laboratories and faculty offices at the Gulf Coast Student Services Center. Both sites have a classroom with an interactive TV (IVN) system. Libraries are available at both sites, and all candidates are able to access materials at the main campus in Hattiesburg.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

| Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable |

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

In FY 11, the CoEP expended approximately 98 percent of the unit's budget on salaries (76%) and fringe benefits (22%), and the remaining two percent was expended for general operations. Though the unit's budget has been reduced due to the state's fiscal crisis, the dean believes there are sufficient funds in each department to prepare candidates to become future educators.

Regarding unit expenditures on technology, the university has a student technology fee ($65 per semester) that supports general upkeep of equipment and software needs throughout campus. In addition, the unit has a technology staff liaison to assist with faculty technology needs. Lastly, all classrooms are equipped with "smart" technology and can accommodate candidate use of technology (i.e., laptop computers), and all buildings have wireless Internet capacity.

The unit candidates and faculty have access to two primary educational resources: The Cook Library and the Gunn Education Materials Center. The Cook Library, located on the Hattiesburg campus, contains the principle collection of books, periodicals, microforms, government documents, and other materials that directly support the research and instructional programs of the university. Collections, housed on all five floors of the building, consist of 1.7 million volumes held; 1.2 million titles held; and 33,300 serial titles received. Each department in the unit has a library liaison that maintains a list of departmental library holdings and makes acquisition requests on behalf of unit faculty on an annual basis. Located on the first floor of Cook Library is the Gunn Education Materials Center. It serves to support faculty and candidates and contains teaching material for grades K-12, including textbooks, classroom activity books and multiple reference materials for classroom teaching and learning.

The Long Beach Campus has modern library facilities that include a broad collection of volumes as well as literature specifically targeted to the unit's programs (children's literature collection and K-12 texts in multiple subject areas). Computers are provided for candidate use as well. Additionally, candidates may request library materials from the main USM campus.

According to faculty/staff interviews, the unit offers programs in various locations throughout the region as well as select courses/programs that are delivered online. Interviews confirm that the university and unit encourage the creation and delivery of online courses.
**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has the facilities and personnel for candidates to meet professional education standards. The university and unit offer quality technology support to meet the needs of twenty-first century learners. While documents regarding the fiscal health of the unit were not consistent, based upon interview evidence, there are sufficient resources to ensure a solid future for the unit.

**Strengths** [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit has insufficient support to maintain and operationalize the assessment system.</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that the unit has spent significant time and resources (including the adoption of a commercial data management system) to ensure it has a system in place to receive data from the candidates so that quality unit/departmental decisions can be made. Candidate and PEF interviews confirm support for the new assessment system. There was also ample evidence of data and reports prepared by the new system to demonstrate its successful adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**New AFIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report** [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]
IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

See uploaded file.

Persons Interviewed

See uploaded file.

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

| On-Site Visit Interviews
| Evidence List.pdf |

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: