Section 1. AIMS Profile
After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider’s (EPP’s) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate...

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Contact person</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 EPP characteristics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Program listings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. Program Completers
2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2014-2015?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure: 259

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.): 133

Total number of program completers: 392

*2.2 Indicate whether the EPP is currently offering a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure.
Yes, a program or programs leading to initial teacher certification is currently being offered.

Section 3. Substantive Changes
Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2014-2015 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.5 Change in regional accreditation status
No Change / Not Applicable

3.6 Change in state program approval
No Change / Not Applicable

Section 4. Display of candidate performance data.
Provide a link that demonstrates candidate performance data are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the school, college, or department of education homepage.
Teacher candidate performance data, enrollment data, Annual Reports, GPA: http://www.usm.edu/education-psychology/educator-preparation-provider-epp-data

Section 6. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The Educational Leadership programs lack sufficient data to demonstrate that all candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. (ADV)

2. The Physical Education program lacks evidence that candidates possess the content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. (ITP) (ADV)

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The Unit does not regularly and systematically involve P-12 stakeholders in the development and evaluation of the assessment system. (ITP) (ADV)

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit’s school partners do not participate in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. (ITP) (ADV)

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds. (ITP) (ADV)
The Unit is striving to cultivate and prepare all teacher candidates to teach effectively in diverse classrooms. Professional development for teacher candidates is planned that will focus on student differences, information, interaction, and activities with a panel of diverse educators and community leaders. A Diversity Committee is planned for the Unit that works with other stakeholders toward promotion of diversity awareness and education. This committee will review and report the use of differentiated instruction, sheltered instruction, universal design, and multicultural education being used in instructional approaches. Teacher candidates must have the pedagogical tools needed to teach standards in diverse, inclusive classrooms. To assess these tools, informal, teacher-made assessments, as well as large-scale tests, will be used.

Section 7. Accreditation Pathway
Continuous Improvement. Summarize progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected.

Much progress was made on the reports submitted for the Early Instrument Evaluation. The process re-examination included how candidates are assessed during field experiences and how to generate better data on continuous improvement. Over the course of the summer, several group meetings were held to align the rubrics to the standards, and align the rubric to each assignment's directions. After reviewing the assignment's weaknesses and strengths, revising numerous iterations, and conducting focus group studies on the effectiveness of the rubric to promote student work, the assignment/evaluations were piloted. At the conclusion of each of the two field placements during student teaching, each university supervisor was sent a feedback survey about the revised assignment/evaluation. Based on the analysis of data and comments from the supervisors, evaluations and/or assignment directions were modified.

In order to accurately measure inter-rater reliability, an expert group of subject matter experts gathered to create anchors for each indicator in the rubric. An outside consultant was hired to lead the session on identifying anchors, identifying biases, identifying different levels and how to compare scores. University supervisors met to calibrate their scores and through the process, increased the reliability of the assessment data.

A formalized process was developed for dispositional issues with the help of legal counsel. More importantly, an evaluation will be completed by instructors twice before the senior year so that there will be ample time to counsel the student, develop a plan for improvement, or to be counseled out of the program. Performance indicators have been added to the rubric to help define the criteria.

Section 8: Preparer’s Authorization

Preparer’s authorization. By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2016 EPP Annual Report.

☑️ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer’s Information
Name: Dr. Deborah Stoulig
Position: Coordinator of NCATE Assessment
Phone: 601/266-4539
E-mail: deborah.stoulig@usm.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, going forward accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.