

2011 Part C of the AACTE / NCATE Annual Report

Institutional Information

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| NCATE ID: 11908 | AACTE SID: 3155 |
| Institution: Mississippi State University | |
| Unit: College of Education | |

Section I - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs) during the 2010-2011 academic year?

791

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2010-2011 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section II. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. Changes in program delivery from traditional to distance learning programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.

No Change / Not Applicable

2. Change in control of institution. Please indicate any changes in control or ownership of the institution such as a merger with another institution, separation from an institution, purchase of an institution, etc.

No Change / Not Applicable

3. Increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals at off-campus sites and outside the United States.

No Change / Not Applicable

4. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in budget

No Change / Not Applicable

5. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in candidate enrollment

No Change / Not Applicable

6. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in size of the full-time faculty

No Change / Not Applicable

7. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in significant changes as the result of a natural disaster

No Change / Not Applicable

8. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in delivery of a program in whole or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner

No Change / Not Applicable

9. Addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., a master's degree).

No Change / Not Applicable

Section III. Areas for Improvement

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

| | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Unit dispositions identified in the conceptual framework program outcomes are not consistently reflected in the disposition instruments. | (ITP) | (ADV) |
|---|-------|-------|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

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

| | | | |
|----|---|-------|-------|
| 1. | Data for advanced continuing teacher education programs (M.S. and Ed.S.) are not aggregated for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and professional knowledge. | | (ADV) |
| 2. | Although data are collected, procedures are not in place to ensure that data are systematically disseminated and used for program improvement. | (ITP) | (ADV) |

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

| | | | |
|----|--|-------|-------|
| 1. | The unit does not systematically evaluate part-time faculty. | (ITP) | (ADV) |
|----|--|-------|-------|

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

| | | | |
|----|---|--|-------|
| 1. | The unit lacks a sufficient number of faculty to support the Educational Administration program particularly at the Doctoral level. | | (ADV) |
|----|---|--|-------|

II.1 Summarize activities, assessments and outcomes toward correcting AFI(s) cited in the last Accreditation Action Report, if applicable.

Standard 1. Unit Dispositions - The unit continues to use the updated dispositions instrument that was revised after the last NCATE visit. The dispositions of all candidates, initial and advanced, are assessed using this dispositions assessment instrument which was revised by faculty and members of the College of Education Advisory Board to align with the Conceptual Framework program outcomes, and with state and national standards.

Standard 2.1. Data for Advanced Programs and 2.2 Systematic Dissemination for Program Improvement - Data, which are collected by faculty and staff in the Dean's Office and in the respective departments in the College of Education (COE) for the Graduate Database, are used to analyze performance data on candidates enrolled in the various graduate programs. Critical assessment data, such as scores from written and oral comprehensive examinations, are now being entered into the system and aggregated and analyzed by faculty in each program area. The data are utilized by faculty to determine program modifications and improvements. Faculty and staff in the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness continue to assume a leadership role in coordinating the Institutional Effectiveness/Assessment reports at the initial and advanced levels for all colleges. A university standing committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, reviews and provides feedback to departmental heads as well as program coordinators and departmental faculty in regard to strategies for strengthening expected outcomes, assessment criteria/ procedures, assessment results, and use of results. The department heads, program coordinators, and faculty review the feedback and make changes as needed for program improvement. The Institutional Effectiveness/ Assessment reports, which are directly related to Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation, serve as a resource and mechanism for improving National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education assessment efforts within the program/unit as well. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness in collaboration with the Registrar's Office and Information Technology Systems have developed and implemented an Undergraduate Exit Survey for all colleges including the COE graduates. After the results of this survey are disseminated to academic department heads and graduate program coordinators in each respective department, faculty review the data and make changes as needed for program improvement. The Graduate Curriculum Advising and Program Planning (CAPP) degree evaluation system is accessible on the campus-wide Banner system as of spring 2011. The Graduate Curriculum Advising and Planning evaluation system provides administrators and faculty in the COE access for tracking the academic progress of all graduate candidates and graduate programs. This database is used by faculty in each program area to determine areas of strength and areas that need to be improved. At the initial level, each program area uses TaskStream, which is an electronic portfolio to collect and aggregate data. The data collected in each department are aggregated at the end of the fall, spring, and summer semesters. At retreats and faculty meetings, faculty and staff analyze these data and make program improvements as needed.

Standard 5. Systematic Evaluation of Part-time Faculty - All courses taught by part-time faculty are evaluated using the Mississippi State University Instructor and Course Evaluation System. This is the same method used to evaluate all courses taught in the department regardless of faculty status. If course problems are illuminated by means of this evaluation instrument, they are dealt with by the department chair. Further, to address this area for improvement, faculty in the COE developed and implemented a Lecturer Evaluation form and a Lecturer's Handbook subsequent to the previous NCATE site visit. Lecturers are evaluated annually by department heads using this form, and these evaluations are due to the Dean at the same time as evaluations for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Standard 6. Faculty for Educational Administration program - During 2010, the Department of Leadership and Foundations conducted a series of meetings focusing on the graduation productivity of doctoral students. The Department of Leadership and Foundations includes a department head and ten tenure-track or tenured faculty members who serve as major advisors and committee members for doctoral candidates in the department. Faculty are given consideration in their work load distribution while working with doctoral candidates as they complete their dissertation research, and in many instances, are given a reduced teaching load. Candidates are assigned to major advisors so that no major advisor will have more than two candidates graduating within a given semester. In addition to faculty within the department who serve as major professors, administrators approved by the Graduate School serve as dissertation directors to assist candidates with their dissertation research. Two new faculty were added to the Department beginning August 2011. Both faculty members hold degrees in Educational Leadership. With the addition of the two new faculty members, the advising load will be lightened for existing faculty in the Department of Leadership and Foundations.

Section IV: Units with Regular/Continuous Improvement Accreditation Option

C.1. Summarize evidence indicating progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected by the unit

€ Std. 1 € Std. 2 € Std. 3 € Std. 4 € Std. 5 € Std. 6

Faculty in the College of Education at Mississippi State University are in the process of selecting a standard and facilitating the move toward target level performance on this standard. As faculty in the unit proceed with the selection of this standard, they are carefully examining all six standards in order to ensure they choose the most appropriate standard for the college. Although the faculty have begun to focus in on a couple of specific standards, they are not at the point to make the final decision. Once the standard has been selected, faculty will continue to review and analyze data and the programmatic changes based on this data as they work to continually improve the teacher education programs in the move toward target with this standard.

C.2. Summarize data that demonstrate continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality in the area of content knowledge

PRAXIS II Exhibit - One example of evidence that Mississippi State University (MSU) teacher candidates possess the necessary content knowledge at the initial level is based on their performance on the PRAXIS II examination, which measures general and subject-specific skills and knowledge. The MSU institutional pass rates on the PRAXIS II content assessment range from 88% in Secondary Mathematics to 100% in the following programs: Secondary English, Secondary Chemistry, Secondary Biology, Secondary Social Studies, Business Education, Special Education, Music, and Physical Education. The largest program, Elementary Education, had an institutional pass rate of 93% which is also the institutional pass rate of all program completers. As shown in Table 1.1, in the PRAXIS II exhibit, when institutional pass rates are compared to statewide pass rates all program areas meet or exceed the statewide pass rates with the exceptions of Elementary Education and Secondary Mathematics. These two areas are within 3% of the statewide pass rate.

Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) Exhibit - Teacher preparation programs in Mississippi use the TIAI, which is based on the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards, to assess teacher intern performance and content knowledge. The TIAI has 34 indicators which are incorporated into the following five domains: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) Communication and Interaction, 3) Teaching for Learning, 4) Management of the Learning Environment, and 5) Assessment of Student Learning. Each of the 34 TIAI indicators has a rubric with the following ranges: Unacceptable (0-2), Emerging (3-5), Acceptable (6-8), and Target (9-10). Tables 1.2 and 1.3 in the exhibit, which contain TIAI data related to content knowledge for MSU teacher interns, show the average of scores for the four transition points during the fall 2010 and spring 2011 semesters. The following TIAI indicators are used to determine if teacher interns have the appropriate content knowledge: a) Indicator 1 - Teacher interns must have the necessary content knowledge to select developmentally appropriate objectives; b) Indicator 3 - Teacher interns must have the necessary content knowledge in order to select appropriate materials and technology for lessons; c) Indicators 4 and 5 - In order to prepare appropriate assessment procedures and material to evaluate learner progress and to use the assessment information to plan differentiated learning experiences that accommodate differences in developmental and/or educational needs, teacher interns must have the necessary content knowledge; d) Indicator 7 - Teacher interns must know their content in order to integrate knowledge from several subject areas; and e). Indicator 16 - Teacher interns must know their content in order to demonstrate knowledge of the subject being taught.

Exhibits that support the narrative:  PRAXIS II  Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI)

Notes on C.2: Standard 1 will be the focus of the 2010-2011 Annual Report. Please submit sample data/evidence/exhibit(s) - no more than two - that demonstrate continuing to meet standard 1 related to content knowledge only. The sample can be from a single program but should be representative of the unit as whole. For selection of exhibits, please use NCATE's Exhibit List provided as a guide.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Teresa Jayroe

Phone: 662-325-7069

E-mail: tjayroe@colled.msstate.edu