

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	11908	AACTE SID:	3155
Institution:	Mississippi State University		
Unit:	College of Education		

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...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure ¹	302
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.) ²	24

Total number of program completers 326

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.4 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
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status
- 3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/p12/>

Description of data accessible via link:

Impact on P-12 Learning – Four cohorts, comprised of completers graduating with a bachelor's degree in teacher education programs in academic years 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 who started working as a teacher in a Mississippi public school the following academic year, were identified. Analysis of the data showed learning outcomes of Mississippi public school students taught by the College of Education program completers in their first year of teaching. Data were collected from statewide assessments established by the Mississippi Department of Education. Assessments were administered in diverse subjects and grades in public school districts in Mississippi.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/teaching-effectiveness/>

Description of data accessible via link:

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness – Data from the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument, which assesses the professional knowledge and skills for program completers/candidates, were analyzed to determine teaching effectiveness. These data include formative and summative assessments from Classroom Mentor Teacher and University Supervisors from fall 2015 through spring 2018.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/milestone/>

Description of data accessible via link:

Satisfaction of Employers and Milestones – The 2016, 2017, and 2018 Employer Survey results provide information from employers about the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (preparedness) of the College of Education's completers as they enter the workforce and assume the responsibility of teaching P-12 students. The Milestones Data include results of the first year teachers (2014-2015 completers, 2015-2016 completers, & 2016-2017 completers) who were retained in Mississippi

public schools the following academic year. Satisfaction of Employers data for advanced program level is not available at this time but will be available in one year.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/satisfaction-of-teachers-completers/>

Description of data accessible via link: Satisfaction of Teachers/Completers – The 2016, 2017, and 2018 Initial Program completers' Survey results provide information from the first year and third year teachers who have graduated from Mississippi State University College of Education on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions (preparedness) in working with P-12 students. Satisfaction of Completer data for advanced program level are not available at this time but will be available in one year.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/gradrates/>

Description of data accessible via link: Graduation Rates – Graduation rates are provided for completers who were admitted into initial programs in academic years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. Graduation rates for completers of advanced program are not available at this time but will be available in one year.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/title2/>

Description of data accessible via link: Praxis II/Title II Reports – Data for institutional-level pass rates and single assessment pass rates for initial programs are provided for academic years 2000-2001 through 2017-2018. Data for traditional (initial) and alternative institutional level and single assessment pass rate data are provided for academic years 2014-2015 through 2017-2018.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/licensure/>

Description of data accessible via link: Licensure Scores – A three-year pass rate history of the Praxis Subject Assessments for initial program completers (2015-2016 through 2017-2018) are provided. Data for advanced program level are not available at this time but will be available in one year.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/employmentstatus/>

Description of data accessible via link: Employment Status – Data are included for the employment status of initial program completers and advanced program completers (2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018) who are employed in a Mississippi Public School.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9

Link: <https://www.educ.msstate.edu/accreditation/student-loan-default-rates/>

Description of data accessible via link: Student Loan Default Rates & Consumer Information – Student Loan Default Rates for the FY2013, 2014, and 2015 are provided along with Consumer Information that shares general information, educational programs, financial information, health & safety, research, and service/outreach.

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

*Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?
Are benchmarks available for comparison?
Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?*

In reviewing the Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years, the Provider has determined that using multi-dimensional measures of assessments impacts programs at different levels. The Impact on P-12 Learning data of the first-year teachers indicates that the academic performance of the P-12 students are comparable to the statewide performance level. When reviewing the data, it was noted that the Mississippi Department of Education changed state testing assessments in 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016. Therefore, determination of Impact on P-12 Learning over that period of three years was not clear. However, using the 2016-2017 first-year teacher cohort compared to the overall state results, the greatest impact came from the Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) Math Assessment with classroom students' achieving at a higher percentage (2.9%) at the proficient or advanced performance level. Regarding all of the MAAP assessments (English Language Arts, Science, and Math) the first-year teacher cohort's classroom students performed equal to or above the proficient or advanced levels compared to the overall Mississippi public school students (statewide). The MAAP measures student progress in grades 3 through 8. High school students take end-of-course exams in Algebra I, English II, Biology, and US History to determine the impact on student learning. In reviewing data on all cohorts of the first-year teachers using the end of the course exams compared to the state, the results indicated that the first-year teachers had more impact on the student growth than the overall state results for the 2016-2017 first-year cohort in the areas of Algebra I and Biology.

The Provider requires that the statewide Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) be used by Classroom Mentor Teachers and University Supervisors to assess completers' effectiveness on applied professional knowledge and skills in the preparation experiences. The TIAI has 25 indicators and uses a Likert scale of 0 (Unacceptable), 1 (Emerging), 2 (Acceptable), and 3 (Target).

The faculty use the TIAI as an assessment in their annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports and have set as a benchmark that at least 80% of the completers will perform at the Acceptable level (2) or higher on all 25 indicators. The data (Fall 2015-Spring 2018) show that the benchmark has been met with the exception of the English Education program overall results in the Spring 2018 semester for 7 out of the 25 indicators and for Spring 2016 overall results on indicator 9, "Uses acceptable written, oral, and nonverbal communication in planning and instruction;" Mathematics Education program in the Fall 2017 on item 6, "Plans differentiated learning experiences that accommodate developmental and/or educational needs of learners based on assessment information which is aligned with core content knowledge" and item 14, "Demonstrates knowledge of content for the subject(s) taught;" and the Music Education program for the Fall 2017 on item 1, and 4 out of the 25 indicators for Fall 2016. The Provider reviewed the current TIAI with the Mississippi Department of Education and other EPPs in the state for modifications to ensure validity and inter-rater reliability. The modified TIAI was implemented in fall 2018 along with an online statewide training. To ensure inter-rater reliability of 80%, all CMTs, USs, and teacher interns must complete the TIAI statewide Mississippi Common Assessment Training. The professional development training was designed so that each stakeholder (CMTs, USs, interns) is required to score at least 80% on each domain/assessment before a certificate is issued to show adequate understanding of the TIAI.

The Provider began surveying employers through a statewide survey three years ago. The trend data showed in the first year that 15 of the 18 survey items were rated at least 82% Agree/Strongly Agree satisfaction by employers (principals). For the second year deployment of the survey, the Provider expanded the population of the employers to evaluate first year and third year completers. For the second year deployment, 17 of the 18 survey items received 80% Agree/Strongly Agree satisfaction by the employers (principals). For the third year deployment, all 18 items received at least 84.38% satisfaction rate of Agree/Strongly Agree by the employer (principals). Overall, the Provider anticipated positive results from the employers with no unexpected trends.

The Provider began surveying completers through a statewide survey three years ago. The trend data showed in the first year that 17 of the 18 survey items were rated at least 84.21% Agree/Strongly Agree satisfaction by completers (first year teacher). For the second year deployment of the survey, the Provider expanded the population to include not only first year but third year completers. For the second year deployment, 17 out of the 18 survey items received at least 81.81% Agree/Strongly Agree satisfaction by the completers (first and third year). For the third year deployment, all 18 items received at least 80.7% satisfaction rate of Agree/Strongly Agree by the completers (first and third year). Overall, the Provider noticed that item 15 (provide an inclusion classroom setting that addresses the full spectrum of student needs-severe learning disabilities to gifted) continued to be the lowest rated item. However, from second year to third year deployment of the survey, this item showed an improvement in satisfaction rating from 78.78% to 80.7%.

For Title II/Praxis II, the Provider has statewide comparison passage rate data since 2000. The last three years trend (2015-2016, 2016-2017, and 2017-2018) showed that the Provider's initial (traditional) program completers performed at or above the statewide passage rate (91% or higher) with the EPP's passage rate being 2% higher than the statewide passage rate for 2017-2018. For the alternative teacher initial program completers, the three-year trend showed that completers scored only one percent lower on the first and third year compared to the statewide passage rate. However, the EPP's passage rate was 2% higher than statewide on the second year comparison.

Based on the Mississippi State Board of Education's licensure guidelines/cut scores, all initial programs except for the Music Education initial program have at least 88% or higher overall passage rate based upon the three years trend of 2015-2016 through 2017-2018.

The multi-dimensional measures of assessments have been shared in various ways through the Provider's Assessment Committee which has faculty representation from each area of the initial programs as well as advanced programs; the External Advisory Board, the Teacher Education Council which includes P-12 Principals and Teachers in the field along with EPP's faculty, department heads, and administrators; and the Education Administrative Council which includes the Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean along with department heads from the initial and advanced programs. Department heads, assessment committee members, and program coordinators share assessment information with faculty during retreats and monthly meetings. This information has also been published on the Provider's website for public review.

Section 5. 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.

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

1 The unit does not ensure that candidates work with English language learners during some of their (IT (AD . field experiences or clinical practice. P) V)

Candidates in the College of Education (COE) at Mississippi State University (MSU) interact with P-12 students from a broad range of diverse groups. COE partner school districts have diverse P-12 populations, including students with exceptionalities and English language learners.

In initial teacher education programs, candidates complete field experiences in diverse P-12 educational settings. The COE Office of Clinical/Field-Based Instruction, Licensure, and Outreach (OCFBI) staff work directly with COE faculty and P-12 school district personnel to secure field experiences and internships for initial candidates. For 2016-2017, the Field Placement module within Watermark was implemented. This module incorporates the demographic data of each partner school district including the category of "Bilingual Education and English as Second Language." This data provides assistance in accurately aligning candidates' work with English language learners (ELLs) during their field experiences. In advanced programs, candidates complete field experiences, internships, and assignments that document their experiences in diverse settings. School administration candidates complete two internship courses in diverse settings, and school counseling candidates' complete internships in settings

with diverse ethnic and cultural populations.

For the 2017-2018 reporting period, teacher candidates in the elementary education program enrolled in EDF 3423 (Exploring Diversity Through Writing) participated in a pen-pal project between Provider's teacher candidates and middle schoolers from a public school in Russia. Each teacher candidate had between one and three pen pals. They exchange three sets of letters. After every instance of writing a letter or reading a response from Russian pen pals, the candidates had lively in-class discussions that helped them use inquiry and self-reflection, become more culturally- and linguistically-responsive, gain new knowledge of ELL methods and apply knowledge in an authentic context. The candidates also exchange PowerPoint presentations that help teacher candidates teach Russian pen pals about America and American culture and learn about Russia, Russian culture and build personal relationships.

Candidates collaborate with university supervisors (USs) and classroom mentor teachers (CMTs) as they develop their effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. In teaching internship, candidates collaborate with CMTs who teach ELLs, with USs, and with ELL students. Candidates identify what language/s the students speak fluently, determine how the CMTs manage the classroom to promote an understanding of content, identify how the management of the classroom with ELLs differs from a classroom with no ELLs, and identify what evidence indicates that ELLs gain an understanding of the content. Candidates engage in reflective practice as they complete assignments and engage in conversations with USs and CMTs about their ability to help all students, including ELLs and students with exceptionalities. Prior to teaching internship, the Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) for Mississippi, housed in the COE at MSU, provides workshops for candidates that include strategies for how to work with ELLs. The MMESC works to ensure that migrant students and youth across Mississippi are receiving appropriate educational services to enable them to achieve high academic standards by overcoming obstacles created by cultural and language differences and the educational disruption stemming from frequent moves.

Advanced educational leadership candidates collaborate with administrators/classroom teachers who are involved in working with ELLs to develop their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for assisting/supporting with ELLs. In summary, the COE is committed to the belief that all students can learn. In order to ensure that candidates value diversity, curricula and field placements are designed to provide experiences in a variety of diverse settings that specifically include ELLs.

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?
- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The EPP annually assesses and updates its performance against its goals through the University's Institutional Effectiveness process which consists of Institutional Effectiveness Reports that 1) identify the expected outcomes (goals), 2) set an assessment protocol to measure the outcomes, 3) report the results of the protocol, and 4) provide evidence of improvement based upon the analysis of the results. The EPP collects data through fall and spring and then reflects and makes modifications/adjustments using these results for continuous improvement.

One of the EPP's goals was to measure student success with respect to student achievement. To measure student success, teacher interns are assessed at progression points during the internship semester which is comprised of two six (6) hour courses. The Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI), used for both formative and summative assessment, provides a comprehensive assessment of the teaching practice of teacher candidates. The TIAI is completed by the university supervisor (US) and classroom mentor teacher (CMT) midway during each course and at the end of each course.

During this reporting period, the TIAI was redesigned. The Educator Preparation Provider Collaborative Committee (EPPCC) which is comprised of field directors, assessment coordinators, and upper level administrators from Mississippi Institutes of Higher Learning both public and private throughout the state of Mississippi worked on this revision as a statewide common assessment. Initially, the group considered the current TIAI (Appendix A) item by item to revise each item to make it clearer, more easily assessable, and align to CAEP standards. Once finalized, EPPCC committee members shared the instrument with their faculty, mentor teachers, and university supervisors. The EPPCC members considered all feedback and further revised the instrument. The newly revised TIAI (Appendix B) is based on 10 standards developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), CAEP Standards, and the Teacher Growth Rubric (TGR) used in Mississippi public P-12 schools. The CMT and US share responsibility for assessment of the teacher intern. The CMT's role is critical to the performance assessment of the teacher intern.

TIAI indicators are incorporated into five domains: I.) Planning and Preparation which assesses the teacher candidate's written lesson plans, unit plans, classroom observations, and other artifacts (pretests, inventories, surveys, etc.) II.) Assessment which assesses the teacher candidate's ability to effectively communicate assessment information to the students, provide feedback, and incorporate informal and formal assessments, III.) Instruction which assesses the teacher candidate's overall ability to effectively communicate with students and implement innovative lessons using a variety of teaching strategies that meet the needs of all students, IV.) Learning Environment which assesses the teacher candidate's ability to manage the classroom environment in a way that is conducive to learning, and V.) Professional Responsibilities which assesses the teacher candidate's ability to collaborate with professional colleagues to involve parents and/or guardians in the student's learning and development. The TIAI consists of 25 indicators on the rubric. Prior to Fall 2018, the rubric included the following four Likert scale ratings: Unacceptable, Emerging, Acceptable, and Target. The newly revised rubric includes the following four Likert scale ratings: Unacceptable, Needs Improvement, Meets Standard, and Exceeds Standard. Items rated at the "Meets Standard" level represent successful teaching practice by the teacher candidate. Anything below "Meets Standard" is identified as an area in need of improvement. Each indicator on the TIAI is assessed and scored using the performance descriptors for that indicator. Indicators from the TIAI may be assessed through a review of lesson plans, unit plans, classroom observations, artifacts and through discussion/conferencing among the CMT, US, and the teacher intern. Following each TIAI assessment, the evaluator (CMT or US) conference with the teacher intern to review the results of the assessment. Teacher interns are given actionable feedback from their CMT and US with expectations of performance growth from the TIAI evaluation. The TIAI is used for teacher candidate monitoring and progression as successful completion of the first internship course is required before teacher candidates can progress to the next internship course.

Prior to the revision of the TIAI, the EPP's data showed inconsistency of the ratings from the US versus CMT on the teacher intern's performance. For example, for fall 2017 second placement summative TIAI data for the Secondary Education-Mathematics concentration initial program, of the 4 teacher interns assessed for criterion indicator 6 and 14, 75% scored at "Meets Standard" by the CMT whereas 100% scored at "Meets Standard" by the US. For the Spring 2018 data, of the 13 teacher interns assessed for criterion indicator 19 and 25, 92% scored at the "Meets Standard" by the CMT whereas 100% scored at the "Meets Standard" by the US. Then for criterion indicator 20, it was in reverse order of where 92% scored at the "Meets Standard" by the US, and 100% scored at the "Meets Standard" by the CMT (Appendix C). For the Secondary Education-English concentration initial program, although it was only one teacher intern assessed for Spring 2018, there was a huge variation on evaluation from the US versus CMT. For criterion indicator 4, 5, 16, 17, 20, 22, and 24, 100% scored at the "Meets Standard" by the US whereas 0% met the standard by the CMT (Appendix D).

In the Fall 2017 for the Physical Education & Coaching initial program, of the 9 interns assessed, 89% scored at "Meets Standard" for criterion indicator 19 and 25 by the CMT whereas 100% scored at the "Meets Standard" by the US (Appendix E).












Hence, validity and reliability were implemented on this newly revised TIAI. In validating the newly revised TIAI, the EPPCC used the Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) and the CVR calculated to be 0.778. To ensure reliability for the TIAI, inter-rater reliability was established. The EPP first provided multiple trainings for the USs at both campuses (Appendix F). As Appendix F shows, the inter-rater reliability or agreement ranged from 39% to 87%. To ensure inter-rater reliability of 80%, all CMT, US, and teacher interns now complete the statewide Mississippi Common Assessment Training on the TIAI (Appendices G, H). The online training consists of a Prezi presentation that uses narrative, examples, and video to explain the expectations of each indicator. The Prezi presentation was separated out by each domain and placed within the professional development modules so that USs, CMTs, teacher interns view the Prezi presentation and then take a short assessment to gauge their understanding of the domain. The professional development training was designed such that each stakeholder must meet 80% on each domain/assessment before a certificate is issued to show adequate understanding of the TIAI. The statewide training is used by the Mississippi Institutes of Higher Learning both public and private.

As part of the continuous improvement of this process to ensure that every US and CMT are appropriately trained for administering the TIAI instrument, all USs and CMTs must now complete a Confirmation of Training Form in Watermark, an electronic data management e-portfolio system, to document completion of the online statewide training. Teacher interns must upload their Certificate of Completion that was received after participating in the online statewide training. The Program Coordinator within the EPP's Office of Clinical/Field-Based Instruction, Licensure, and Outreach runs report(s) to track and document that all USs (Appendix I), CMTs (Appendix J), and teacher interns (Appendix K) have completed the online training.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

- 1.1 Understanding of InTASC Standards
- 1.2 Use of research and evidence to measure students' progress
- 1.3 Application of content and pedagogical knowledge
- 1.4 All P-12 students afforded access to college- and career-ready standards.
- 1.5 Model and apply technology standards
- 5.2 Quality assurance system relies on measures yielding reliable, valid, and actionable data.
- 5.3 Results for continuous program improvement are used

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

-  **Appendix_ATIAIOld_Version.pdf**
-  **Appendix_BTIAI__New_Revised_Version.pdf**
-  **Appendix_CMathematics_Education_(TIAI)_SP_18__FL_17__2nd_Summative_MT_US.pdf**
-  **Appendix_DEnglish_Education_(TIAI)_SP_18_and_FL_17_2nd_Summative_MT_US.pdf**
-  **Appendix_EPhysical_Education_(TIAI)SP18FL17_2nd_Summative_MT_US.pdf**
-  **Appendix_FInterrater_ReliabilityFINAL.pdf**
-  **Appendix_GGuideHow_to_Complete_the_Mississippi_Common_Assessments_Trainingfor_CMT__I**
S.pdf
-  **Appendix_HGuideHow_to_Complete_the_Mississippi_Common_Assessments_Trainingfor_INTER**
.pdf
-  **Appendix_I_ExampleUniversity_Supervisor_Confirmation_of_Training_ReportExample_from_F18**
supervisors.pdf
-  **Appendix_J_ExampleCMT_Confirmation_of_Training_ReportExample_from_F18_Elem_1st_PL.p**
L.pdf
-  **Appendix_K_Example_Intern_Certificate_of_Completion_Report_for_TIAI_TrainingF18_Music_1s**
PL.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or s activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3 Optional Comments

Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a success transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful r

regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress in addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

☐ No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

1) After reviewing the State data for Impact on P-12 learning and development, it became evident that the Mississippi Department of Education had changed state testing assessments in 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016. Therefore, determination of the impact over a period of three years was not clear. For this reporting period of the fourth year, there were no changes made by MDE regarding the state testing assessments. Therefore, the data for the 2016-2017 cohort of first year completers/teachers was more clearly aligned.

2) For Advanced Programs, when defining an "admitted student," the EPP found that some candidates begin as unclassified students taking up to nine hours and then the students' classifications changed to continued instead of first-time graduate students within the EPP's administrative software system. Therefore, the EPP found it difficult to calculate graduation rates. The EPP has determined that program coordinators need to discuss and define an admitted student and implement an electronically accessible tracking process to determine graduation rates in collaboration with the Information Technology Services department at the University.

3) The employment status for initial and advanced programs was based upon completers who were employed in the Mississippi Public Schools. The gap is tracking completers who were employed outside of the state, employed in the state but not in the teaching profession or employed in private schools. The EPP has met with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System provider for the state of Mississippi to additionally track completers who are employed in private schools or employed outside of the teaching profession within the state of Mississippi.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning
A.3.3 Selectivity during Preparation
A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

☒ Yes ☐ No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

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 2019 EPP Annual Report.

☒ I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: Mitzy Johnson

Position: Assistant Dean

Phone: 662-325-2245

E-mail: mitzy.johnson@colled.msstate.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing 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.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completion data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.



Acknowledge