

**REDESIGN
OF THE STATE REVIEW PROCESS
FOR
MISSISSIPPI EDUCATOR
PREPARATION PROGRAMS**



October 2012

Proposal for the Redesign of the State Review Process for Mississippi Educator Preparation Programs	1
Executive Summary	3
Introduction and Background	5
Annual Review for Approval or Disapproval of Educator Preparation Programs	6
Midpoint State Reviews (MEPPA)	7
Targeted Assistance Visits	9
MS Educator Preparation Program Accreditation Review Standards	9
Standard 1: Content Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions	9
Standard 2: Assessment	10
Standard 3: Meaningful Field Experiences	11
Standard 4: Diversity and Differentiation of Instruction	11
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications and Practice	12
Standard 6: Recruitment, Retention and Partnerships	12
Proposal of Revisions to the Teacher Education Program Approval Process	13
Executive Summary	14
Introduction	15
Implementing a New Teacher Education Degree Program	16
Modifying an Existing Teacher Education Degree Program	21
Implementing a Distance Learning Program	25
Glossary	26

PROPOSAL FOR THE REDESIGN OF THE STATE REVIEW PROCESS FOR MISSISSIPPI EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Executive Summary

- The State Review Redesign Committee proposes that the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) move to an annual review of programs through required documentation submitted electronically to determine approval or disapproval of Educator Preparation Programs (EPP), and conduct onsite visits during midpoint between National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) cycles.
 - Electronic submissions of documents for the annual approval of EPPs by the Commission and State Board will consist of data previously submitted for the legislative annual report and additional data that will provide a measure of candidate/program performance.
- As proposed, the new annual approval of EPPs will be based on meeting the following requirements:
 - Submission of a copy of an annual American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Report, which includes assessment data, as required for CAEP institutions or the equivalent report for state accredited institutions.
 - Evidence of a three-year average of an 80 percent pass rate on state licensure tests (Praxis exams)
 - Performance and demographic data on admitted candidates and completers, including GPAs
 - Faculty Demographics
- The state will conduct official onsite visits for the purpose of assessing educator preparation programs' ability to meet or exceed state standards. The Mississippi Educator Preparation Program Accreditation (MEPPA) site visit schedule provides for state teams to conduct reviews of every EPP in mid-cycle, or fourth year after an official NCATE, CAEP or MEPPA visit.
- The visit schedule that begins the first year after the NCATE, CAEP or MEPPA visit is on a seven year accreditation cycle as outlined in the following table. The exception is for institutions that have just completed their initial accreditation visit and are scheduled for the next visit in five years, and thereafter begin a standard seven year cycle.

- All program proposals be submitted in a uniform format requiring more information to be reviewed only twice annually by a committee at one location onsite or via teleconference/video conference

CAEP/MEPPA Review Schedule

YEAR	APPROVAL REQUIREMENT
1st Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for State Program Approval Status
2nd Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for State Program Approval Status
3rd Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for State Program Approval Status
4th Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Mid-cycle Onsite State Review Visit (MS Educator Preparation Program Accreditation or MEPPA)
5th Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for Program Approval Status
6th Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for Program Approval Status
7th Year (State/National Accreditation Visit)	Onsite CAEP/MEPPA Review

- MDE reserves the right to conduct an onsite visit at the state consultant’s discretion (with the approval of the Deputy State Superintendent of Quality Professionals and Special Schools), in particular when documentation or other evidence suggests that an EPP is not in compliance with state policy, procedures and guidelines established for educator preparation programs and/or is not effectively preparing candidates in approved programs of study.

Introduction and Background

The Annual Process Review of approved teacher education programs was an outgrowth of the Mississippi Education Reform Act of 1982. This Act called for the setting of standards and criteria for all teacher education programs in Mississippi colleges and universities. Two critical elements of teacher preparation had considerable impact upon this process:

1. What professional knowledge is essential for beginning teachers
2. What teaching skills and abilities are most effective

In 1997, a major update of the teacher licensure process as well as the revision of standards for teacher licensure programs was undertaken. The following components are the basis for the teacher education process.

- Each applicant for entry into a teacher licensure program shall demonstrate minimum academic ability on a test approved by the Licensure Commission and the State Board of Education.
- Each applicant for a standard license shall graduate from an NCATE or state-approved teacher education program and shall be able to pass a state-approved test in order to demonstrate knowledge of pedagogy and competency of the subject to be taught.
- Each educator shall successfully complete individual professional development requirements during a five-year timeframe for continued licensure.

The Process and Performance Reviews, set in place by legislative mandate (MS Code, Section 37-2-3), had as its purpose the enactment of a voluntary peer review process designed to help ensure that Mississippi educator preparation programs would “produce competent, caring, and qualified teachers and other professional school personnel who can help all students learn.” In 2009, the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) in collaboration with the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning (MS IHL) and the Mississippi Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) began discussion about improving the rigor of the state review process.

The discussion centered around utilizing state standards more closely aligned to the national accreditation standards to further promote an accredited institution’s ability “to engage in continuous improvement based on accurate and consistent data [and to] remain current, relevant, and productive so that graduates of these institutions are able to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning.”¹ Thus, state-sponsored reviews are conducted for the ongoing dual purposes of continuous accountability and creative reform within the process by which competent educational professionals are produced for the P-12 learning environment.

¹ Paragraph quotes from National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education “Professional Standards,” (2002 Ed.) p. 1

From stakeholder discussion, MDE formed a committee of stakeholders in 2009 to begin the process of revising the state standards to better align with the most current NCATE standards and review process. In 2010, NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) announced intentions to join together to establish one unified national accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This decision would ultimately affect the current NCATE standards and thus the state's alignment to the most current standards. With the advent of the transition into CAEP, MDE tabled the 2009 committee recommendation to revise the state process. In 2012, MDE and an expanded committee moved forward to redesign the state review and align state standards with the current NCATE standards that would be in effect for a considerable period of time while fully transitioning into CAEP. Additionally, new state standards would also align to the state's Blue Ribbon Committee on the Redesign of Teacher Preparation standards as recommended by MS IHL.

Annual Review for Approval or Disapproval of Educator Preparation Programs

It is the responsibility of the State Consultant for the Mississippi Department of Education to serve as the coordinator for the state review of all educator preparation programs in both public and private institutions. The review process for all institutions is scheduled to be completed annually by June 1 and must include documentation for the academic time period designated to include summer, fall and spring. The state review process includes data relevant to the units' documentation of compliance with state protocol for admitting candidates into an approved teacher education program, into clinical practice, and for awarding degrees upon completion of approved programs of study. The data will be posted online as part of an effort to provide transparency through stakeholder access to a teacher preparation data dashboard on MDE's website. The dashboard will provide reporting capabilities on individual program performance and demographics.

The annual approval of educator preparation programs will be based on the following reporting requirements:

- Submission of a copy of an annual American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Report (includes assessment data) as required for CAEP institutions or the equivalent report for MEPPA institutions.
- Evidence of a three-year average of an 80 percent pass rate on state licensure tests (Praxis exams)
- Performance and demographic data on admitted candidates and completers, including GPAs
- Faculty Demographics

Annual reports will be submitted to MDE via electronic means. The reports will be reviewed by the MDE state consultant, a MS IHL representative and at least one external reviewer. The institution will receive a formal statement of findings with a recommendation for approval status: Met, Met with Conditions or Not Met. The institution may submit a rejoinder to the findings

within 30 days after receipt of the first draft of the report, if the institution deems any portion of the findings to be inconsistent with their records or support documentation. Based on a review of the rejoinder, a subsequent recommendation and further action will be determined by MDE within 30 days after the date the rejoinder is received.

Programs that are not in compliance with submitting required documentation or submit insufficient documentation to MDE by the annual deadline may be subject to a Targeted Assistance Visit at a time specified by MDE, or additional documentation may be required to be submitted on a designated timeline.

MDE reserves the right to conduct onsite visits at the state consultant’s discretion, in particular when documentation or other evidence suggests that an EPP is not in compliance with state policy, procedures and guidelines established for educator preparation programs and/or is not effectively preparing candidates in approved programs of study. Based on visit findings, MDE reserves the right to determine an appropriate course of action.

Mid-Cycle Educator Preparation Accreditation (MEPPA) Reviews

MDE will conduct official onsite visits for the purpose of assessing educator preparation programs’ ability to meet or exceed state and national standards. The proposed Mississippi Educator Preparation Program Accreditation (MEPPA) onsite visit schedule provides for state teams to conduct reviews of every educator preparation program in mid-cycle or in the fourth year after an official NCATE/CAEP or state accreditation visit. State teams serve as co-examiners with the national Board of Examiners (BOE) team members during the official NCATE/CAEP visits and solely conduct the state accreditation visits under the advisement of the state consultant and a MS IHL representative. The visit schedule that begins the first year after the NCATE/CAEP or state accreditation visit is based on a seven-year accreditation cycle as outlined in the CAEP/MEPPA Review Schedule below.

CAEP/MEPPA Review Schedule

YEAR	APPROVAL REQUIREMENT
1st Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for State Program Approval Status
2nd Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for State Program Approval Status
3rd Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for State Program Approval Status
4th Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Mid-cycle Onsite State Review Visit (MS Educator Preparation Program Accreditation or MEPPA)

5th Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for Program Approval Status
6th Year (after State/National Accreditation Visit)	Annual Report to MDE for Program Approval Status
7th Year (Full State/National Accreditation Visit)	Onsite CAEP/MEPPA Review

The mid-cycle onsite state review (MEPPA) will be conducted by the MDE state consultant, a MS IHL representative and two or more peer reviewers. The mid-point review will be a process that provides a review of any additions and updates to CAEP evidence and preparation toward the next national or state accreditation visit. The state review team will provide a report of the findings and possible recommendations or areas for improvements (AFIs). The EPP must address the areas of improvement to bring the standard to a satisfactory level by the next official NCATE/CAEP or MEPPA visit, or on a schedule determined by the state consultant and/or the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development (Commission).

The unit has 30 days after receipt of the state report to submit a rejoinder. MDE will either accept evidence in the rejoinder if it presents a solid case for amending the team recommendation or elect to stand on the initial recommendation. The EPP will be assigned a specific timeline for correcting any deficits before the program is recommended for non-approval status.

Length of visit. One (1) to two (2) days as needed

Size of team. Any review team for a mid-point site visit will be required to include one state consultant from MDE, one representative from IHL, and a minimum of two representatives from four-year institutions in Mississippi.

Peer reviewers. State reviewers must complete specialized MEPPA training to ensure a fair and consistent process. State team members will be selected based on the needs of the targeted institution.

Cost of visit. The targeted institution will be responsible for specified costs associated with the MEPPA visit (team travel to and from campus, food, and lodging). MDE will reimburse mileage for the state team's travel to the visit site and travel home.

Annual electronic data reports. An Annual Performance Report for NCATE/CAEP will be submitted to MDE for continuity of record keeping at MDE.

Mid-point site visit. Because the unit will be in the initial phases of preparing for the next full onsite NCATE/CAEP or state accreditation visit, the 4th year visit (MEPPA) will have similar requirements but on a smaller scale.

Review of student records. Review of MDE standards related to admission, coursework, GPA, and graduation to verify annual report submissions while onsite.

- Guidelines for review will be determined (i.e., which files to review and sample size; 25% of records).
- Checklist of MDE requirements to include team members' initials on specific items and signatures at the end of the report.
- Review of syllabi. MDE requires evidence of how the state, national (INTASC), and professional standards are infused into course content.
 - Specific guidelines for review will be developed (i.e., sample size)
 - Checklist of MDE requirements
- Interviews with key faculty. Review team members will assist the institution by clarifying evidence related to the national/state standards.
- Feedback from MDE and team members. A report template will be developed for the team members that will include the following:
 - Materials reviewed (i.e., Annual Report, Student Files, Exhibits reviewed)
 - Evidence of Continuous Improvement on all standards (i.e., Unacceptable, Acceptable, Target)
 - Target Area (Steps identified to move to target have been identified)
 - Areas of Concern / Follow Up – MDE/IHL Team will cite areas that need further addressing and a timeline for receiving the response from the institution.
- Assistance team. In the event that the review team determines that the Evidence of Continuous Improvement is unacceptable, a Targeted Assistance Visit will be required to ensure the institution addresses the areas of concern. MDE will determine the appropriate assistance team composition for bringing the unit to an acceptable level on all areas recommended for improvement.
- MDE reserves the right to conduct an onsite visit at the state consultant's discretion, in particular when documentation or other evidence suggests that a program is not in compliance with state policy, procedures and guidelines for educator preparation programs and/or is not effectively preparing candidates in approved programs of study.

Targeted Assistance Visit

For institutions requiring one or more Targeted Assistance Visits MDE in collaboration with MS IHL will develop a team to work directly with the institution to bring them to an acceptable level on deficit areas. The assistance team may consist of the original members, members selected in areas of specific expertise, or a combination of both.

Length of visit. One (1) to two (2) days as required by unacceptable conditions cited in state/national reports

Purpose of visit(s). To provide support to the targeted institution to assist in ensuring successful continuation of national/state accreditation

Timing. To be based on national/state timelines

Size of review team. The review team will consist of one (1) representative from MDE, one (1) representative from IHL, and a minimum of two (2) representatives from four-year institutions.

Representation from four-year institutions. Team members should be selected based on variables specific to the targeted institution.

Cost of visit. The targeted institution will be responsible for costs associated with the peer assistance visit (onsite team travel to and from campus, food, and lodging). MDE will reimburse mileage for the state team's travel to the visit site and travel home.

Action plan. The institution will provide a copy of their national/state rejoinder to the Assistance team at least one month prior to official submission to NCATE.

Annual electronic data. Reports will continue to be submitted to MDE for continuity of record keeping at the state level, even during years of assistance visits.

MISSISSIPPI EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM ACCREDITATION (MEPPA) MID-CYCLE REVIEW STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Content Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The unit identifies and implements comprehensive and consistent performance expectations for candidates in all educator preparation programs.

1. The unit ensures adequate content of courses, professional development and/or other appropriate experiences to ensure the teacher candidate masters subject area content knowledge in all areas in which the candidate will be licensed.
2. Candidates are required to complete rigorous programs of study that ensure depth and breadth of content and pedagogical knowledge appropriate for beginning teachers as required by the state.

Candidates must satisfactorily complete required coursework common to all teacher candidates that includes instruction in the following:

*Classroom Management (CM)
Special Education (SPED)
Data Analysis/Evaluation (DAE)*

Interdisciplinary programs of study for all elementary education teacher candidates (K-3, K-6) must additionally include at a minimum:

<i>English</i>	<i>12 semester hours</i>
<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>9 semester hours</i>
<i>Science</i>	<i>9 semester hours</i>
<i>Social Studies</i>	<i>12 semester hours</i>
<i>Fine arts/teaching of fine arts</i>	<i>3 semester hours</i>
<i>Reading/Literacy</i>	<i>15 semester hours</i>

**15 hours of Reading/Literacy must include Literacy I and Literacy II courses*

Elementary education teacher candidates seeking certification in K-6 must complete two 18-hour content area concentrations.

Secondary teacher candidates seeking certification in grades 7-12 must have an academic content major or equivalent coursework.

Candidates certifying in K-12 areas (i.e., foreign language, music, art) must complete pedagogy/literature/reading integration coursework appropriate for all grade levels, the required common coursework (CM, SPED and DAE) and the MS IHL common interdisciplinary core of courses listed below that are required for earning a bachelor's degree (BT Minutes, 1/2003; 3/2008):

<i>English Composition</i>	<i>6 semester hours</i>
<i>College Algebra, Quantitative Reasoning, or higher level mathematics</i>	<i>3 semester hours</i>
<i>Natural Science</i>	<i>6 semester hours</i>
<i>Humanities and Fine Arts</i>	<i>9 semester hours</i>
<i>Social or Behavioral Science</i>	<i>6 semester hours</i>

3. Candidates demonstrate appropriate pedagogical skills, including the ability to deliver content, to reflect on practice, and to adapt instruction to enhance student learning.
4. Candidates demonstrate the appropriate content knowledge for professional educators.
5. Candidates exhibit the attitudes and behaviors appropriate for professional educators.

STANDARD 2: Assessment

The unit requires that candidates are provided opportunities to demonstrate mastery in delivery of content and assessments as it relates to P-12 student development needs; and the unit systematically assesses candidate and unit performance.

1. The unit requires mastery of knowledge and skills for effectively differentiating instruction based on a variety of factors such as learning styles, multiple intelligences, disabilities, and enrichment/remedial needs.

2. The unit has an assessment system that reflects professional and state standards, and candidate performance data are systematically collected utilizing multiple assessments (both internal & external) at appropriate transition points, including program admission, student teaching and program completion.
3. The unit maintains its assessment system through the use of information technologies appropriate to the size of the unit and institution to regularly and systematically collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations in order to initiate changes in programs and unit operation.

STANDARD 3: Meaningful Field Experiences

The unit develops effective field experiences and assesses consistent expectations within educator preparation programs for candidate performance as it relates to knowledge, skills and dispositions including classroom management; and the unit provides adequate and appropriate supervision of teacher candidates during all field placements.

1. The unit provides extensive opportunities for teacher candidates to demonstrate appropriate expertise in a variety of classroom strategies.
2. The unit strengthens the collaborative involvement of P-12 educators with educator preparation programs in identifying problem areas related to classroom management.
3. The unit identifies and implements comprehensive and consistent performance expectations for teacher candidates.
4. The unit systematically ensures a range of diverse settings that reflect the reality of the P-12 classroom and represent areas in which the teacher candidate will be licensed.

STANDARD 4: Diversity and Differentiation of Instruction

The unit ensures a range of diverse settings that reflects the reality of the P-12 classroom and represents areas in which the teacher candidate will be licensed.

1. The unit reinforces/revises program content related to differentiating instruction through collaboration with P-12 Partners.
2. Candidates receive instruction in how to utilize a variety of teaching tools to adapt instruction to meet the challenges of diverse student populations.
3. Candidates demonstrate an awareness of different learning styles and appropriately adapt instruction to meet the needs of all students.
4. Candidates demonstrate awareness and sensitivity to diversity.

5. Candidates share experiences with diverse faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 school settings, including diversity of gender, race/ethnicity, socio-economic background, culture, and exceptionalities.

STANDARD 5: Faculty Qualifications and Practice

The unit's professional education faculty demonstrate current best practices in scholarship, service, and instruction and have appropriate academic credentials and professional experience. Unit faculty are actively engaged in fostering a community of learners through regular collaboration with P-12 practitioners and various university faculties.

STANDARD 6: Recruitment, Retention and Partnerships

The unit enhances scholarships and other pre-service incentives for educator preparation in critical needs content areas, and/or for service in critical needs schools (also a state responsibility); and the unit engages in a well defined system of collaboration that is accessible and communicated to all stakeholders, including P-12 educators, teacher preparation programs and the broader community.

1. The unit implements a program of induction and mentoring based upon current research and exemplary practice, requiring implementation by districts and partner programs of teacher preparation (also a state responsibility);
2. The unit establishes P-16 Councils; and plans opportunities for collaboration among representatives from K-12 educators, teacher preparation programs and the broader community.
3. The unit utilizes induction and mentoring programs that are essential for the retention and development of teachers
4. The unit maintains collaborative activity with school districts regarding induction and mentoring processes/involvement in newly funded mentoring and induction plan adopted by MDE, etc.

(TBD) Required exhibit list for review during the MEPPA visit.

**PROPOSAL FOR REVISIONS
TO THE
EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL
REQUEST PROCESS**

PROPOSAL FOR REVISIONS TO THE EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL REQUEST PROCESS

Executive Summary

The division of Teacher and Administration Preparation (TAP) recommends implementing a more rigorous process for submitting proposals for new teacher education degree programs or modifying existing programs. The recommended process involves a more detailed proposal presentation and the contents addressed. The new process also better defines what constitutes a modification and what requires TAP and/or Commission/Board approval.

The proposed teacher education program approval process requires the following:

- Proposals for new programs to be reviewed biannually and only on designated dates for approval in order to implement the program beginning the next academic year.
- Documentation of institutional administrative approval and/or Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning approval, if public.
- Evidence that the program content meets state standards (InTASC), curriculum frameworks, common core and national program recognition standards where applicable.
- Programs must identify and meet appropriate licensure/certification requirements.
- All secondary degree programs must meet the following MS IHL minimum core curriculum requirement to receive a baccalaureate degree:

English Composition	6 semester hours
College Algebra, Quantitative Reasoning, or higher level mathematics	3 semester hours
Natural Science	6 semester hours
Humanities and Fine Arts	9 semester hours
Social or Behavioral Science	6 semester hours

(IHL BT Minutes, 1/2003; 3/2008)

The proposal must include and detail the following sections (see attached for specifications) as applicable:

Cover Page

Content Page

Introduction

Program Content

Assessment

Field and Clinical Experiences

Faculty

Support Documentation

The following provides the approval timeline for **fall implementation** of a new or modified program:

Deadline to Submit to TAP	Formal Recommendations by MDE and PRC	Commission Approval	SBE Approval
February 15	March 15	May 15	July 15

The following provides the approval timeline for **spring implementation** of a new or modified program:

Deadline for Submission to TAP	Formal Recommendations by MDE and PRC	Commission Approval	SBE Approval
July 15	August 15	September 15	November 15

The committee and TAP will continue work to refine the details of the process and accompanying forms/templates for uniform submission of documentation, including capabilities for online submission.

Introduction

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) holds all teacher education and educational leadership programs at Mississippi's institutions of higher learning accountable for establishing and maintaining programs that meet the guidelines for best preparing educators for Mississippi schools. Educator preparation programs (EPP) should adhere to the state's guiding principles, curriculum frameworks, standards and legislation established to support quality education for the children of Mississippi.

Implementing a New Teacher Education Degree Program

Approval requests for new programs shall be submitted to MDE's division of Teacher and Administrator Preparation (TAP) in February and July of each year. To be considered by the Commission and State Board of Education (SBE) in June /July, TAP must receive a program proposal no later than February 15 of that year. A proposal submitted for consideration to implement a program in January must be received no later than July 15 of the year prior to the semester of planned implementation.

The following sections provide the processes that must be followed by Mississippi teacher preparation programs seeking approval for new teacher education initial and advanced degree programs, modifications to existing programs, and/or changes to licensure requirements for degree or endorsement programs.

Institutions that seek to implement a new program must ensure the following:

- The program must have appropriate institutional administrative and governance approval, including the dean of education and, for public institutions, MS IHL approval before receiving MDE's final approval of the proposal request.
- Public institutions must not require more than the maximum number of credit hours toward graduation for an undergraduate degree program that are currently designated by the MS IHL Board of Trustees.
- The program must meet state standards, curriculum frameworks, common core and national program recognition standards where applicable. Secondary education programs must meet the minimum MS IHL core curriculum requirements for a bachelor's degree:

English Composition	6 semester hours
College Algebra, Quantitative Reasoning or higher level mathematics	3 semester hours
Natural Science	6 semester hours
Humanities and Fine Arts	9 semester hours
Social or Behavioral Science	6 semester hours

- The program must meet Mississippi certification requirements for licensure track programs.
- The program must be appropriately documented in the unit's approved program inventory and available for review by MDE as requested.

To implement a new teacher or administrator preparation program, institutions must submit a letter of request from the education unit's dean or vice president of academic affairs, and the **Program Proposal Form N** (Implementing a New Program) or include the IHL proposal request submitted (if it fully addresses each MDE proposal section requirement) by the February 15 or July 15 deadlines. In addressing each section of the proposal, please be thorough, but as brief as possible. Where applicable, attach any institution/unit forms or guidelines that provide the required information. The components of the proposal should include a cover page, and a content page that outlines required sections. The **cover page** must include the following information:

- Institution
- Name of Dean
- Mailing Address of Dean
- Name of Faculty Contact for Proposal
- Faculty Contact Telephone and Email Address
- Name of Program (Content Area)
- Level of Program (e.g., Bachelor's)
- Date Proposal Submitted to MDE

The **content page** must identify the following sections:

- I. Introduction
- II. Program Content
- III. Assessment
- IV. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
- V. Faculty
- VI. Support Documentation

The **six required sections** should address the specific details of the proposal as outlined below (insert tables, charts, or narrative where appropriate):

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

- A. Provide a brief rationale for establishing the new program.
- B. Identify the specific degree to be conferred and the applicable area of licensure, including the accompanying license code.

SECTION II: PROGRAM CONTENT

- A. Provide a description of the **proposed course of study** (the new or proposed program/advisement sheet may be submitted if it specifically identifies the required courses), state and national standards addressed, and related field experiences or clinical practice as applicable to specified courses, and a brief discussion or statement of how the program or specific courses infuse **differentiation in instruction and technology**.
NOTE: Any new courses developed specifically for the proposed program should be identified by placing an (X) beside each.
- B. **Course syllabi** for any newly developed courses for the proposed program that have not been previously reviewed or approved by MDE; and for modifications, both new and old syllabi should be submitted for comparison.
- C. A brief description of the program's **alignment** with the unit's **conceptual framework**.

SECTION III: ASSESSMENT

- A. A description of the **criteria for admission to, retention in, and exit from the program**, including the required grade point average and minimum grade requirements for the college or university and **how the key assessments** used in the program **are derived from or informed by the unit's assessment system**
- B. A description of the **key assessments** that are required of candidates in the program and include a discussion of how the assessment data will **demonstrate candidates' mastery** of the identified standards in field and clinical practice.

SECTION IV: FIELD AND CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

A description of the **required field experiences and clinical practice**, that includes:

- The criteria or measures taken to ensure placements in diverse settings and with diverse students
- Number of assessments and when administered. Identify the number of hours of field experiences and clinical hours required.

- The program’s requirements for faculty supervision of these experiences

SECTION V: FACULTY

- A. Identification of **faculty** members (full time, part time and adjunct) with **primary** responsibility for preparing professional educators in the program and their qualifications for their assigned positions
- B. Identification of program **faculty** responsible for instructing at **alternate locations**, where applicable

SECTION VI: SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

- A. Documentation of the unit’s current state/national **program recognition**
- B. Documentation of institution **administrative approval** and, if applicable, a document that indicates **MS IHL approval**
- C. **Optional documentation**, including feasibility studies or surveys that support the rationale for the proposal

The following steps must be followed to present a program approval request to the Commission and/or State Board of Education (SBE):

1. The institution must have submitted all required documentation to be eligible for an initial review by MDE’s TAP office. The initial review will be conducted by MDE staff to ensure the proposal includes all components required and where applicable, program syllabi cite alignment to the most current state curriculum model within the subject area and meet common core guidelines.
2. After the initial review, TAP disseminates the proposals to a Program Review Committee (PRC) that uses criteria established by a professional association. The PRC committee evaluates whether the program supports the rationale provided with appropriate course descriptions, content and syllabi aligned with state and national standards. The PRC must provide final recommendations 30 days in advance of a scheduled Commission meeting to be approved for the agenda.
3. The PRC will meet in a central location or conduct meetings via web/teleconference to review proposals submitted by the deadline. The PRC will review the proposals and will be required to complete the **Educator Program Proposal Review - Form R**, which provides a formal recommendation for or against MDE submitting the proposal for the Commission’s review. If the PRC raises questions or provides any negative recommendation(s) regarding a proposal, it will not be considered for the Commission agenda until all issues are addressed by the institution and revisions are accepted and approved by the Office of Quality Professionals and Special Schools.

4. If the PRC recommends a program, the proposals will be presented for discussion at the earliest feasible Commission meeting. The internal and external recommendations are included as an official component of the backup materials presented to the Commission for review. Once discussed, the Commission will consider the item for approval at the next scheduled meeting, unless the item is tabled per the members' discretion.

5. If approved, the Commission recommends the program for approval by the State Board of Education. After SBE members review and discuss the proposal and, at a subsequent meeting approve the proposal, the Office of Educator Licensure will notify the institution of the date that program candidate completers will be eligible to apply for licensure under the new degree or endorsement program.

If a proposal is denied by MDE, the Commission or SBE, TAP will forward a formal notification to the institution stating the reason for denial.

The following provides the approval timeline for ***fall implementation** of a new or modified program:

Deadline to Submit to TAP	Recommendations by MDE and PRC	Commission Approval	SBE Approval
February 15	March 15	May 15	July 15

**Based on the designated timeline, each institution should determine how to plan needed steps to make the timeline practicable for meeting their individual plan for implementation.*

The following provides the approval timeline for ***spring implementation** of a new or modified program:

Deadline for Submission to TAP	Recommendations by MDE and PRC	Commission Approval	SBE Approval
July 15	August 15	September 15	November 15

** Based on the designated timeline, each institution should determine how to plan needed steps to make the timeline practicable for meeting their individual plan for implementation.*

Modifying an Existing Educator Preparation Degree Program

An institution seeking approval to modify an existing program must provide a letter signed by the dean or vice president of academic affairs addressed to the director of TAP. The letter should provide an overview of the modifications to the program, the rationale for making the proposed modifications and evidence that the program has satisfied university protocol. Additionally, the unit should request the **Program Proposal Packet M** (Modifying an Existing Program) and complete all applicable sections. Minor modifications will be reviewed within 90 days of submission to TAP. Major modifications may be subject to review by committee and held for the semi-annual proposal approval sessions.

The components of the proposal should include a cover page, and a content page for the required sections. The **cover page** must include the following information:

- Institution
- Name of Dean
- Mailing Address of Dean
- Name of Faculty Contact for Proposal
- Faculty Contact Telephone and Email Address
- Name of Program (Content-Area)
- Level of Program
- Date Proposal Submitted to MDE

The **content page** must provide for the following sections:

- I. Introduction
- II. Program Content
- III. Assessment
- IV. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
- V. Faculty
- VI. Support Documentation

The sections should address the specific details of the proposal as outlined below:

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

- A. Provide a brief rationale for modifying the existing program.
- B. Describe and identify any changes to the applicable area(s) of licensure based on the modifications.

SECTION II: PROGRAM CONTENT

- A. An outline of the **current program** (advisement/program sheets may be submitted)
- B. A description of the **proposed course of study** (the new or proposed program/advisement sheet may be submitted if it identifies the required courses), how state and national standards will be modified if any, related field experiences or clinical practice as applicable to specified course changes, and a brief discussion or statement of how the program or specific course changes will affect provisions for **differentiation in instruction and technology**.

NOTE: Proposed changes to the current program should be clearly identified or defined. New courses should be identified by marking (X) beside each. Any courses to be deleted should be identified by marking (XX).

- C. **Course syllabi** for modified courses not yet approved
- C. A description of how the modifications affect the program's **alignment** with the unit's **conceptual framework** (if applicable)

SECTION III: ASSESSMENT

Provide a description of how the proposed modifications adjust the **criteria for admission to, retention in, and exit from the program**, including the required grade point average and minimum grade requirements for the college or university. Also describe if and how the **key assessments** used in the program will be altered as a result of the modifications.

SECTION IV: FIELD AND CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

- A. A description of how the proposed modifications will affect the **required field experiences and clinical practice**, including criteria, measures taken to ensure placements in diverse settings and with diverse students, the number of assessments and when administered, and the program's requirements for faculty supervision of these experiences (if applicable).
- B. A description of how assessment data will **demonstrate candidates' mastery** of the identified standards in field and clinical practice with the proposed modifications (if applicable).

SECTION V: FACULTY

- A. Identification of any changes in **faculty** members with **primary** responsibility for preparing professional educators in the program
- B. Faculty **qualifications** for assigned roles

- C. MDE’s Professional Faculty Table (forms or tables used as documentation for regional and national accreditation may be substituted)

SECTION VI: SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

- A. Documentation of the unit’s current state/national **program recognition**
- B. Documentation of institution **administrative approval** and, if applicable, a document that indicates **MS IHL approval**
- C. **Optional documentation**, including feasibility studies or surveys that support the rationale for the proposal

Modifications to existing programs, including licensure changes, should be submitted to the TAP division of MDE for review and recommendation to the Commission. SBE approval is not required for most modifications; however, *any* modifications that significantly impact licensure track degree programs or endorsement programs are required to be submitted to TAP for institutional files and/or approval.

The modifications that must be submitted to TAP for approval include, but are not limited to:

- Adding or deleting courses within approved degree or endorsement programs
- Deleting an established approved degree program

The modifications that must be submitted to TAP for Commission/SBE approval include, but are not limited to:

- Any modification of a program that requires a change in licensure or requires the addition or reinstatement of a licensure area/code
- Establishing a distance learning program that is an extension of an existing program in which the curriculum *differs* from the originally approved program
- Re-implementing a program that has been dormant for more than three years

The renaming of an established approved degree program and implementing a different mode of delivery for an existing approved program that requires no curriculum changes are required to be submitted to TAP with the updated documents that indicate the new designations (course codes, course descriptions, course syllabi, program sheets, etc.). The updates to TAP are to be submitted for the purpose of maintaining educator preparation program records at MDE. These **updates** shall not require Commission or SBE approval.

A list of courses required (i.e., advising or program sheets) to complete the program and a syllabus for each course must be included with a request for approval of modifications. If a public (state funded) institution governed by the Board of Trustees of the State Institutions of Higher Learning is not required to submit the proposal initially to MS IHL for approval (in a manner consistent with the *Academic Guidelines* posted on the MS IHL website, Academic and Student Affairs downloads), include that evidence. If all MDE required proposal content is addressed in the proposal for IHL, the institution may elect to submit or duplicate the IHL proposal and attach that documentation to MDE's **Program Proposal Packet M** (Modifying an Existing Program) for submission to TAP.

The following steps must be followed to present a program approval request to the Commission and SBE:

1. The institution must submit all required documentation to be eligible for an initial review by MDE's TAP office. The initial review will be conducted by MDE staff to ensure the proposal includes all components required and, where applicable, the program syllabi cite alignment to the most current state curriculum model within the subject area and meet common core guidelines.
2. After the initial review, TAP disseminates the proposals to a Program Review Committee (PRC) that uses criteria established by a professional association. The PRC evaluates whether the program supports the rationale provided with appropriate course descriptions, content and syllabi are aligned with state and national standards. The PRC must provide final recommendations 30 days in advance of a scheduled Commission meeting to be approved for the agenda.
3. The PRC will meet in a central location or conduct meetings via web/teleconference to review proposals submitted by the deadline. The PRC will review the proposals and will be required to complete the **Educator Program Proposal Review - Form R**, which provides a formal recommendation for or against MDE submitting the proposal for the Commission's review. If the PRC raises questions or provides any recommendations for changes to the proposal, it will not be considered for the Commission meeting agenda until all issues are addressed by the institution and revisions are accepted and approved by the Office of Quality Professionals and Special Schools.
4. If the PRC recommends a program, the proposals will be presented for discussion at the earliest practicable Commission meeting. The internal and external recommendations are included as an official component of the backup materials presented to the Commission for review. Once discussed, the Commission will consider the item for approval at the next scheduled meeting, unless the item is tabled at the Commission's discretion.
5. If approved, the Commission recommends the program for approval by the State Board of Education. If approved by the SBE, the Office of Educator Licensure will notify the institution of the date that program candidate completers will be eligible to apply for licensure under the new degree or endorsement program.

If a proposal is denied by MDE, the Commission or SBE, TAP will forward a formal notification to the unit head stating the reason for denial.

Implementing a Distance Learning Degree Program

Guidelines and any board policies and standards that apply to on- and off-campus instruction also apply to distance learning. Distance learning may be defined (according to *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*) as “institutionally based formal education where the learning group is separated and where interactive communications systems are used to connect instructors, learners, and resources or the acquisition of knowledge and skills through mediated information and instruction, encompassing all technologies and other forms of learning at a distance.”

An institution seeking to implement a degree program by distance learning must provide a letter signed by the dean or vice president of academic affairs addressed to the director of TAP. The letter should provide an overview of the program, the rationale for implementing the program, and document that the program has satisfied university protocol. Additionally, the steps for implementing a new program or modifying an existing program as provided above should be followed to implement a distance learning degree program.

If the proposed distance learning program does not differ from the existing approved program except through its delivery system, the unit is only required to submit a letter to TAP that states such to provide an update to program records with MDE. However, if the proposed program differs beyond the method of delivery from the approved program from which it extends, it shall require Commission approval. To implement a degree program by distance learning, an institution must submit a **Program Proposal Request D** (Implementing a Distance Learning Program) to MDE according to the established schedule.

Distance learning programs must:

- Meet the approval of IHL prior to approval by MDE
- Require no more than 124 credit hours towards graduation for an undergraduate program
- Meet state and national standards and Mississippi licensing or certification requirements.

Glossary

Area for Improvement (AFI) – A statement cited by the state and national Board of Examiners or the Unit Accreditation Board (NCATE/CAEP) indicating that a unit has not met expected levels of achievement in one or more elements of a standard.

Board of Examiners (BOE) – On-site evaluators who review institutions based on accreditation standards.

Commission - The Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development is charged with the responsibility of making recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding standards for the preparation, licensure, and continuing professional development of those who teach or perform tasks of an educational nature in the public schools of the State of Mississippi.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) - ensures the preparation of highly qualified educators through the accreditation of programs in which data-driven decisions; resources and practices support candidate learning; and candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions geared toward raising student achievement. NOTE: TEAC and NCATE are in the process of merging to become CAEP.

Educator Preparation Program (EPP) - A program that provides teacher candidates with the academic, professional, and personal resources needed to succeed as highly qualified educators.

Mississippi Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) – organization comprised of the deans of education for public and private universities and colleges in the state of Mississippi. MACTE is one of the decision making bodies for colleges of education in Mississippi.

Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) – state department of education for the state of Mississippi. MDE strives to ensure every child in Mississippi has access to the education he or she deserves and one that can lead to a brighter future through a life-long love of learning.

Mississippi Educator Preparation Program Accreditation (MEPPA) – review process that is designed to help ensure that Mississippi educator preparation programs produce competent, caring, and qualified teachers and other professional school personnel who can help all students learn.

Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning (MS IHL) - consists of the eight public universities: Alcorn State University, Delta State University, Jackson State University, Mississippi State University, Mississippi University for Women, Mississippi Valley State University, The University of Mississippi, The University of Southern Mississippi, including the [University of Mississippi Medical Center](#), Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service, Mississippi Agricultural, Forestry and Veterinary Medicine, ten off-campus centers, and various

other locations throughout the state. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools is the accrediting body for each of the public universities in Mississippi.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) - recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council of Higher Education as a professional accrediting body for teacher preparation. Mississippi has been an NCATE partnership state.

State Board of Education (SBE) - The Mississippi Board of Education is made up of nine members appointed according to the rules in the Mississippi Constitution. The Board appoints the State Superintendent of Education, sets public education policy and oversees the Mississippi Department of Education.

State Standards - The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel. State standards may include candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Standards may also relate to the state curriculum and assessment model for P-12 students.

Teacher Candidates - Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial preparation of teachers. Candidates are distinguished from “students” in P-12 schools. The term “students” indicates learners in the P-12 environment.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) - an organization dedicated to improving academic degree programs for professional educators, those who will teach and lead in schools, pre-K through grade 12. TEAC’s goal is to support the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified professional educators. TEAC’s primary work is accrediting undergraduate and graduate professional education programs in order to assure the public about the quality of college and university programs. The education program, not the college, school, department or other administrative unit of the institution, receives TEAC accreditation.