

**TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM**  
**ACTION REPORT**  
**FOR**  
**MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**January 27, 2017**

**REVIEW SUMMARY**

**TDOE Recommendation:** Full Approval\*

**Approval** - Full approval is unequivocal, but may be accompanied by statements of weakness. Annual progress toward correcting weaknesses must be reported to the DOE. The progress will be reviewed yearly and DOE staff will assist the program provider in developing a plan to correct weaknesses.

<b>Learning Centered Leadership Policy – Area of Focus</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Partnership with LEAs</b>	
Formal Partnership Agreement	M
Roles and Responsibilities	M
Screening and Selecting Candidates	M
LEA Perception Survey	E
<b>Candidate Selection</b>	
Selection Processes	M
Selection Criteria	M
<b>Preparation Curriculum</b>	
Alignment to TILS	M
Assessment System	M
SLLA First Time Pass Rate	E
<b>Practicum</b>	
Handbook and Materials	M
Mentor Selection	M
Evaluation of Candidates	M

\*Assessment System was the only remaining indicator on which the provider did not meet expectations in the Fall 2015 review. Through the Fall 2016 review, it was determined that MTSU meets expectations on this indicator.

- E = Expectation Exceeded
- M = Expectation Met
- PM = Expectation Partially Met
- NM = Expectation Not Met

**TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAM**  
**ACTION REPORT**  
**FOR**  
**MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**January 26, 2017**

**REVIEW DETAIL**

Review team findings are included in the table below for areas where Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU) did not meet expectations in the Fall 2014 and subsequent 2015 review. Throughout the spring of 2016, MTSU carried out an implementation plan to redesign their assessment system to address the concerns raised by the review team. TDOE and MTSU were in frequent communication throughout this process and MTSU demonstrated making adequate progress throughout the spring and summer months. In August 2016, MTSU formally submitted revisions that addressed the areas of deficiency. These documents were reviewed by a review team comprised of faculty members from leader preparation programs across the state. The team determined that MTSU’s revisions were substantial and that the expectations of the indicator were met. As a result, the Department is recommending Full Approval of MTSU’s instructional leader preparation program.

Section 3: Preparation Curriculum	Fall 2015 Rating	Fall 2016 Rating
<p><b>3.2 Assessment System</b></p> <p><b>Area of Concern:</b> Evidence minimally supports the indicator at the Partially Met level. There is an unclear assessment system documented. There is no clear evidence of how the assessment program is connected with TILS.</p> <p><b>Fall 2015 Review Comments:</b> The review team determined the assessment system remains inadequately developed. Specifically, the team identified the following deficiencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment system is not comprehensively or systematically aligned to the TILS</li> <li>2. The assessment system does not systematically provide candidates and the program with actionable feedback</li> </ol> <p>While assessment of candidates throughout the practicum is present, the remaining system is primarily course and project-driven but may vary based on the individual candidate’s identified needs. As a result, the program does not have the ability to look across TILS in a systematic way. In addition, feedback tools (e.g., self-assessment, course assessment, and capstone) provide candidates with broad, general feedback that is also not systematic throughout the program. The rating for this indicator remains unchanged.</p> <p><b>Fall 2016 Comments:</b> The review team determined revisions to the assessment system are adequate and meet expectations of this review. Specifically, the team identified transitional data points that had connections to the TILS. Assessments and tools provided (such as the various assessment rubrics, Capstone activity, and culminating rubric) offered clear guidance, with connection to the TILS, and measurable performance criteria to determine if the expectation has been met. Examples of student work and feedback were useful to understand the system. While tools and protocols for feedback loops back to the program were present, it will take a number of cycles of implementation to generate data from this system. This will be a primary focus of the next review cycle. The review team commended the program for</p>	<p><b>Partially Met</b></p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>

<p>integrating the LiveText tool as one that will provide performance data back to the program for the purpose of continuous improvement.</p> <p>There was some concern about the sheer number of documents involved in the assessment process. Review team members suggested that MTSU review their documents and self-assess for any potential redundancies across tools.</p> <p>Ultimately, the review team determined expectations had been met on this indicator.</p>		
--	--	--