

OFFICE OF CHIEF ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICER
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items
Consent Agenda
November 8, 2018

OFFICE OF TEACHING AND LEADING
DIVISION OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION

- B. Approval of Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) mid-cycle program approval report as recommended by the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development on September 14, 2018

Background Information: The Mississippi Department of Education's mid-cycle onsite review of EPPs is based on approved standards and criteria required for all EPPs in Mississippi. Reviews conducted in 2018 were pilots to inform the official, more rigorous process which is currently under revision. Trained state members review EPP's programs and prepare a report of their findings based on the prescribed standards. The team assigns a status of "Met," "Met with Conditions" or "Not Met". If an EPP Onsite Program Review Report has a status recommendation of "Met with Conditions" or "Not Met" the EPP is required to provide a response which outlines corrective actions.

In accordance with Miss. Code Ann. § 37-3-2, the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development reviews the state team findings and recommends to the State Board of Education approval of educator preparation programs in the state.

Mississippi has 15 Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) plus additional alternate providers that are subject to annual review and approval through the state's Process and Performance Review and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) accreditation onsite review.

The attached report is a result from one (1) mid-cycle onsite review:

- Teach For America

On September 14, 2018, the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development approved the attached report and response for the mid-cycle onsite review referenced above.

Recommendation: Approval

Back-up material attached



PILOT

ONSITE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

TEACH FOR AMERICA

2018

TEACHFORAMERICA

Contents

Overview	3
Program Review Status Report	4
Teach for America Program Review Report.....	5
Teach for America Program Review Rubric.....	7
Program Review Committee Signature Page	18

Pilot Draft

OVERVIEW

On April 9, 2018, a team of 4 individuals, consisting of representatives from the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and education faculty from Mississippi institutions, convened for a review of education program at Teach for America (TFA) Mississippi. The purpose of the review, as mandated by legislation, is 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”. This pilot visit was conducted under the MDE’s revised onsite visit review format and will serve to inform future visits and the revision of the MDE Educator Preparation Performance Review processes.

After its founding in 1990, Teach for America was invited to establish the Mississippi Delta region in light of a social and political need to improve the quality of life and education for children growing up in Arkansas and Mississippi. TFA is an alternate route-only educator preparation provider. Although a national organization, it only operates in geographic critical teacher shortage areas in the state of Mississippi. The TFA review focused on understanding the organizational structure, format for delivery, instructional content, data collection, program impact, recruitment, and program evaluation. During the review, the team analyzed course sessions to ascertain alignment to national and state standards, ensured educator preparation program (EPP) collected and analyzed data appropriately for a minimum of 3 cycles, reviewed assessments, determined EPP’s impact on completers and the education community, interviewed program instructors and leadership, and monitored for other areas of program compliance.

The following recommendations will be used for recognition of the EPP’s individual licensure or endorsement programs:

Met: The preponderance of the evidence indicates the licensure or endorsement program(s) fully meets or exceeds the program review standards.

Met with conditions: The evidence indicates the licensure or endorsement program(s) has not fully met the program review standards and conditions exist that require the EPP to provide additional information about the program in its annual report, provide follow-up documentation to the MDE, or receive a follow-up visit.

Not Met: The EPP did not present substantial evidence to indicate the licensure or endorsement program(s) has met the program review standards and should not receive state approval.

The evidence submitted by the EPP is reviewed and determined by program team members after an evaluation of the “met,” “met with conditions,” and “not met” designations for each rubric item. The EPP 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 confirm the initial recommendation. The EPP will be assigned a specific timeline for correcting any deficits before the program is recommended for non-approval status.

This report contains the completed review rubric and overall report for each program reviewed. The report rubric contains the individual components that were reviewed. The review report summarizes the evidence submitted by category and gives a summary of the review of the program. The overall review of a program will consist of the three parts: Program Review Status Report, Annual Report, and Survey Data (Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, First Year Teacher, and Principal of First Year Teacher).

Teach for America Program Review Status Report

Alternate Route Program: **MET**

Additional Documentation Requested: Yes

PROGRAM REVIEW DATE: APRIL 9, 2018



MDE MID-CYCLE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

INSTITUTION: Teach for America – MS

PROGRAM: Alternate Route Provider-Only

DATE OF REVIEW: 4.9.2018

STATUS OF REVIEW: **MET**

MET WITH CONDITIONS

NOT MET

Provide a narrative of the evidence submitted to meet each component.

FIELD EXPERIENCES (Clinical hours will vary between teaching and administrator programs)	Evidence Cited
The EPP provides a variety of effective field or clinical experiences. The EPP co-constructs with P-12 school and community partners for field and clinical experiences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates complete clinical experiences during their institute training. Candidates receive constant monitoring and coaching during their placement as the full-time teacher of record. All are placed in geographic critical shortage areas.
COURSE INFORMATION	
Syllabi: For this section, the EPP is required to provide program course syllabi. This information is used to provide program review team members with course descriptions. Include faculty information, resources (textbooks and readings).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Course session topics and agendas are included in great detail.
Program Alignment to State and National Standards: For this section, a license or endorsement program must meet its specific state and national standards. Courses, assessments, course assignments, syllabi, and other information provided will be used to determine if standards are met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPP should strengthen alignment to national and state standards with course sessions.
The Mississippi Educator Code of Ethics and dispositions for professional behavior is taught and assessed at multiple checkpoints in the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MS Code of Ethics is mentioned but there is no evidence that it is incorporated into course sessions, assignments, and activities.
ASSESSMENTS	
Each assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure. (A minimum of 3 assessments provided)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPP included 3 assessments that assessed student knowledge and growth, candidate knowledge via coursework, and student satisfaction. It would be helpful to include how candidates are assessed on the individual session topics, especially those that target

	certain subject areas, i.e.: Finishing the ELA year strong; Social Justice in the Social Studies Classroom; Building Numeracy in Secondary Mathematics.
The EPP provides 3 cycles of assessment data that is summarized and analyzed appropriately.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EPP collects and analyzes data in cycles. The data includes survey results from members (candidates), students, and principals and student achievement.
PROGRAM IMPACT	
The EPP has a quality assurance system and uses multiple sources of data at various checkpoints to monitor candidates and to make improvements to the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate data is collected at multiple check points. However, a quality assurance system is not in place to specify how data is used to make program changes.
SUMMARY How well does the EPP use quality evidence within a continuous improvement system (CAEP Standard 5) that assures candidates are knowledgeable (CAEP Standard 1), have skills well-developed through clinical experiences (CAEP Standard 2), show readiness and promise (CAEP Standard 3), and are prepared to positively impact P-12 students (CAEP Standard 4)?	
<p>The EPP uses real-time student achievement data as evidence that candidates are knowledgeable and show readiness to be competent educators. However, more documentation is needed on how candidates are taught and assessed on MS Code of Ethics (CAEP 1). The EPP has a rigorous and effective recruitment process that includes a diverse candidate population and targets hard-to-staff locations (CAEP 3). The EPP states that team meetings occur weekly to analyze data and yearly to make program changes with their senior leadership, but there is little evidence to show this has occurred. To document that this occurs, the EPP should include items like meeting agendas, meeting minutes, documentation of session topic changes, etc.- but all changes should be directly tied to program data. Although some components are present (achievement data, survey data, analyses of data, etc.), the EPP should develop a comprehensive quality assurance system that reflects how the various components unify to inform continuous improvement to the overall program (CAEP 5).</p> <p>The program provides candidates with diverse field experiences across several districts. All candidates are placed in geographic critical shortage areas in the state. Candidates are observed, monitored, and assessed through ongoing coaching, monitoring, and professional development (CAEP 2).</p> <p>The EPP collects and analyzes data to show candidates are equipped to positively impact P-12 students. The EPP uses several stakeholder surveys and student achievement data to determine program impact. The EPP has implemented a unique data monitoring system in mathematics to track student growth aligned to MCCR Standards (CAEP 4).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Additional Documentation Requested:</p> <p>The EPP should submit additional documentation that details how various components will be unified to form a quality assurance system to inform continuous improvement to the overall program.</p>	

MDE MID-CYCLE PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC

INSTITUTION: Teach for America – MS

PROGRAM: Alternate Route Provider-Only

DATE OF REVIEW: 4.9.2018

STATUS OF REVIEW: **MET**

MET WITH CONDITIONS

NOT MET

Program Name:	<i>Met (M)</i>	<i>Met with Conditions (MWC)</i>	<i>Not Met (NM)</i>	Rating
Program Description				
The licensure or endorsement program is indicated.	The licensure or endorsement program is provided.		The licensure or endorsement program is not provided.	M
A general description of the program is provided (e.g. history of the program, special recognitions, etc.).	A general description of the program is provided.		A general description of the program is not provided.	M
Pass rates indicate an 80% success rate over three years	80% or more of candidates passed required assessment		Less than 80% of candidates passed required assessment	M
The degree awarded is indicated.	The degree awarded is provided.		The degree awarded is not provided.	M
A description is provided of any major or minor modifications made since the previous state recognition of the program or the provider indicated there were no major or minor modifications.	A description is provided of all relevant major or minor modifications made since the previous	Some of the description information is provided; however, some information is missing.	Modification information is not provided.	N/A

	state recognition of the program.			
The provider must identify the standard delivery of the program, as well as variations to the delivery. Examples of variations include: Alternate locations, weekday/weekend offerings, online offerings, or hybrid programs, etc.	All program standard delivery and variations information is provided.	Some of the program standard delivery and variations information is provided; however, some information is missing.	The program standard delivery and variations information is not provided.	M
Field Experiences (Clinical hours will vary between teaching and administrator programs)				Rating
The EPP provides a variety of field or clinical experiences in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a teaching/administrator license.	The EPP provides a variety of field or clinical experiences in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a teaching or administrator license.	The EPP provides a field or clinical experience in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a teaching or administrator license; however, some weaknesses were found.	The EPP does not provide a variety of field or clinical experiences in a public or private school setting that ensures the candidate will be able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be a successful candidate for a teaching or administrator license.	M
The EPP's supervisor(s) meet with the candidate and the cooperating teacher 3 or more times in joint conferences to discuss	The EPP requires the supervisor(s), candidate, and	The EPP requires the supervisor(s), candidate, and	The EPP does not require the supervisor(s),	M

the candidate performance. Evidence of co-construction with P-12 partners. (Applies to teacher education program only)	cooperating teacher meet 3 or more times to discuss evaluations and the candidate's work samples or portfolios.	cooperating teacher meet less than three times to discuss candidate performance.	candidate, and cooperating teacher to meet to discuss candidate performance.	
Course Information				Rating
Syllabi: For this section, the EPP is required to provide program course syllabi. This information is used to provide program review team members with course descriptions. Include faculty information, resources (textbooks and readings).	All relevant syllabi are provided.	Not all syllabi are provided; however, some information is missing. Syllabi lack rigor and specificity to detail.	The syllabi are not provided.	M Agendas for sessions are provided
Program Alignment to State and National Standards: For this section, a license or endorsement program must meet its specific state and national standards. Courses, assessments, course assignments, syllabi, and other information provided will be used to determine if standards are met.	Assignments, assessments, syllabi, and other information indicate proper alignment to state and national standards.	Assignments, assessments, syllabi, and other information show some alignment to state and national standards but weaknesses exist.	Assignments, assessments, syllabi, and other information show little to no alignment to state and national standards.	MWC EPP should tag each session/ activity with appropriate InTASC and/or MCCR standards
The Mississippi Educator Code of Ethics and dispositions for professional behavior is taught and assessed at multiple checkpoints in the program.	Candidates taught and assessed on MS Educator Code of Ethics and dispositions for professional behavior on multiple occasions	Discussions and/or activities related to ethical behavior for educators is included in the program but not in great detail.	Discussions nor activities related to ethical behavior of educators is not incorporated into the program.	MWC It is mentioned but more focus should be placed on Code of Ethics.

	throughout program.			
Assessments and Rubrics/Scoring Guides (e.g. surveys, tests, grades, etc.) EPPs are required to provide a narrative summary for 3-5 assessments. EPPs must provide a rubric and/or scoring guide for the assessment, if appropriate, which the EPP uses for data collection. “If appropriate” signify that some types of assessments would not use or require a rubric or scoring guide. For example, a survey would not have a rubric or scoring guide.				Rating
Each Assessment will be evaluated based on the following elements. Summarize your review of each assessment to evaluate the overall quality of assessments. *See Assessment Scoring Table.				
A1: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), measures what it purports to measure.	The assessment measures what it purports to measure.	Overall, the assessment measures what it purports to measure, but some weaknesses exist.	The assessment did not measure what it purports to measure.	M
A2: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is clearly defined.	The assessment is clearly defined.	Overall, the assessment is adequately defined but there are some areas that are vague or poorly defined.	The assessment is vague and poorly defined.	M
A3: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.	The assessment addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student	Overall, the assessment addresses the specific assessment area but some weaknesses exist. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy	The assessment does not adequately address the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge,	M

	learning, dispositions, or technology.	and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.	content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.	
A4: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure.	The assessment is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure.	Overall, the assessment is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure, but some weaknesses exist.	The assessment is not consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skill required by the standard it is designed to measure.	M
A5: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is a fair measure. A fair measure returns the same results even if applied by different observers under different circumstances or at different points in time.	The assessment is a fair measure.	Overall, the assessment is a fair measure, but some areas could be strengthened.	The assessment is not a fair measure or an evaluation for fairness was not completed.	M
A6: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.	The assessment allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.	Overall, the assessment allows for levels of candidate proficiency to be determined, but some weaknesses exist.	The assessment does not allow for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.	M

A7: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.	The assessment instrument provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.	Overall, the assessment instrument provides candidates or supervisors with guidance as to what is being sought, but some weaknesses exist.	The assessment instrument does not provide candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.	M
Data from key assessments				Rating
<p>Cycles of data for the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ongoing assessment: The EPP provides three cycles of data for the assessment; or o Revised assessments: The EPP provides a total of three cycles of data for the assessment, including as much data as is available from the revised assessment plus data from the original assessment, to total three cycles; or o New assessments that do not have a predecessor: The EPP indicates it is a new assessment and provides as many cycles of data as are available. 	The EPP provided the required data for the assessment. For a new assessment, the EPP indicates it is a new assessment and provides as many cycles of data as are available.	The EPP provides fewer than the required number of cycles of data for the assessment; however, the EPP provides some data.	The EPP does not provide data for the assessment.	<p>M</p> <p>*See comment below</p>
The EPP provided cycles of data on Student Achievement and surveys. However, survey instruments were not included.				
The assessment data demonstrate 80% candidates meet the standards being assessed:	The assessment data demonstrates most candidates meet or exceed the standards being assessed.	Overall, the assessment data demonstrates most candidates meet the standards being assessed; however, some weaknesses exist.	The assessment data does not demonstrate most candidates meet the standards being assessed.	M

The assessment data is summarized and analyzed	The assessment data is summarized and analyzed.	Overall, the assessment data is summarized and analyzed; however, some weaknesses exist.	The assessment data does not demonstrate most candidates meet the standards being assessed.	MWC
The EPP is using assessment data, or has a plan in place to use assessment data, to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program:	The assessment data results are used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program or the EPP has a plan in place to use assessment data to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program.	Overall, the assessment data results are used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program or the EPP has a plan in place to use assessment data to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program; however, some weaknesses exist.	The assessment data results are not used to improve candidate performance or strengthen the program or the EPP does not have a plan in place to use assessment data results to improve candidate performance or strengthen the program.	MWC *See comment below
EPP uses data to improve candidate performance but needs to strengthen ways the data has been used to make programmatic changes.				
Program Impact				Rating
The EPP uses multiple sources of data for monitoring program performance and monitors candidate progress at various check points throughout the program.	Program collects and uses multiple sources of high-quality internally and externally	Program collects and uses few sources of high quality information, relying on data of	Sources of information collected and used for program monitoring are	M

	validated data to monitor ongoing performance.	inconsistent quality to monitor ongoing performance.	not high quality data.	
The EPP uses quality data to systematically monitor program and make adjustments to program components. (Data sources could include: program improvement plans, candidate completion rates, feedback surveys, internal reviews, faculty study groups, faculty/peer observations)	Program leadership regularly and systematically monitors overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. This includes regular examination of observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as regular training for mentor teachers	Program leadership inconsistently monitors overall quality of coursework, clinical experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. Examination of observation and feedback instruments and practices is not regular nor is training for mentor teachers.	The program does not take steps to monitor the quality of coursework, candidate fieldwork clinical experiences, and/or the program's observation and feedback practices. Mentor teacher do not receive at least annual training to ensure consistency of approach in giving feedback to teacher candidates.	MWC *See comment below
Although candidate performance is monitored and observed, it is difficult to determine how data is systematically monitored and adjustments are made for program improvement. Data is monitored on individual candidates and surveys are conducted but is difficult to identify a unifying quality assurance system used to inform overall program improvements.				
The EPP has a well-developed quality assurance system that leads to ongoing improvement of the program.	The program has and regularly uses rigorous and well-	The program inconsistently makes use of quality	Quality assurance systems are not	MWC

	<p>embedded quality assurance systems informed by high quality data about cohorts or groups of candidates and completers to sustain high-quality outcomes, and these processes are the basis for improvement planning and action steps.</p>	<p>assurance systems, and these quality assurance systems need improvement to be used effectively in improvement planning and action steps.</p>	<p>used to examine the effectiveness of the program and secure further improvements in outcomes for individuals and groups of teacher candidates and completers.</p>	<p>*See comment below</p>
<p>TFA has a conceptual framework for its assessment of its impact on student development and learning. However, a well-defined assessment system for the overall program as a complete program provider is lacking even though there are components of a strong assessment system. The quality assurance system needs to be defined, articulating the stages and time frames of data collection and use.</p>				

Assessment Scoring Table

Assessment #1 Summer Experience Rubric		Rating
A1: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), measures what it purports to measure.		M
A2: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is clearly defined.		M
A3: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.		M
A4: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure.		M
A5: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is a fair measure. A fair measure returns the same results even if applied by different observers under different circumstances or at different points in time.		M
A6: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.		M
A7: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.		M
Overall Rating		M
Assessment #2 Student Outcomes Wheel		Rating
A1: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), measures what it purports to measure.		M
A2: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is clearly defined.		M
A3: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.		M
A4: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure.		M
A5: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is a fair measure. A fair measure returns the same results even if applied by different observers under different circumstances or at different points in time.		M
A6: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.		M
A7: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.		M
Overall Rating		M

Assessment #3 Student Survey	Rating
A1: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), measures what it purports to measure.	M
A2: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is clearly defined.	M
A3: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), addresses the specific assessment area. For example, candidate content knowledge, content pedagogy, pedagogy and professional knowledge, student learning, dispositions, or technology.	MWC What is the assessment area?
A4: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is consistent with the complexity, cognitive demands, and skills required by the standard it is designed to measure.	MWC Difficult to determine
A5: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), is a fair measure. A fair measure returns the same results even if applied by different observers under different circumstances or at different points in time.	M
A6: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), allows for different levels of candidate proficiency to be determined.	M
A7: The assessment, including any rubric/scoring guide (if appropriate), provides candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being sought.	M
Overall Rating	M



Educator Preparation Code of Ethics

While representing the Mississippi Department of Education and Office of Teaching and Leading, program review team members and Division of Educator Preparation representatives and staff shall conduct themselves as thoughtful, competent, well-prepared, and impartial professionals who maintain the confidences of all parties involved in the program review processes and resulting decisions contained in this report.

Teacher for America Program Review Status Report

Alternate Route Program: **MET**

Program Review Committee	Signature	Date
Dr. David Hand	<i>David B Hand</i>	<i>8-27-2018</i>
Dr. Jennifer Young-Wallace	<i>Jennifer Young Wallace</i>	<i>8-28-2018</i>
Dr. Debra Burson	<i>Debra B. Burson</i>	<i>8-29-18</i>
Dr. Albert Carter	<i>Albert Carter</i>	<i>8-29-18</i>

By signing this document, Program Review Committee members agree to comply with the Mississippi Educator Preparation Code of Ethics, serve voluntarily as a reviewer, and agree with the contents included in the Teach for America Program Review report as submitted by the Mississippi Department of Education's Division of Educator Preparation.



State Policy Board	Status Recommendation	Date Approved
Program Review Committee	MET	August 29, 2018
Licensure Commission	MET	September 14, 2018
State Board of Education	MET	