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Abstract

This research focused specifically on the impact and effectiveness of the Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program (METP), the only teacher scholarship program currently offered in the state of Mississippi. The first research question asked to what extent METP has impacted the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi, focusing specifically on the impact of the program in attracting students to enter teacher education programs and learning opportunities that have been made available post-college. The second research question asked if METP is likely to continue impacting the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi. As the population size was limited, as well as the sample that completed the survey being small, none of the predictor variables significantly predicted the impact of METP, thus suggesting that METP is not effective in attracting students to enroll in teacher education programs; however, the impact of METP significantly predicted the likelihood of METP to continue impacting the shortage. Though there were limitations due to the number of participants and strict focus on METP, this research provides a starting point in looking into the means of attracting and retaining teachers in critical shortage areas such as Mississippi, as well as throughout the country.
Thesis Proposal: Have Teacher Scholarship Programs Impacted the Critical Teacher Shortage in Mississippi?

Teacher shortages are not an uncommon phenomenon across the United States, especially in the past decade. News stories of teacher walk-outs, protests, and strikes have flooded media outlets in recent years, bringing to the forefront questions of teacher pay, teacher freedoms, and teacher benefits—all factors frequently quoted as reasons many are not seeking teaching as a profession as well as reasons that current teachers leave the profession. States with poor education systems seem to be the hardest hit, including the state of Mississippi. Clarion Ledger notes that one of three school districts in Mississippi are considered critical shortage areas (Harris, 2019). Harris (2019) notes are fewer college students are choosing to pursue teaching as a profession, which is resulting in fewer teacher licenses being issued. In an attempt to combat this, Mississippi has begun offering scholarship programs catered directly towards getting teachers in—and keeping them in—the Mississippi public education system. However, with most of these programs getting cut due to budget constraints, their impact is difficult to measure; still, only one scholarship program for teachers remains in Mississippi whose effect can be assessed—the Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program (METP).

METP began in fall 2013 after being funded by the Robert M. Hearin Support Foundation in Jackson, Mississippi (Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program). Its goal is to attract “top performing students” to become teachers in the state of Mississippi by granting full-paid scholarships and incentives at Mississippi State University (MSU) and The University of Mississippi (Ole Miss) (Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program). Both universities select up to 30 students each year to major in secondary English, math, or science; elementary education; or special education with ACT scores of 28 and over and high school GPA of 3.5 or above
(Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program). In exchange for a full-paid scholarship, graduates are required to teach in a Mississippi public school for five years following graduation, or they will be required to pay the scholarship, which turns into a student loan, back in its entirety. However, students can defer the scholarship to pursue graduate school, but they must still fulfill the requirement post-graduation. At this time, three classes of METP have graduated from both MSU and Ole Miss. These three classes will be the focus of my research.

**Literature Review**

While creating programs to get college students in the field of education is not a novel initiative, retaining teachers in the field, as well as changing public opinion about the profession as a whole, are still steady challenges. Multiple organizations agree that recruiting and adequately preparing pre-service teachers is essential to improving schools, suggesting that teacher quality is the most significant variable in student achievement (Black, 2017). Therefore, states who have been forced to hire non-qualified teachers are doing so at the expense of their students and educational systems as a whole (Black, 2017).

Mississippi recently made national news because of this—the state is one of many turning to alternate route programs to get teachers in the classroom, allowing college graduates with bachelor degrees in other subject areas to teach while working towards certification (McCausland, 2019). One example of this that received national attention recently is Jackson Public Schools—one of the largest districts in the state, serving over 25,000 students—which was hit exceptionally hard the summer of 2019 when the Mississippi Department of Education revoked the temporary three-year teaching licenses of over 200 teachers (McCausland, 2019). Emma Garcia, who worked on the Economic Policy Institute report, states that teachers who are not fully prepared, such as these in alternate route programs, are much more likely to leave the
field compared to those who are fully certified, thus earning these programs the term “Band-Aid” in regards to fixing the shortage (McCausland, 2019). Aragon, a policy researcher at the Education Commission of the States based out of Colorado, (2016a) suggests that addressing teacher shortages should focus less on recruiting any and every body that wants to teach and focus more on recruiting teachers who genuinely want to be in the profession and who are a good fit in the school in which they aspire to teach.

Many states and organizations have begun looking at ways not only to attract new teachers to the field, but also to retain current teachers. Aragon (2016a) states that 719,000 students enrolled in teaching programs in 2008-2009, while only 465,500 enrolled in 2013-2014. She suggests that a focus on marketing education programs could help recruiting efforts and attract more teachers, while quality mentor and orientation programs could help retain teachers once they are in the profession by combating issues such as dissatisfaction, limitations in their careers, and loss of self (Aragon, 2016a).

Similarly, Colorado Department of Education (2017) reports that lack of interest and issues in retention are just a few of the many issues to blame. They suggest that promoting the value of teaching and supporting programs that have been proven to work can help combat both of the attraction and retention issue (Colorado Department of Education, 2017). However, the biggest similarity of the two articles, as well as others regarding this topic, is the impact of the financial aspect.

Two-thirds of states are funding education at lower levels (some up to 20% lower) than they did in 2008, thus resulting in lay-offs and pay cuts that keep high school students considering their long-term careers away from the field of teaching (Black, 2017). Adding to the financial aspect are the pressures teachers face regarding accountability, forcing teachers to
achieve at a certain level though their financial needs remain unmet, both at the salary level as well as funding going directly into their classrooms (Black, 2017). Further, Aragon (2016a) states that shortages within states are often affected by the governments and the policies they implement; she argues that there must be financial incentives, such as diversified pay and loan forgiveness in order for the teaching profession to compete. She notes that current teacher salaries are not competitive with salaries of those who are educated similarly, thus creating a lack of encouragement to the “best and brightest” of teachers. Salary-wise, Mulhere (2017) notes an 18.7% pay gap between teachers and college graduates who are similarly qualified; this pay gap is minimally larger in the state of Mississippi, at 18.9%. Similarly, Colorado Department of Education (2017) notes changes in salaries as a means of retaining and attracting teachers. They suggest that states and districts should consider implementing a minimum salary that is at or above the specific district’s cost of living, in addition to incentives to further help the cost of living (Colorado Department of Education, 2017). Colorado Department of Education (2017) also suggests supporting the advancement of teachers by offering an increase in salary for obtaining National Board Certification in Teaching (NBCT), something that Mississippi has already implemented, rewarding teachers an extra $6,000 a year (In your state: Mississippi).

Aside from salaries, there are other financial options states can consider in regards to attracting teachers. Many states are implementing loan forgiveness programs as well as financial incentives for teachers who choose to enter the field, while also starting to offer scholarships for preservice teachers. Colorado Department of Education (2017) notes that student loan forgiveness as well as supplements specifically for shortage areas can help attract more teachers, in addition to offering financial assistance to those in educational preparatory programs in the form of stipends or the
option to waive student teaching and enter the profession early to begin earning income. Since then, Colorado passed a House Bill enacting these ideals, creating the Teacher of Record License and the Grow Your Own Educator Program. Of these, the Grow Your Own Educator program looks similarly to the METP in that the state pays for the last 36 hours of a teaching degree if the student makes a commitment to teach for three years after (Teacher of Record and Grow Your Own Educator Programs). However, according to data analyst for the program, Molly Gold, the program is still too new to have relevant data, though she did mention that there had been three applications submitted for the Teacher of Record program (M. Gold, personal communication, August 27, 2019). In addition to Colorado, the Florida Critical Teacher Shortage Program (FCTSP) offered compensation to teachers for undergraduate and graduate level courses, as well as loan forgiveness. Of these two, FCTSP noted that the loan forgiveness program was more effective than paying for the last 36 credit hours because it continued to pay as long as teachers were still in the field. Feng and Sass (2015) studied the effectiveness of the FCTSP and concluded that loan forgiveness did reduce teacher turnover, particularly when more money was on the line, but that there were few to no differences in teacher quality.

Feng, Sass, and Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness (2015) state that 40 states are already offering loan forgiveness and scholarship programs to attract and retain teachers. Feng, Sass, and Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness (2015) noted that there is little research completed on the effect of the programs implemented in the 40 states. However, although Feng, Sass, and Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness (2015) have analyzed the effectiveness of Florida’s programs, their work, too, produced minimal conclusions and no implications in moving the programs forward, noting that while their preliminary analysis showed some patterns, there was still a need for a larger sample size in
order to generalize the findings. Thus, there is still a research gap involving the lasting impact of the effectiveness of these endeavors, which can be attributed to the limited length of the programs, sample sizes, and availability to said data.

Mississippi as a state has tried similar programs as well, though many have recently ceased being offered due to budget constraints. Therefore, while other states are finding the means to implement and fund these programs, Mississippi appears to be going backwards. Now, METP is currently the only financial aid program available to incoming teachers in the state. In the past, the office of Mississippi Financial Aid promoted the following loan forgiveness programs for educators: Mississippi Teacher Loan Repayment Program (MTLR) in which the state would help repay student loans for alternate-route teachers who taught in a critical shortage area; Teacher Education Scholars (TES), which is very similar to the requirements of METP, though only offering $15,000 a year rather than full scholarship; William Winter Alternate Route Teacher Forgivable Loan (WWAR) and William Winter Teacher Forgivable Loan (WWTS), which both loan juniors or seniors enrolled in a university $4,000 for two years while seeking teaching certification which would be forgiven after teaching those two years (Mississippi Office of Student Financial Aid). While these are still listed on the website, it now notes underneath each that “due to budget constraints, no awards will be made to new or renewal applicants for the…2019-20 year” (Mississippi Office of Student Financial Aid). Therefore, the programs that the state implemented in order to combat the shortage has fallen victim to financial constraints discussed above, leaving METP as the only remaining program in the state of Mississippi that exists to financially combat the teacher shortage.

Research Question
In the literature I have reviewed, the question of how to attract and retain teachers have heeded little answers, especially regarding the financial implications in order to implement said programs. Though initiatives are in place nationwide, Mississippi has revoked most of its solutions with the exception of the Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program (METP). Thus, my research questions are as follows:

Q1: To what extent has the Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program (METP) impacted the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi?
Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between the demographic variables (age, gender, proximity to hometown, and salary) and the impact variable (METP rating and learning opportunities).

Q2: Will METP be likely to continue to impact the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi beyond the five-year commitment of its scholars?
Null Hypothesis: There is no relationship between the demographic (age, gender, proximity to hometown, salary) and impact variables with teaching satisfaction and likelihood to remain in state.

Method

Participants

My participants will be the three classes of METP graduates—49 scholars from Mississippi State University and 48 from Ole Miss. Of these, 47 of 49 from MSU are still teaching in a Mississippi public school (M. Stubbs, personal communication, August 28, 2019), while 43 of 48 from Ole Miss are (B. Adams, personal communication, September 18, 2019). All participants are between the ages of 21-25. All participants were Caucasian except two African Americans and one Hispanic. Over seventy-six percent of the graduates are female. About fifty-
nine percent are native to the state of Mississippi. IRB has exempted this study due to minimal to no risk for participants (Appendix II).

**Instruments**

Participants were emailed an anonymous survey (Appendix I) via Google Forms online (https://forms.gle/XxJbrKUDCGb59CJC7). This survey consisted of five parts; the first three (demographics, education, and employment) were mostly the type of fill-in-the-blank, while the last two (teaching outlook and future plans) were 17 questions in a 5-point Likert scale.

Demographics (Part I) asked questions relating to age, race, hometown, current location(s) post-graduation, and current salary rate. On these, participants selected their age and current salary rate, and they typed in their race, hometown, and current location. Education (Part II) asked questions regarding whether the teacher education programs were effective that they completed at MSU or Ole Miss; if participant attended, is currently attending, or plans to attend graduate school; and what other learning opportunities have been made available to them since undergraduate graduation. They were asked which cohort they were a part of (either MSU or Ole Miss) and what their current graduate school status is, choosing from the following: completed and graduated with a master’s degree or higher, currently enrolled in a master’s program or higher, currently applying for graduate programs, or no current interest in graduate programs. This section of the questionnaire also included a portion of questions relating to the financial aspect of the METP scholarship and its effect on his or her decision to choose to major in education. Specifically, question 11 asked participants if they would have majored in another subject area if not for the METP scholarship; participants had to choose between the options of yes, no, or maybe. Employment (Part III) asked participants to list their current place of employment, their past place(s) of employment (if applicable), and other employment
opportunities in which they may be partaking in addition to their primary place of employment due to financial disparities or other reasons. This was assessed by allowing participants to type in their addition employment opportunities, followed by a question asking them which of the following best explains why they are partaking in these additional opportunities, in which they could select extra income, it is something I enjoy, or opt to type in their answer. This section also asked if the participant is still fulfilling the scholarship requirements of teaching in a Mississippi public school for five years, prompting him or her to select yes, no, or maybe.

The last two sections applied mostly to participants currently in the teaching profession; those who have left teaching public education in Mississippi had the option to skip this portion and leave an anonymous comment regarding his or her decision to do so and the factors associated with their decision, which concluded their participation in the survey.

For those still teaching in Mississippi public education, the Teaching Outlook portion (Part IV) was assessed on the 5-point Likert scale ranging from highly dissatisfied to highly satisfied, while the Future Plans portion was assessed on the 5-point Likert scale ranging from not likely to very likely. Teaching Outlook assessed job satisfaction, effectiveness of mentoring programs—both through specific schools/districts and METP, effectiveness of undergraduate teaching programs, effectiveness of specific METP experiences (such as study abroad and cross campus visits) on their teaching, issues that may have arisen in the occupation, and changes in attitudes about teaching. For example, question 24 asked participants how satisfied they are in the teaching profession, in which they must select an option ranging from 1-5, with 1 being highly dissatisfied and 5 being highly satisfied.

Lastly, Future Plans (Part V) assessed whether the participant is likely to continue teaching in the state of Mississippi after the five year requirement has been met, as well as what
the participant is interested in doing if not. Both of these portions included sections regarding the financial aspect of the METP—i.e., has it influenced his or her decision to remain teaching in Mississippi—as well as the effect that his or her teaching salary has had on his or her outlook and future plans. At the end of this section, participants were asked to discuss their occupational plans after their five-year teaching commitment, as well as include direct variables that affect their decision to leave the profession, leave the state, or other alternatives.

**Procedure**

Participants received the anonymous survey by email (Appendix). All 97 participants received the survey to complete voluntarily. Details of the research study and how data will be used was addressed prior to participants beginning the survey. Participants had the option to end the survey at any time, and their answers were not recorded if exited prior to submission. Participants had two weeks from issuance to complete the survey. Answers were anonymous and collected via Google Forms. The survey did not ask for any identifying information.

**Coding**

**For answering the first research question**, participants’ ratings of METP, the number of learning opportunities that have been made available to them, and the impact of the financial aid portion of METP were all collapsed into one score as the dependent variable, which was given a new name, Impact. All the six participants’ ratings of METP (Q18 - Q23) were already on a five-point Likert scale; the average of these ratings became one score as a composite program rating. (Note that this score was also used later as an independent variable for the second research question.) Learning opportunities were assessed based on question 10 in which participants had to select which learning opportunities had been made available to them post-undergraduate graduation; based on their selections, participants received 1 point for 0-1 learning
opportunities, 3 points for 2-3 learning opportunities, and 5 points for 4+ learning opportunities. Lastly, for the questions regarding the impact of the financial aid aspect of METP, the questions (Q11 and 12) were coded as follows: for question 11 asking if the participant would have majored in another concentration if not for METP, “yes” was given 1 point, “maybe” was given 3 points, and “no” was given 5 points; for question 12 asking if the participant had already decided prior to METP to pursue education, “no” was given 1 point, “maybe” was given 3 points, and “yes” was given 5 points. The two scores were averaged together to create one as well. Finally, the score derived from participants’ rating of METP, the score derived from learning opportunities, and the score derived from the financial impact of METP were averaged together to create the one score to be used as the dependent variable for answering the first research question.

Participants’ reported demographics regarding age, gender, hometown, current location, ethnicity, salary, and education were used as the independent variables for the first research question. Age was not coded as it was already on an ordinal scale. Gender was coded female = 0, male = 1. Ethnicity was coded white/Caucasian = 0, African American = 1, and Hispanic = 2. Current salary rate was coded $28,000-32,000 = 0, $32,001-36,000 = 1, $36,001-40,000 = 2, $40,001-44,000 = 3, and $44,001+ = 4. While the other demographic variables stood alone (age, gender, salary, and education), hometown and current location were combined into one variable, coded by teaching in hometown = 0, teaching within 50 miles of hometown = 1, and teaching further than 50 miles from hometown = 2.

For answering the second research question, participants’ reported satisfaction with the teaching profession (Q24) ranging from highly dissatisfied (1) to highly satisfied (5) and the
likelihood that he or she will remain teaching in Mississippi past the five-year commitment (Q28) ranging from not likely (1) to very likely (5) were averaged for one score.

The demographics were independent variables, as well as a composite program rating derived from the questions regarding METP from the first research question.

**Analysis**

In this study, multiple regression was used for the analysis of the data. I analyzed the relation between demographics (IVs), that is, age, gender, ethnicity, proximity and salary, and the composite impact score (DV) to answer the first question regarding the impact of METP on these scholars and their decision to attend college to become a teacher and to teach in the state of Mississippi post-graduation. Then, I regressed the participants’ outlook (DV) on the demographics including the composite impact score (IVs) to answer the second question by assessing what demographic variables are likely to keep these graduates teaching in the state of Mississippi in order to fulfil their requirement and expectations.

**Results**

For question 1, multiple regression analysis was used to test if demographics (age, gender, ethnicity, proximity, and salary) significantly predicted impact score (participants' ratings of METP and learning opportunities). The results of the regression indicated the five predictors explained 16% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.16$, $F(5) = 1.56$, $p = .194$). It was found that ethnicity did not predict ratings of METP and learning opportunities ($\beta = -0.79$, $p > .05$), nor did proximity from participants’ hometown to current location ($\beta = -0.15$, n.s.), and current salary ($\beta = -0.05$, $p = .695$). It was found that age did not significantly predict ratings of METP and learning opportunities ($\beta = .10$, $p < .48$), nor did gender ($\beta = .03$, $p = .93$). (See Appendix III: OUTPUT 1)
For question 2, multiple regression analysis was used to test if demographics (age, gender, ethnicity, proximity to hometown, and salary) and the impact score (METP ratings and learning opportunities) significantly predicted participants' teaching satisfaction and likelihood to remain in the state. The results of the regression indicated that the six predictors explained 28.3% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.28$, $F(6) = 2.57$, $p=0.034$). However, five of the six independent variables did not predict the variance of teaching satisfaction and likelihood to remain in the state ($\beta = .018$, $p=.90$), gender ($\beta = -.037$, $p = .83$), ethnicity ($\beta = -.263$, $p = .14$), proximity ($\beta = -.105$, $p = .46$) and salary ($\beta = .224$, $p < .16$). However, the impact score (METP ratings and learning opportunities) significantly predicted the satisfaction ($\beta = .357$, $p = .02$). (See Appendix IV: OUTPUT 2)

**Discussion**

The two sets of multiple regression analyses were conducted to address the two research questions. First, to what extent has the Mississippi Excellence in Teaching Program (METP) impacted the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi? Second, will METP be likely to continue to impact the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi beyond the five-year commitment of its scholars?

The results appear to be mixed. Regarding the impact in the first question, the satisfaction rating and learning opportunities cannot be accounted for by all or any of the five predictors (age, gender, ethnicity, proximity, and salary). Thus, I fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the demographic variables (age, gender, proximity to hometown, and salary) and the impact variable (METP rating and learning opportunities). However, the data analysis for answering the second suggests that, of the six predictors (age, gender, ethnicity, proximity, salary, and impact score), impact score appears to be a significant
predictor for METP impact on participants’ teaching outlook and future plans. Thus, I have to reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the demographic (age, gender, proximity to hometown, salary) and impact variables with teaching satisfaction and likelihood to remain in state.

This finding seems to be consistent with the respondents’ views regarding the program and the learning opportunities available to them (impact score). Most have chosen to continue teaching to fulfill the scholarship requirement, as only 6% of respondents are no longer fulfilling their requirement. Of the three respondents not currently fulfilling the scholarship requirements, two were white females, while one was an African American male. One of these respondents stated, “The program itself is good for people who genuinely want to teach kids, but I feel as if I was manipulated by the money and convinced to join rather than joined on my own volition.” This may be a common sentiment that is mixed with other perceptions of the program, as others noted similar concerns such as issues with the state of Mississippi as a whole, the detriment of student teaching, the unexpected difficulty in the field, and the overinflated view of prestige that METP promised its scholars in obtaining jobs post-graduation.

Still, the effectiveness of METP as a teacher education program combined with learning opportunities that have been made available to respondents does seem to play a role in current satisfaction in the field. While only 26% of respondents selected that they were highly satisfied with the METP at their university, with 58% of these respondents being from the University of Mississippi, only 3 of the respondents remaining in teaching reported that they felt highly unsatisfied in the field of teaching, compared to 31 highly satisfied. Further, only 13 respondents reported being highly satisfied with how prepared METP made them to enter the teaching profession, though 14 strongly felt that being a part of METP provided them with an added
advantage. One respondent reported the following: “METP prepared me, I believe, more than the
typical education route. However, I don’t think anything could ever fully prepare us for what
education can really be like these days.” Only 6% of respondents found the required cross-
campus visits beneficial, while 26% reported the study abroad experience was beneficial.
Regardless of respondents’ reported views, 94% of respondents are still fulfilling the
requirements of METP by teaching in a Mississippi public school. Of these respondents, 41%
reported they were near or highly likely to continue teaching in the state of Mississippi after their
five-year commitment.

While the financial aspect of teaching, particularly salary, is often a reason quoted for
teachers leaving the field, it does not seem to be playing a significant role in participants’ current
reports of the likelihood of staying in the profession post-five years. While 20% of respondents
who are still teaching in a Mississippi public school are making over $40,000 a year, 11% of
respondents are making between $28,000-32,000 a year. Thirty-four percent of respondents are
working additional jobs—such as tutoring, coaching, and driving busses—in order to receive
extra income. Regardless, only 20% of respondents list their current salary as being a heavy
determiner in whether or not they choose to remain in the state teaching. One respondent, who is
teaching in her hometown, noted the following as a reason to remain in-state to teach: “I have
purchased a home and plan on putting down roots. If any change happens at all, it would have to
be drastic to get me to move.” However, other respondents noted the potential of leaving the
state but still teaching so they could “afford to put money in savings,” while others noted the
potential of moving states due to significant others’ jobs and to be closer to their hometowns.
Still, one respondent said, “I want to stay in Mississippi because we NEED quality teachers who
care, but the salary is not worth the 40+ hours of week every week.” Similarly, another noted “I
love METP, and I'm thankful for all that it gave me. Teaching is just plain hard. With little pay and respect, it's going to be hard to get any one to stay in the career for very long.” Thus, though salary is often linked to reasons teachers leave the field, for most of these young respondents, it does not seem to play be one of the deciding factors.

**Limitations**

As a curriculum exercise, this study has a number of limitations that can be addressed in the future research design for investigating the same issue. One is to increase the sample size. The population for this study consisted of 97 scholars but only 47 completed the survey. At the same time, the five or six predictors in the models significantly reduced the statistical power, which might be a reason that impact score in the first question are not attributable to any of the five predictors. A second limitation is that, due to a tight schedule, the survey items were not tested for their validity to eliminate the possible confounding effects. Similarly, the analysis requires a correlation test that was skipped, resulting in a group of indiscriminate predictors. Finally, this study was also limited to its strict focus on METP and its effect on the state of Mississippi due to personal interest in this specific program. While the state of Mississippi does not have any other current teacher scholarship programs, the state is limited in what data can be obtained regarding the teaching shortage. However, the study could be assessed on other states that have teacher scholarship programs in order to determine the effectiveness on other states with similar programs and assess their results.

**Conclusion**

From this study, the impact of a particular Mississippi teacher scholarship programs was assessed, as well as how beneficial it has been on the critical teacher shortage. Though this study
was small and focused only on the state of Mississippi and one scholarship program, it can be duplicated to include more programs or other programs in other states.

Though this study had mixed results with no significant variables explaining the variance of the extent that METP has impacted the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi, the findings in answering the second question suggest that METP has had a significant impact on these teacher’s outlook ratings in the field. Therefore, though respondents noted some of the extra things that METP had to offer—such as cross-campus visits and study abroad opportunities—were not necessarily beneficial, something about the program has prepared them enough to be positive and forward-looking in the beginning of their careers. While the exact reason was not uncovered in this study, it does open the opportunity for future studies to consider what about METP or what about the students that METP attracts makes them more likely to be satisfied in teaching and want to stay past their commitment.

Although this was a small attempt to uncover the means of combatting critical teacher shortages, much work is still left to do to attract and retain teachers in the field in Mississippi, as well as the nation. It can be concluded that teacher scholarship programs such as METP will continue to help combat the critical teacher shortage, although METP was proved to be not effective in attracting students to enter the field of education.
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Appendix I

Are Teacher Scholarship Programs Impacting the Critical Teacher Shortage in Mississippi?

This research is being conducted by Jerome S. Jacquet at the University of Memphis. The impact of Teacher Scholarship programs is being measured in Mississippi. All responses are anonymous and your participation is voluntary, meaning you can leave the survey anytime.

Thank you for your participation.

Consent Statement

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Jerome S. Jacquet of the University of Memphis, Department of Educational Psychology and Research, is in charge of the study. The study is being conducted by Dr. Yeh Hsiau.

Memphis

Institutional Review Board
190 Administration Bldg.
Memphis, TN 38152-3379
Office: 901-678-2540
Fax: 901-678-2219

The purpose of this research is to determine the impact of teacher scholarship programs on the critical teacher shortage in Mississippi. You will be asked to complete a 33-question survey. Your participation should take about 15-20 minutes. Participating in this study is completely voluntary and if you decide to participate now, you may change your mind and stop at any point. You may choose not to submit your answers by exiting the survey at any time.

As a participant in this research study, you may not be any direct benefit for you. You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

There are no known risks involved in participating in this study other than those encountered in day-to-day life.

If you have any questions about the research you can contact Jerome S. Jacquet at jacquetj@memphis.edu or Yeh Hsiau at yhsiau@memphis.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject please contact the University of Memphis Institutional Review Board at 901-678-2705

Electronic Consent

Please read all of this information carefully. You may print a copy of this consent document for your records. Clicking on the "consent to participate" button below indicates that you

1. Have read the above information.
2. Voluntarily agrees to participate
3. Am 18 years of age or older

☐ I consent to participate in this survey.
☐ I do not consent to participate in this survey.

NEXT
Are Teacher Scholarship Programs Impacting the Critical Teacher Shortage in Mississippi?

Demographics

1. Age *
   Your answer

2. Gender *
   ○ Male
   ○ Female
   ○ Prefer not to say
   ○ Other:

3. Ethnicity *
   Your answer

4. Hometown *
   Your answer

5. Current location *
   Your answer

6. Current salary rate *
   ○ 20,000-29,999
   ○ 30,000-39,999
   ○ 40,000-49,999
   ○ 50,000-69,999
   ○ Other:
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Form submitted securely through Google Forms.
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- Required

**Education**

7. Please select the METP location you participated in: *
   - Choose

8. Please select the cohort you were a member of:
   - Choose

9. What is your current graduate school status? *
   - Completed and graduated with masters degree or higher
   - Currently enrolled in masters program or higher
   - Currently applying for graduate programs
   - No current interest in graduate programs

10. What other learning opportunities have been made available to you post-undergraduate graduation? Select all that apply. *
    - PLCs (Professional Learning Communities)
    - Access to national conferences in subject area (paid for by district or college)
    - CEU opportunities (through district or college)
    - Access to local conferences in subject area (paid for by district or college)
    - Training in another subject area or endorsement (paid for by district or college)
    - Professional Mentor
    - Other:

11. Would you have majored in another subject area if not for the METP scholarship? *
    - Yes
    - No
    - Maybe

12. Had you decided to pursue education prior to applying and accepting the METP scholarship? *
    - Yes
    - No
    - Maybe

[Google Forms]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Please list your current place of primary employment. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Please list your past places of employment (only those post-graduation). *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Please list any other employment opportunities in which you are partaking in addition to your current primary employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Which of the following best explains why you are partaking in addition employment opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Are you still fulfilling the METF scholarship requirement (teaching in a Mississippi public school for five years post-graduation)? *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are Teacher Scholarship Programs Impacting the Critical Teacher Shortage in Mississippi?

Teaching Outlook:

If you are no longer teaching, please skip this portion. Please consider offering an anonymous comment at the conclusion of this survey regarding any thoughts you have about the METP in learning the critical teacher shortage in your decision to leave the field of education.

19. How satisfied were you with the METP at your university?
   1 2 3 4 5  Highly satisfied

19. Were you satisfied with how prepared METP made you to enter the teaching profession?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

20. Did you feel the required undergraduate courses at your university adequately prepared you for teaching?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

21. Did you feel that METP provided an added advantage to students pursuing education (not financial related)?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

22. Did you feel the cross campus visits were beneficial to your future teaching career?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

23. Did you feel the study abroad experience was beneficial to your future teaching career?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

24. Overall, how satisfied are you in the teaching profession?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

25. How effective were mentor programs provided to you at your place of employment?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Highly dissatisfied

26. Was your general outlook on teaching changed? Please include details.

You answer:
Are Teacher Scholarship Programs Impacting the Critical Teacher Shortage in Mississippi?

Instructions:

For each of the following questions, please select your answer. Please consider offering an anonymous comment at the conclusion of the form, regarding any thoughts you have about the MSEP impacting the critical teacher shortage, or your decision to leave the field of education.

27. How likely are you to remain in the teaching profession after your five year commitment?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

28. How likely are you to remain teaching in Mississippi after your five year teaching commitment?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

29. How likely are you to remain working (at any occupation) in Mississippi after your five year teaching commitment?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

30. How likely are you to move to another state to teach after your five year teaching commitment?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

31. If not for the five year commitment, how likely are you to choose to stay in the state of Mississippi to teach?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

32. If not for the five year commitment, how likely are you to choose to continue teaching post-graduation?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

33. How likely is your current salary a determinant for if you will remain in the state of Mississippi after the five year commitment?
   - Not Likely
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Very Likely

34. Please discuss your occupational plans after your five-year teaching commitment. If applicable, please include variables (salary, location, proximity to hometowns) that impact your decision to leave the profession, leave the state, or other.
   
   Your answer:

   [Input Field]

   [Submit Button]

[Google Forms link]
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Please include any final thoughts or comments.

Your answer

BACK NEXT

https://extension.msstate.edu/photogrammetry.
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Appendix III: OUTPUT 1

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.400a</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.77218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Salary, Proximity, Age, Ethnicity, Gender

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.785</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>-1.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>-1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Impact
Appendix IV: OUTPUT 2

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.532 *</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1.01631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Impact, Age, Proximity, Gender, Salary, Ethnicity

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.698</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-1.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>1.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>2.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Teaching Satisfaction and Likelihood to remain in state