

April 19, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Vermelle J. Johnson, Chairman, and Members, Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

From: Dr. Gail M. Morrison, Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing

Consideration of the NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluations at Coastal Carolina University, South Carolina State University and the University of South Carolina-Aiken

Background

The Commission entered into a partnership agreement with the S.C. Department of Education and the National Council for Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1995 to conduct joint reviews of teacher education programs at our public colleges and universities. Our current partnership protocol requires that an on-site visit occur at each of the institutions every five years with representatives of the three partners serving on the evaluation team. The first review cycle occurred between 1996 and 1999 which resulted in all eleven of our teacher education programs institutions receiving NCATE accreditation which was effective for five years.

Historically, NCATE has reviewed teacher education programs on a five-year cycle (changed in 2005 to a seven-year cycle). Since the time of our last review cycle, NCATE has undertaken a major revision of the standards that are used to assess teacher education units. NCATE revises its standards every five years to ensure that the standards reflect the most current research on teaching. The new standards developed in 2000 are performance-based, and a teacher education unit must be able to demonstrate that it has in place an assessment system that can determine the level of its graduates' knowledge and skills. For example, NCATE reviewers look for evidence that teacher candidates know the subject matter they plan to teach as shown by their ability to explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional and state standards. The NCATE 2000 standards are substantially different from the 1995 standards, and substantially more difficult to meet, in large part because they require units to be able to demonstrate

through data that graduates of their programs have the knowledge and skills to teach successfully P-12 students. The accreditation process has shifted its focus from what are typically called “input measures” to “output measures.” That is, what do the graduates of the program know, what can they do, and how can the unit prove that graduates know and can do what the unit claims?

NCATE standards are applied to the teacher education unit for an evaluation of the entire unit. In addition, NCATE coordinates the evaluation of individual programs through an established review process by specialized professional associations (SPAs) and national accreditation organizations. Under our partnership protocol, programs that do not have a review by a SPA or an accrediting organization are reviewed by a consultant hired by the Commission for that purpose, who joins the on-site review team..

During this review cycle, the Commission hired four national consultants who evaluated the programs that were not reviewed by SPAs and do not lead to initial teacher certification. These programs are typically at the graduate level and may include programs such as a Masters of Education in Elementary Education or Special Education. One CHE consultant joins the NCATE team to conduct an on-site review and validate documentation presented in the institution’s self-study reports. The consultant also examines all programs for compliance with the Commission’s program productivity standards.

In Spring 2004, Coastal Carolina University, South Carolina State University and USC-Aiken underwent their NCATE reviews, which consisted of a five-day visit by a team of national and state reviewers. The visiting team is called the Board of Examiners (BOE). This body presents a report to NCATE’s Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) which assesses whether or not the education unit meets each of six standards. The UAB makes the accreditation decision based on the BOE’s findings. Institutions visited in the spring of 2004 had accreditation decisions made by the UAB in Fall 2005.

The attached report (attachment) represents a compilation of the results of NCATE’s Unit Accreditation Board findings, the CHE consultant’s findings with respect to graduate programs not received by the SPAs, and the evaluation results for all individual programs within the teacher education unit at the three institutions visited during Spring 2004. Included in this report are the institutional decisions of the UAB along with any weaknesses cited for a unit, a list of the programs reviewed at the intuitions, the approval status of each program, and the productivity analysis of programs at each of the three institutions covered in this report.

As is the practice with all program reviews, each program receives one of four recommendations: 1) commendation of excellence; 2) full approval; 3) provisional or probationary approval; or 4) recommendation for termination. Typically, provisional

approval is awarded under four circumstances: 1) the unit does not receive full NCATE accreditation, in which case all programs in the unit are given provisional approval until the next evaluation which usually occurs two years later; the program has not received full approval from the SPA or specialized accrediting/professional body; under State Board of Education policy, a program has two years from the UAB decision to obtain full approval from the SPA; 2) the program does not meet CHE's program productivity requirements; or 4) the CHE consultant recommends provisional approval given a number of substantive weaknesses identified in the program.

Recommendation

The staff suggests that the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommend to the Commission that it grant to the programs in Education at Coastal Carolina University, South Carolina State University, and USC-Aiken the designations presented in the attached report (**Attachment 1**) along with the accompanying recommendations found on the pages listed below:

Coastal Carolina University	See pp. 6-7
South Carolina State University	See pp. 10 - 12
USC-Aiken	See pp. 14

I. Coastal Carolina University

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on April 17-21, 2004, at Coastal Carolina University. At its October 2004 meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) reviewed the materials and reports for Coastal Carolina University and rendered the decision to “continue accreditation with conditions” for the Spadoni College of Education at Coastal Carolina University at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels.

At the initial teacher preparation level, programs in early childhood and elementary education have conditionally met the standards for their respective specialized professional associations (SPAs). At the advanced level, programs in science and social studies were not recommended for national recognition. After considering additional data submitted in the requesting rejoinder to the BOE report, the UAB cited the following areas for improvement and will conduct a focused visit responding to the met standards in October of 2006.

- (Initial and Advanced) Assessments do not indicate that all candidates meet professional, state and institutional standards (Standard 1).
- (Initial and Advanced) The unit does not systematically collect data to assess all candidates’ ability to have a positive effect on learning for all students (Standard 1).
- (Initial and Advanced) The unit does not have a well-defined, comprehensive assessment system of data collection and analysis for candidate performance (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced) Data collection is inconsistent and seldom aggregated and analyzed (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced) The unit does not maintain an assessment system utilizing information technology (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced) Reliability and validity are not established for any of the instruments that are being used (Standard 2).

- (Initial and Advanced) The unit makes limited use of data collected, including candidate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs and clinical experiences (Standard 2).
- (Initial) P-12 partners are not involved in the design of the practica or internship (Standard 3).
- (Initial) The unit does not have a system in place to track field experiences to insure that all candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups (Standard 3).
- (Initial and Advanced) The unit does not ensure that all candidates are aware of different teaching and learning styles shaped by racial and ethnic influences across all programs (Standard 4).
- (Initial and Advanced) Candidates in the unit reflect minimal cultural diversity (Standard 4).

The College will continue its work toward full implementation of a performance-based assessment system for decision-making. In addition, the CHE consultant reviewed two programs: the program leading to an **M.Ed. degree in Elementary Education** and a program leading to an **M.Ed. degree in Secondary Education**. The consultant recommended provisional approval of both the M.Ed. in Elementary Education and the M.Ed. in Secondary Education citing the following areas for improvement:

1. The unit may want to consider forming a Graduate Committee to guide program development and to provide consistency in planning, assessment, and data collection.
2. Faculty working in the M.Ed. in Elementary Education and in the M.Ed. in Secondary Education programs need to construct an assessment system consistent with the unit assessment system that allows the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data at the program and candidate level. Data should be collected on a systematic basis from internal and external sources including follow-up studies and employer surveys. The data from this program will also be used to guide decision-making at the unit level.
3. The proposed portals that are scheduled to be implemented in Fall 2004 should be implemented on a pilot basis for the academic year 2004-2005. Within the portals, rubrics or scoring criteria should be developed to adequately evaluate candidate performance at the advanced level. The

portals will allow faculty to collect meaningful data to determine the quality of their program and serve as a strong guide for candidates moving through the program. Modifications to the portals can be made after the pilot phase and feedback from candidates and faculty.

4. The data collection tools that will be constructed should be carefully aligned with the conceptual framework, national standards (NBPTS), unit M. Ed. Competencies, and program objectives. This alignment will allow faculty to analyze the program to determine ongoing improvement and necessary curricular changes as well as monitor the quality of candidate performance.
5. Candidate progress within the program should be tracked and monitored. The tracking process can be implemented within the proposed portal system or through the proposed electronic portfolio. These efforts will allow faculty to guide and support candidates and also enable candidates to become a viable part of the assessment process.
6. The unit may want to consider developing a long-range plan for graduate education within the Spadoni College of Education. The plan would outline the educational needs of candidates, possible alternative delivery systems, and possibilities for expansion of the curriculum with the master's program to meet the changing needs of candidates. In addition, the plan should include recruitment and retention activities for minority candidates.
7. The proposed enhancement of the action research component is supported and recommended to provide candidates at the advanced level the opportunity to apply knowledge and skills related to research in an authentic setting.

The Coastal Carolina University Spadoni College of Education indicated the CHE consultant's report was fair and on target.

Recommendation

Consistent with the UAB decision to "approve with conditions" and the CHE consultant's recommendations, staff recommends that programs in the unit be granted provisional approval as noted in **Table I** until the October 2006 focused visit occurs and progress is reassessed in meeting the various standards and in addressing the cited areas for improvement by both the UAB and the CHE consultant. The staff further recommends that no new program requests in Education be considered until the unit obtains full accreditation.

Coastal Carolina University
Table 1

Program Title	Degree Options/Tracks/Concentrations (If Applicable)	Recommendation
Early Childhood Education	BAEd ¹	Provisional Approval
Elementary Education	MEd ¹	Provisional Approval
	BAEd ²	Provisional Approval
Middle Grades Education	MEd ^{2 and 3}	Provisional Approval
	BA	Provisional Approval
Special Education	BA	Provisional Approval
Secondary Education	MEd ³ General	Provisional Approval
	MAT ⁴ English	Provisional Approval
	French	Provisional Approval
	Mathematics	Provisional Approval
	Spanish	Provisional Approval
	Science	Provisional Approval
	Social Studies	Provisional Approval
	Art	Provisional Approval
	Music	Provisional Approval
Technology Teacher Education	MS Industrial Arts	Provisional Approval
Physical Education	BSPE ⁵ Physical Education	Provisional Approval

¹ Received Conditional, not Full approval, by the SPA (National Association for the Education of Young Children)

² Received Conditional, not Full approval, by SPA (Association for Childhood Education International)

³ Reviewed by CHE consultant, who recommend provisional approval.

⁴ First graduates in 2006; therefore, no program reports submitted yet

⁵ Program reports submitted to AAAPHERD

II. South Carolina State University

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on April 24-28, 2004, at South Carolina State University. At its October 2004 meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) reviewed the materials and reports for South Carolina State University and rendered the decision to continue the accreditation of the unit at South Carolina State University at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. The UAB cited the following areas for improvement:

- Data related to the specific standards of the disciplines have not been aggregated to determine whether the standards have been met (Standard 1).
- The unit does not have a systematic plan for tracking candidates throughout their field experiences and clinical practice (Standard 3).

In addition, the CHE consultant reviewed the **M.Ed. in Elementary Education**, recommending continuing approval status with the following areas suggested for improvement:

1. The Admission and Monitoring Matriculation Process for Teacher Education Programs (Revised Fall 2003): The M.Ed. in Elementary Education has developed over time and with collaborative energies of faculty, staff and administrators. It does appear that documents are not always consistent and that stages for monitoring vary in documents. It is strongly recommended that unit faculty and staff arrive at one model for matriculation and archive documents which are inconsistent with current matriculation and assessment practice.
2. Informal discussions were conducted with a number of National Board of Professional Teaching Standards candidates in the M.Ed. in Elementary Education program. However, specific numbers were not located in documentation. Also, the importance of NBPTS activities was not apparent in documentation or seemed on a decline in terms of interest and focus in the program. If one considered that support in acquiring NBPTS certificates is a sign of productivity, these numbers should be readily available and used in marketing strategies.
3. A systematically designed faculty development plan should be developed as aligned with faculty productivity evaluation process as well as specific program improvement initiatives. This professional development initiative should include an assessment which links program enhancements with faculty evaluation and development plan. An example includes the myriad of technology activities which have been assessed informally. Data are not available to qualify the impact of such “rich technology activities” on the program or student learning.
4. Data presented on the program and program option was unclear and nonspecific. Assessment in the Elementary Education Master’s program should be reconstructed along with documented data driven decisions regarding program improvement.

5. Data on program candidates was unclear and nonspecific. Data should be maintained on candidates by disaggregating program data.
6. Data on program graduates is also nonspecific and should be disaggregated to reveal specific number of graduates for each specific graduate program option.
7. The admissions and monitoring process has been developed:
 - It is strongly recommended that administrators and staff monitor documents for consistency—discard old forms and graphics.
 - Archive documents which are inconsistent with current matriculation and assessment practice.
8. Documentation on program faculty should be clear and coherent with systematic data maintained on full-time faculty, part-time and adjunct faculty.
 - A systematically designed faculty development plan should be developed.
 - The plan should be aligned with faculty productivity and evaluation process.
 - The faculty development plan should include program improvement strategies and document such efforts.
 - The plan should be aligned with program delivery, diversity, and technology needs.

The CHE consultant also reviewed the **M.Ed. in Secondary Education** recommending continuing approval status with the following areas suggested for improvement:

1. The admissions and monitoring process has been developed but use is “uneven” in the Secondary program.
 - Documents are not always consistent.
 - Stages for monitoring vary in documents.

- Assessment system should be maintained from entry to exit.
2. Documentation on program faculty should be clear and coherent with systematic data maintained on full-time faculty, part-time and adjunct faculty.
 - The credentials of all faculty members should be systematically evaluated and aligned with program delivery, diversity and technology needs of the unit.
 3. A systematically designed faculty development plan is critical to unit productivity.
 - Faculty development plan should include program improvement strategies and documenting such efforts.
 - Faculty development activities should be provided for adjunct faculty members.
 - Faculty development for full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty members should be assessed for impact on the performance outcomes of candidates.
 4. Annual program evaluations should take place. Such evaluations should provide structure and support for specialty area reviews in the future.

The South Carolina State University Education Department responded to the report by describing it as largely accurate except for some confusion around degree names and titles. The CHE consultant verified that both the initial and advanced teacher preparation programs are in compliance with the CHE Academic Degree Program Productivity Requirements.

Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Committee commend favorably to the Commission full approval status for programs as noted below in **Table 2**, with a follow-up report on improvements made with respect to the CHE's consultant's recommendations for the M. Ed. in Elementary Education and the M.Ed. in Secondary Education programs to be submitted to the Commission by December 2005.

**South Carolina State University
Table 2**

Program Title	Degree	Options/Tracts/Concentrations (If Applicable)	Recommendation
Education Administration	EdS		Full Approval
	EdD		Full Approval
Special Education	BS	Educable Mentally Handicapped Emotionally Handicapped K-12 Learning Disabilities K-12	Full Approval
		MEd Educable Mentally Handicapped Emotionally Handicapped Learning Disabilities	Full Approval
Counselor Education	MEd ¹	Elementary Secondary	Provisional Approval
Elementary Education	BS		Full Approval
	MEd ²	Basic Elementary Education Early Childhood Education Reading Education Physical Education	Full Approval
Early Childhood Education	MAT		Full Approval
	BS MAT		Full Approval Full Approval
Secondary Education – Major is in disciplines:			
English	BA	Secondary Education	Full Approval
Biology	BS	Secondary Education	Full Approval
Mathematics	BS	Secondary Education	Full Approval
Chemistry	BS	Secondary Education	Full Approval
Social Studies	BA	Secondary Education	Full Approval
Dramatic Arts	BA ¹	Secondary Education	Provisional Approval
Physical Education	BS ¹	Secondary Education	Provisional Approval

Secondary Education	MEd ²	Business	Full Approval
		English	Full Approval
		Mathematics	Full Approval
		Social Studies	Full Approval
		Science	Full Approval
		Secondary Physical Education ¹	Provisional Approval
		Chemistry	Full Approval
	MAT	English	Full Approval
		Math	Full Approval
		Science	Full Approval
		Speech Pathology & Audiology	Full Approval
Art Education	BS ¹		Provisional Approval
Business Education	BS ¹		Provisional Approval
Health Education	BS ¹	K-12	Provisional Approval
Family and Consumer Science Education	BS		Full Approval
Industrial Education	BS ¹		Provisional Approval
Music Education	BS ¹		Provisional Approval
		Music Choral K-12	
		Music–Instrumental K-12	
Physical Education	BS ¹		Provisional Approval

¹ Approval from the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) has not been obtained

² Reviewed by CHE consultants

III. University of South Carolina-Aiken

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on February 21-25, 2004, at USC-Aiken. At its October 2004 meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board reviewed the materials and reports for USC-Aiken and rendered the decision to continue the accreditation of the unit at USC-Aiken at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. The UAB cited the following areas for improvement:

- The secondary social studies program has not been recognized by its specialized professional association (Standard 1).

- The plan for assessing candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the Master's of Education in Elementary Education has not been fully implemented (Standard 2).
- The unit does not have sufficient full-time, tenure-track faculty to support the integrity, quality, and continuity of its programs (Standard 6).

The CHE consultant reviewed one program, the **M.Ed. program in Elementary Education** and verified that the program is in compliance with the CHE Academic Degree Program Productivity Requirements. The consultant recommends continuing approval status for the M.Ed. in Elementary Education with the following suggestions for improvement:

1. The faculty of the M.Ed. program in Elementary Education should continue to expand and refine the unit's assessment plan to measure candidate performance and make continuous improvement to the program.
2. A system should be developed to track candidate's professional achievements while they are in the program and after graduation.
3. The School of Education should develop and implement a comprehensive minority faculty recruitment plan with specific hiring goals that are monitored annually. The plan should be revised as needed to ensure that more minority faculty members are hired.
4. The faculty of the M.Ed. program in Elementary Education should develop and implement an aggressive minority graduate student recruitment plan. The plan should be revised as needed to ensure that more minority candidates enroll in the degree program.
5. The School of Education should implement a comprehensive, systematic plan that is aligned with the School's conceptual framework and degree programs to provide continuous development and improvement of faculty members' knowledge and professional skills.

The USC-Aiken School of Education has responded noting that a factual error was made regarding the assessment of program objectives. The Board of Examiner's report identifies a comprehensive exam as the means through which students demonstrate proficiency. However, the program assesses candidate performance using a written portfolio and an oral presentation of the portfolio. Additionally, while the School of Education agrees with the recommendation for improvement by refining the unit's assessment plan, they explain that limited data for the M.Ed. program was available at the time of the NCATE visit because the current assessment plan was newly implemented.

The School of Education also addresses the recommendation for a comprehensive minority faculty recruitment plan by explaining that the current plan is to focus on developing qualified staff members. Additionally, the School believes faculty members are provided with sufficient support for professional development.

Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Committee commend favorably to the Commission full approval status for programs as noted below in **Table 3**.

**University of South Carolina-Aiken
Table 3**

Program Title	Degree	Options/Tracts/Concentrations (If Applicable)	Recommendation
Educational Technology	MEd		Full Approval
Special Education	BASEd ¹	General	Full Approval
Elementary Education	BAEd	General	Full Approval
Elementary Teacher Education	BA MEd ²		Full Approval Full Approval
Early Childhood Education	BAEd		Full Approval
Secondary Education	BSEd	Biology	Full Approval
		Comprehensive Science	Full Approval
		Chemistry	Full Approval
		Math	Full Approval
	BAEd	English	Full Approval
		Comprehensive Social Studies	Full Approval

¹ New program, therefore, no program reports submitted yet

² Reviewed by CHE consultant