



# South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Mr. Kenneth B. Wingate, Chair  
Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Vice Chair  
Ms. Natasha M. Hanna  
Ms. Elizabeth Jackson  
Dr. Raghu Korrapati  
Ms. Leah B. Moody  
Vice Admiral Charles Munns, USN (ret.)  
Mr. Kim F. Phillips  
Mr. Y. W. Scarborough, III  
Dr. Jennifer B. Settlemeyer  
Mr. Rodney A. Smolla  
Mr. Guy C. Tarrant, CCIM  
Mr. Hood Temple  
The Honorable Lewis R. Vaughn

Ms. Julie J. Carullo  
Acting Executive Director

CAAL  
4/05/12  
Agenda Item 8

April 5, 2012

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, Chair, and Members of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

**From:** Dr. T. Michael Raley, Director of Academic Affairs and Licensing 

### Consideration of Awards for Centers of Excellence (Teacher Education) Competitive Grants Program, FY 2012-13 (New and Continuing)

#### **Background**

The purpose of the Centers of Excellence (Teacher Education) grant program is to enable eligible institutions, or groupings of such institutions, to serve as "state-of-the-art" resource centers for South Carolina in a specific area related to the improvement of teacher education. Teacher education encompasses both in-service and pre-service training. These "resource centers" develop and model state-of-the-art teaching practices, conduct research, disseminate information, and provide training for K-12 and higher education personnel in the Center's specific area of expertise.

Requests for Proposals for Centers of Excellence for the FY 2012-13 project year were issued to all eligible public and private four-year institutions with teacher education programs in September 2011. At the request of the Education Oversight Committee, proposals were requested that focus on teacher effectiveness. Three proposals were received for consideration:

- The Citadel  
The Citadel STEM Center of Excellence
- University of South Carolina–Columbia  
Center of Excellence for Literacy and Financial Education
- Southern Wesleyan University  
Transitions-4-Success

A Review Panel (**Attachment 1**), consisting of one representative from the Department of Education, one representative from the Middle Level Teacher Education Initiative, one

representative from the Education Oversight Committee, representatives from Centers of Excellence, and two staff members from the Commission on Higher Education, were appointed to review the proposals and to make recommendations. The Panel was chaired by Dr. Ron Joekel, a professor from the University of Nebraska. The Panel Report is attached (**Attachment 2**).

### **Review Panel Recommendations**

The Review Panel met on March 9, 2012, to receive presentations from the representatives from each institution and discuss the merits of each proposed center. The panel members conducted a lengthy discussion about the proposals and concluded that the proposed center from The Citadel rated the highest in the panel's discussion. In 2010, The Citadel's Schools of Education, Engineering, and Science and Mathematics in a collaborative effort launched the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Center of Excellence to advance STEM literacy in the Lowcountry of South Carolina and beyond. The Center has served as a catalyst for transformational educational models that put STEM skills at the center of education. The purpose of professional development described in the proposal for The Citadel STEM Center of Excellence is to place content, career, and pedagogical-experts (STEM Ambassadors) in classrooms, initially across the Lowcountry and extending to other areas of the state in subsequent years. A series of STEM professional development activities will be developed in partnership with Berkeley County, Charleston County, and Dorchester 4 school districts. The Center will specifically recruit K-12 teachers from low-performing, high need schools. The proposal listed the expected outcomes to be that the Center will produce highly qualified teachers equipped with cutting edge STEM knowledge and 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, that teachers completing the program will be capable of advancing student learning in STEM, inspiring and preparing students to pursue STEM-based careers, and preparing students to be successful in college and beyond. The College Readiness Reference Standards outlined in the South Carolina Course Alignment Project will guide the formulation of professional development activities focusing on STEM content, pedagogy, and college readiness. Business representatives, K-12 education partners, and college faculty will provide leadership in developing the proposed activities of the Center. The panel felt the objectives and activities outlined by the proposal offer great potential for advancing STEM literacy in the Low country of South Carolina and beyond. In essence, it is a "Trainer of Trainers" model whereby selected teachers from the collaborating school districts will be trained as "STEP Ambassadors" who will then train teachers in their district. These teachers will then implement instructional strategies and content taught in the STEP Center of Excellence to students in their classrooms. This Center has the potential to impact pre-service college students, the professional development of K-12 teachers and K-12 students. The potential of interdisciplinary collaboration among industry leaders, college faculty, K-12 teachers, administrators, and guidance and career counselors is attractive. The opportunity to enhance the educational opportunities of K-12 students is imperative to meet the challenges of today and the future that are facing our country. The Citadel and the partner schools have committed to the proposal and it should be an interesting program.

The proposed centers from USC-Columbia and Southern Wesleyan University had notable goals, objectives, and potential, but the panel was charged with selecting the proposal it felt had the most promise to fulfill the purpose of the *Center of Excellence Program Guidelines* and to improve teacher effectiveness in South Carolina. In FY 2011-12, the S.C. General Assembly approved the Commission's request for an appropriation of \$536,853. With four Centers in the third and fourth years of funding (**Attachment 4**), funding is available for only

one new Center for FY 2012-13. Funding for the new Center will be contingent upon availability of funds from the General Assembly.

The non-funded project proposals have been referred to the Commission's *Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program*, a federally funded program to provide professional development in increasing content knowledge to K-12 teachers in high-need school districts. The institutions proposing these projects have been urged either to adapt their proposals to the requirements of that program and submit them for funding or to revise the proposals and resubmit them to next year's Center of Excellence (Education) competition.

### **Recommendation**

The staff recommends that the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing accept the Review Panel's recommendation and approve a new Center of Excellence (Teacher Education) award to The Citadel to establish The Citadel STEM Center of Excellence in the amount of \$150,000, pending submission of 1) a revised budget; 2) a more detailed evaluation plan to assess student and teacher outcomes; and 3) response to staff questions. The awarding of funds to support the new Center at The Citadel is contingent upon the availability of funds allocated from the General Assembly.

The staff further recommends that the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing accept the staff's recommendation and approve continued funding for Clemson University, the University of South Carolina-Aiken, Newberry College, and Claflin University pending submission of formal budget requests for FY 2012-13 and final reports for FY 2011-12.

- Attachment 1:** Review Panel Members
- Attachment 2:** External Chair Panel Report
- Attachment 3:** Continuing Centers of Excellence

**Centers of Excellence  
FY 2012-13  
Review Panel  
March 9, 2012  
9:00 am – 3:00 pm**

<p><b>Dr. Ronald Joekel – Chair</b> Professor Educational Administration &amp; Higher Education University of Nebraska 124 TEAC Lincoln, NE 68588 0360 Phone: 402-472-0971 Fax: 402-472-4300 <a href="mailto:rjoekel2@unl.edu">rjoekel2@unl.edu</a></p>	<p><b>Dr. Falcia Harvey</b> Coordinator of Alternative Certification South Carolina Department of Education 3700 Forest Drive, Suite 500 Columbia, South Carolina 29204 803-734-5858 (office) 803-734-4967 (fax) <a href="mailto:fharvey@ed.sc.gov">fharvey@ed.sc.gov</a></p>	<p><b>Melanie Barton</b> Interim Executive Director Education Oversight Committee PO Box 11867 Room 227 Blatt Bldg. Columbia, SC 29211 803-734-6148 <a href="mailto:mbarton@eoc.sc.gov">mbarton@eoc.sc.gov</a></p>
<p><b>Dr. Fred Splittgerber</b> Grant Coordinator Middle Level Teacher Education Initiative 124 Buckhead Drive Irmo, SC 29063 H: 803-234-6649 C: 803-447-7749 <a href="mailto:fredusc@aol.com">fredusc@aol.com</a></p>	<p><b>Dr. Calvin Williams</b> Director, Center of Excellence in Mathematics and Science Education Clemson University O-323 Martin Hall Clemson, SC 29634 864-656-5241 <a href="mailto:calvinw@ces.clemson.edu">calvinw@ces.clemson.edu</a></p>	<p><b>Dr. Gary J. Senn</b> Director, Ruth Patrick Science Education Center USC-Aiken 471 University Parkway, Aiken, SC 29801 803-641-3558 Fax: 803-641-3615 <a href="mailto:SennG@sc.edu">SennG@sc.edu</a></p>
<p><b>Dr. John K. Luedeman</b> Professor Emeritus of Mathematical Sciences and Teacher Education Clemson University 110 Shorecrest Drive Seneca, SC 29672 864 882-6735 (H) 864 650-4599 (C) <a href="mailto:luedem_j@bellsouth.net">luedem_j@bellsouth.net</a></p>	<p><b>Dr. Argentini Anderson</b> Program Manager SC Commission on Higher Education 1122 Lady Street, Suite 300 Columbia, SC 29201 803-737-2276 <a href="mailto:aanderson@che.sc.gov">aanderson@che.sc.gov</a></p>	<p><b>Trena Houp</b> Program Manager SC Commission on Higher Education 1122 Lady Street, Suite 300 Columbia, SC 29201 803-737-4853 <a href="mailto:thoup@che.sc.gov">thoup@che.sc.gov</a></p>
<p><u>Staff Support:</u>  <b>Dr. Paula Gregg</b> Program Manager Academic Affairs and Licensing Commission on Higher Education 1333 Main Street, Suite 200 Columbia, SC 803-737-2246 <a href="mailto:pgregg@che.sc.gov">pgregg@che.sc.gov</a></p>		

**Report of the Review Panel  
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education  
Centers of Excellence Program  
Education Improvement Act of 1984  
Project Year 2012-13**

**Focus on Effective Teaching  
March 9, 2012**

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education appointed a Panel to review Proposals submitted to the Commission for the establishment of Centers of Excellence for the Fiscal Year 2012-2013. The Panel met on March 9, 2012 at the Commission Office in Columbia, South Carolina, to hear a presentation on each proposal by the institution, discuss each proposal and then to determine its recommendation for funding.

In advance of the meeting, members of the Review Panel were sent the *Guidelines for Submission of Proposals –Centers of Excellence Education Improvement Act of 1984*. Members were asked to read and acquaint themselves with the Guidelines and the three proposals prior to the March 9, 2012 meeting. Panel members were asked to complete a Proposal Review Rubric/Rating Form for each of the three proposals and it was used in their final deliberations.

Three proposals were submitted to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education for funding consideration. The Panel acknowledged the substantial effort and institutional commitment that goes into conceptualizing, developing, and writing proposals following the Commission’s guidelines. The three institutions submitting proposals are to be congratulated for undertaking this task and creating proposals to enhance the education for students in South Carolina Schools.

In addition to reading the proposals prior to the March 9 meeting, Panel members conducted interviews with teams representing each of the three institutions. The teams were comprised of administration/faculty/ from the institutions of higher education and in most cases, representatives from the K-12 schools who were partners identified in the proposal.

A schedule was developed whereby the proposal team was assigned one hour to make a presentation on their proposal and answer questions from Panel members. Following the interviews, the Panel discussed each proposal at some length identifying the strengths of each proposal as well as any areas of concern.

The three proposals and their titles presented in alphabetical order were:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| • The Citadel                           | The Citadel STEM Center of Excellence   |
| • Southern Wesleyan University          | Transitions-4-Success   |
| • University of South Carolina-Columbia | Center of Excellence-College and Career Readiness through Financial Education |

## **Panel Discussion and Deliberation**

Following the proposal presentations by the three institutions, the panel held a discussion about each proposal looking at whether the proposal met the guidelines and the salient features of each proposal. Each of the three proposals was reviewed thoroughly by panel members sharing their thoughts about the written proposals and the presentation by the submitting institution and the partner school districts. After much deliberation, the panel made the following recommendation.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The panel recommends funding for the Citadel proposal titled: The Citadel STEM Center of Excellence. The proposal would build upon the existing Citadel STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Center of Excellence by the development and implementation of a STEM Ambassador Program. The program will place content, career, and pedagogical experts (STEM Ambassadors) in classrooms across the Low country and beyond.

The Citadel proposal has the following four objectives:

- Objective 1: In partnership with local STEM industries, state-wide higher education faculty, and regional K-12 curriculum coordinators, the STEM Center of Excellence will develop a series of professional development activities for area K-12 teachers of STEM disciplines. The professional development activities will focus on interdisciplinary STEM content and pedagogy with a concentration on college and career readiness.
- Objective 2: Over the course of a summer and an academic year, the STEM Center will deliver the series of professional development activities to area wide teachers.
- Objective 3: Following the summer and academic year instruction, the participating teachers will participate in a one-week summer externship in a local STEM industry. Completion of the professional development series and externship will lead to designation as a STEM Ambassador.
- Objective 4: The STEM Center will facilitate the implementation of STEM Ambassador-lead professional development programs in home-school districts.

A series of STEM professional development activities will be developed in partnership with Berkley County, Charleston Country, and Dorchester four school districts. It will specifically recruit K-12 teachers from low-performing, high need schools. The proposal listed the following expected outcomes:

“It is expected that the activities offered by the Center will produce highly qualified teachers equipped with cutting edge STEM knowledge and 21<sup>st</sup>. century skills. It is expected that teachers completing the program will be capable of advancing student learning in STEM, inspiring and preparing students to pursue STEM-based careers, and will be better able to prepare our students to be successful in college and beyond.”

## **Development of Professional Development Activities**

The College Readiness Reference Standards outlined in the South Carolina Course Alignment Project and the document titled: “Redefining College Readiness,” by the Educational Policy Improvement Center, will guide the development of professional development activities focusing on STEM content, pedagogy, and college readiness. Business representatives, K-12 education partners working collaboratively with college educators will provide leadership in developing the proposed activities of the Center.

### **Strengths of the Proposed Center**

There were a number of activities that the panels felt were strengths of the proposal, including the involvement of K-12 District administrators, K-12 District Guidance and Career Counselors in addition to K-12 teachers. It is imperative that District Administrators understand and support the program, and that Guidance and Career Counselors be better informed and be collaborative partners as well.

The opportunity for interdisciplinary collaboration in both developing and delivering Professional Development activities and implementing activities for K-12 students is a feature that was attractive to the panel. Bringing together professors from the various academic disciplines, industry leaders, and K-12 schools has tremendous potential that should not be overlooked. There are too many silos in our educational systems where people work independently rather than collaboratively. Here is a wonderful opportunity for people to work together focusing on an outcome of introducing into the classroom meaningful interdisciplinary projects and “hands on” instruction. The modules of instruction to be developed are another example where interdisciplinary collaboration can occur rather than discrete, and in some cases, isolated instruction.

Another salient feature of the proposal that was attractive was using blended asynchronous learning modules supported by daylong campus meetings. There is a plethora of new technology that can enhance the classroom and communication. The use of Skype, e-mail, podcasts, webinars, blogs, and careful use of social networks are only a few of the examples of how technology is impacting communication and education today. With online classes and communication, access by participants can be 24 hours a day-7 days a week. Blended instruction offers the potential of building learning community where communication is encouraged and participants have a feeling of ownership. It also has the potential of encouraging “reflective thinking” by participants as they have a number of sources of information to process.

### **SUMMARY:**

The panel felt the objectives and activities outlined by the proposal offer great potential for advancing STEM literacy in the Low country of South Carolina and beyond. In essence, it is a “Trainer of Trainers” model whereby selected teachers from the collaborating school districts will be trained as “STEP Ambassadors” who will then train teachers in their district. These teachers would then implement instructional strategies and content taught in the STEP Center of Excellence to students in their classrooms. It has the potential to impact Pre-Service college students, the professional development of K-12 teachers and K-12 students. The potential of interdisciplinary collaboration among industry leaders, college faculty, K-12 teachers, administrators, and guidance and career counselors are attractive. The opportunity to enhance

the educational opportunities of K-12 students is imperative to meet the challenges of today and the future that are facing our country. The Citadel and the partner schools have committed to the proposal and it should be an interesting program.

### **Recommendations for Improvement of the Proposal**

Although the panel has recommended The Citadel proposal for funding, it felt there were some ways the proposal could be further strengthened. Following are suggestions:

1. The Center co-director or assistant director should be a tenure track or tenured faculty member.
2. More specifics in regard to how pre-service college students will benefit from the proposal would be helpful. If there were stated outcomes, it would enhance not only the identification of content and activities, but the evaluation process as well.
3. More specifics in regard to what are the benefits to K-12 students. It would appear that somehow because some teachers have been trained as STEP Ambassadors learning is going to filter down to the classroom. Stated outcomes for K-12 students would help clarify this concern and it would aid the evaluation process greatly.
4. More deliberate interdisciplinary collaboration would benefit the program. There is a wonderful opportunity to plan and deliver instruction collaboratively, not individually by academic discipline. Modules developed interdisciplinary with “hands on” projects.
5. There is a need to develop a larger pool of Ambassadors to really have an impact. Individuals who will potentially be around for a period of time will be essential to maintain sustainability of the program.
6. The Evaluation plan needs to be tightened up and not just by looking at standardized tests. The statement of outcomes, especially for the students, would be beneficial.
7. How will the professional development of teachers be evaluated? Again, a statement of outcomes similar to those for student achievement would be helpful in that process.
8. There is a need to work with other low performing districts similar to Jasper country.
9. It was noted that the creation of a methods course (interdisciplinary) to be offered for alternative certification people would be helpful.
10. A research basis to support the proposed Center activities should be included to form a foundation for the research to be conducted through the Center.

### **Non-Funded Proposals**

Two additional proposals were submitted and each had some admirable features. We encourage the proposal developers to not cast aside their proposals, but work diligently to implement parts of their proposal that are feasible.

**University of South Carolina**  
Center of Excellence for Literacy and Financial Education  
“Making Change” in Jasper County  
College and Career Readiness through Financial Education

The University of South Carolina-Columbia, working collaboratively with the Jasper County School District, submitted a proposal calling for the establishment of a Center of Excellence that would promote financial literacy and college and career readiness for K-12 students. The proposal stated that the center would advocate more financial education opportunities at the local, state, and national level and address the growing need for financial education and increased college and career education for USC pre-service students, educators and high school students in Jasper County.

Stated outcomes for the proposed center included an increased supply of teachers who can prepare Jasper students for both college and careers equipped with strong financial literacy skills.

**Project Goals**

1. Increase the supply of teachers who can prepare students for both college and careers equipped with strong financial literacy skills, including the development of supplemental credentials that certify teacher readiness for delivery of content in multiple ways.
2. Prepare teachers to develop and deliver curricula that mutually reinforce academic and technical content and provide authentic application for post-secondary transitions.
3. To build an infrastructure that provides sustained, intensive college and career readiness professional development training that will increase student success beyond high school.

**Summer Summit and Seminars**

Plans for a one day Jasper County College, Career, and Financial Literacy summit to raise awareness in the public policy arena about the need for increasing personal financial education in high school, at the college level and for adults will be the first activity of the Center. The proposal indicated it will be sponsored by a financial institution/Bank, National Life Insurance Company and a Charitable Foundation.

A Jasper County Teachers Financial Literacy Summer Institute (co-sponsored by a local bank) will be held to provide financial training held each summer providing graduate level training for more than 45 Jasper County high school educators. Each institute/seminar will be for three weeks duration. The school district will host a five day literacy camp for students during the last week of the summer institute with the trained teachers placing into practice what they have learned in the seminars. Six college classes will be offered in the summer institutes which will award both CEU credits and graduate credits. Onsite training at the school district would consist of seminars throughout the year. There would be two cohorts, one in the fall and one in the spring. When USC presented the proposal to the panel, a question was raised by a panel member in regard to further cohorts. The response was that there would be cohorts in year three and four.

## Panel Concerns

- A lack of specifics about how the proposal would be designed, implemented and evaluated became a major concern of the panel. To begin with, the title of the proposal was somewhat misleading as college and career readiness through financial education was presented in the heading for the abstract and proposal. However, emphasis throughout the proposal was centered on financial literacy. Not one of the six standards presented focused on college or career readiness.
- In the vision for the center, it was stated that it would be creative and interdisciplinary in its approach to instruction. The need for interdisciplinary collaboration would be a significant step to develop and deliver professional training. Yet the proposal was vague about what disciplines would be involved and what commitments have been made. The term interdisciplinary was not used again in the proposal.
- In number three of the project objectives, it is stated that others would be engaged in the creation and dissemination of financial literacy including College of Business faculty, experts in the field, alumni, students, and general public at various forums, such as class lectures, seminars, summer institutes, lecture series and panels. Certainly a worthy objective, but again there no specifics of how this will happen. During the presentation by USC representatives, a panel member asked how the College of Business sees its role in the Center. A response was given that they did not see this as a college of business venture, but more of an education venture. There were no specific show that any of the groups identified would be engaged with the creation and dissemination of information about financial literacy!
- Under measurable benchmarks, number four states: “Develop a detailed research agenda that will enable higher education faculty and K-12 personnel statewide to improve classroom effectiveness and student achievement. An ambitious benchmark and no specifics were given how this would be implemented. What is the research agenda?”
- What research questions or topics need to be researched and how do you propose to conduct the research?
- Specifics were again lacking when the proposal on page twenty-six under benefits to the institution stated: “Our pre-service teachers will benefit by having access to the curriculum, and the research data.” Specifically, how will this happen? Is it part of special seminars or special classes? Is there a planned approach of how this will happen?
- It would appear the Center would be dependent upon outside financial support as stated in the proposal. Sustainability of the Center if the funding from outside sources is successful, what will happen to the center? No contingency plans were presented in the event that this happens. Wouldn't it be prudent to obtain a commitment from them prior to starting the project? What would happen to the financial literacy summit and the summer institutes if you did not obtain financial support from a local bank, financial institution, a charitable foundation or an insurance company as you identified in the proposal? Working with the Council on Economic Education or a Business Roundtable might be places where you can secure guidance and assistance.

- Specifics would have also benefited the proposal in the selection of the teachers for the project and specifically for the summer institutes and seminars during the school year. The same is true for the selection of the students for the five day summer camp
- The opportunity to use distance education via online instruction to deliver instruction and communicate with teachers in the cohorts is recommended. There are many examples of online instruction or blended instruction that are successful delivery methods.
- If the evaluation plan could focus more on outcomes it would be more effective and there would be a better view of what worked and what the results are of professional development training, classroom instruction in Jasper High School, and the impact of the center on its stated goals and objectives.
- There are also some concerns about the budget that would need to be worked out if the proposal were funded.

### **Southern Wesleyan University Transitions -4-Success in the 21<sup>st</sup>.Century**

The third proposal was submitted by Southern Wesleyan University in collaboration with Pickens County Schools and Anderson School District Four. Alliances with Newberry College's Center for Excellence-RETAIN, Winthrop University NetSCOPE, and South Carolina Personal Pathways would be further developed if the proposal were funded.

#### Purpose of the Center

The stated purpose of the Center was to provide professional development for teachers to help ensure that P-12 learners are ready to successfully enter the 21<sup>st</sup>. century workforce.

#### Goals for the proposed Center:

1. Promote transition strategies for veteran teachers in career readiness so P-12 students can move successfully to meaningful work experiences upon graduation.
2. Enhance the preparation for cooperating clinical teachers in high needs school districts through quality professional development.
3. Conduct and distribute research related to successful strategies to assist transitioning-cooperating teacher to mentor teacher; pre-service teacher candidate to classroom teacher; and P-12 student to successful career experiences.

#### Objectives for Goal One

Objective One: Promote college credit courses to allow secondary seniors to earn college credit at reduced tuition.

Objective Two: Work with career theme focused P-12 school faculty to provide signature school-to-work experiences for the P-12 students during the student teaching experience.

## Objectives for Goal Two

Objective One: Investigate models for enhancing the mentoring skills of cooperating teachers serving in the classroom.

Objective Two: Develop and implement strategies in professional development activities to prepare teachers in high needs schools to work with career awareness and transitions for P-12 students.

Objective Three: Increase the number and quality of highly qualified teachers trained for initial certification that will be prepared to serve in high need schools through an innovative clinical preparation model.

## Objectives for Goal Three

Objective One: Investigate current research and publish papers explicit to South Carolina on topics related to transitions from P-12 to college and career success; new clinical models; retention of teachers in high need schools; common core standards, working with career awareness; effective education leadership models.

Objective Two: Create a Transitions-4-Success website to publish and disseminate papers and research data; to create videos and webinars; to prepare networking and outreach prospects.

## Concerns

- The director will have an extremely heavy load with her administrative duties as Associate Dean, teaching responsibilities, plus serving as director of the proposed Center. Additionally, the Assistant Director is serving as an adjunct faculty member and has limited higher education experience. She already has three jobs and this would add a fourth. This raises a concern about the sustainability of the Center. What would happen if the Director was no longer available?
- The proposal lacks specifics of how the goals and objectives will be achieved. For example, Goal Three calls for conducting research and an objective is stated to investigate current research. There is a great deal of difference of actually conducting research and investigating research. If it is to conduct research, what are the research plans? What will be researched? Who will be involved in the research?
- It would appear that a limited number of veteran teachers would be involved who will in turn train cooperating teachers to transition to mentor teachers who would work with teacher candidates. The figure of 20-30 veteran teachers was reported in the presentation.
- There was lack of specificity about the benefits for P-12 students in the collaborating schools. For example, how many students will be involved and grade levels served? What will be provided that is not currently being provided to these students. How do you know it makes a difference?
- There are some budgetary issues that would have to be worked out if the proposal were to be funded
- The evaluation plan proposed is weak and lacks specifics and it should be outcome driven. It is stated that the evaluator will review materials, analyze and develop surveys.

Some outcomes for the program goals/objectives/activities need to developed and evaluated.

**Report Submitted by Dr. Ronald G. Joekel, Chair  
Review Panel for Centers of Excellence Education Improvement**

**Centers of Excellence (Teacher Education)**  
**New and Continuing Projects**  
**FY 2012-13**

Center	Institution	Project Director	FY 2010-11 Award	Award Year
Center of Excellence in Middle-level Interdisciplinary Strategies for Teaching	USC-Aiken	Gary Senn	\$ 112,500.00	Year 5 of 5
Center of Excellence for Inquiry for Mathematics and Science	Clemson University	Bob Horton	\$ 112,500.00	Year 5 of 5
Center of Excellence to Retain and Empower Teachers through Action, Innovation, and Networking	Newberry	Cindy Johnson-Taylor	\$ 112,500.00	Year 3 of 5
Center of Excellence in English Language Learners Professional Development	Claflin University	Nan Li	\$ 119,300.00	Year 2 of 5
STEM Center of Excellence	The Citadel	Carolyn Kelley	\$ 150,000.00	Year 1 of 5