

October 6, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Layton R. McCurdy, Chairman, and Members, Commission on Higher Education

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

**Consideration of the NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluation at
Francis Marion University,
Lander University and College of Charleston**

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 pending approval of the new state partnership agreement). 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 three 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 each 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 Fall 2004, Francis Marion University, Lander University and The College of Charleston 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 (**See Appendix I**). The UAB makes the accreditation decision based on the BOE’s findings. Institutions visited in the fall of 2004 had accreditation decisions made by the UAB in March 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 reviewed by the SPAs, and the evaluation results for all individual programs within the teacher education unit at the three institutions visited during Fall 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 CHE program reviews, each program receives from CHE one of four recommendations: 1) commendation of excellence; 2) full approval; 3) provisional or probationary approval; or 4) recommendation for termination. For programs in Education, 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; 2) the program has not received full approval from the 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; 3) 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.

Recommendations

1. The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends to the Commission that it grant to the programs in Education at Francis Marion University, Lander University, and the College of Charleston the designations presented in the report as follows:

Francis Marion University	See pp. 5-7
Lander University	See pp. 8-11
The College of Charleston	See pp. 12-15

2. The Committee recommends that the Commission congratulate College of Charleston for achieving full approval from NCATE.
3. The Committee recommends that the Commission urge all institutions to submit or resubmit program reviews to the Specialty Professional Associations (SPA) at the earliest opportunity until full approval is obtained for all programs for which a SPA evaluation process exists; until full SPA approval is obtained, program status awarded by CHE remains at "provisional approval."
4. For Francis Marion University and Lander University, the Committee recommends that the Commission accept no new program requests in Education until the unit obtains full accreditation, as opposed to "accreditation with conditions" from NCATE.
5. The Committee recommends that the Commission require that each institution submit to the Commission as part of its Institutional Effectiveness Report, due August 1, 2006, a progress report that summarizes the responses made by the

institutions for improvement with respect to the UAB findings as well as the findings of their CHE consultant.

**Summary Report of the NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluation at
Francis Marion University,
Lander University, and College of Charleston**

I. Francis Marion University

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on October 23-27, 2004, at Francis Marion University. At its March 13-17 2005, meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) reviewed the materials and reports for Francis Marion University and rendered the decision to “continue accreditation with conditions” for the School of Education at Francis Marion University at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. Both initial and advanced programs are each evaluated on six NCATE standards. The initial and advanced teacher programs did not meet Standard 2, the assessment standard. The School of Education will submit to NCATE documentation by October 1, 2005, describing progress made toward meeting Standard 2, and its accreditation status will be reconsidered by the UAB. Areas cited for improvement are as follows:

- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit’s assessment system does not include a structured process for collecting, analyzing, summarizing, and using data from assessment measures (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit’s assessment system does not include a structured process for ensuring that key assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and unbiased (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Not all candidates meet entrance and exit criteria for student learning (Standard 3).
- (Advanced Preparation) The unit does not ensure that all candidates have experiences working with diverse P-12 students (Standard 3).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Candidates have limited opportunities to work with diverse faculty (Standard 4).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not conduct comprehensive evaluations of part-time faculty (Standard 5).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Although a governance and committee structure exists, the unit does not regularly collaborate or communicate across all program areas (e.g., school psychology) or with P-1 school partners (Standard 6).

The CHE consultant reviewed graduate programs for which no NCATE approved folio evaluation existed, including programs leading to an **M.Ed. in Elementary Education**, an **M.Ed. in Instructional Accommodation**, and an **M. Ed. in Secondary Education**. The consultant recommended continuing approval of all three programs citing the following areas of 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 use this information to make continuous improvements to the program.
2. The current Minority Faculty Recruitment Plan is not effective and has not produced positive results. Therefore, the plan should be revisited and revised as needed to ensure that more minority faculty members are hired.
3. 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 the faculty's knowledge and professional skills.
4. A system should be developed to track candidate's professional achievements while they are in the program and after graduation.

The CHE consultant verified that both the initial and advanced teacher preparation programs are in compliance with the CHE Academic Degree Program Productivity Requirements. Francis Marion University School of Education accepted the findings and recommendations in the CHE consultant's report.

Recommendations

1. Consistent with the UAB decision to "continue accreditation, with conditions," the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission grant provisional approval to programs in the Francis Marion School of Education as noted in **Table 1** until the UAB reconsiders the unit's status based on new documentation to be submitted to NCATE (due October 1, 2005) explaining progress in meeting Standard 2.
2. In addition, the Committee recommends that the Commission require that the School of Education report on unit and program improvements made in response to the UAB and CHE consultant's findings in its 2006 Institutional Effectiveness report, due August 1, 2006.

3. In keeping with customary practice and policy, the Committee further recommends that the Commission approve no new program requests in Education be considered until the unit obtains full accreditation.
4. Finally, The Committee recommends that the Commission require that the two programs not receiving full approval from their respective SPAs (see Footnotes 1 and 3) should be resubmitted until full approval is granted.

**Francis Marion University
Table 1**

Program Title	Degree	Options/Tracts/Concentrations	Recommendation
Learning Disabilities	MAT ^{1,5}		Provisional Approval
	MEd ^{1,2}		Provisional Approval
Instruct. Accommodation	MEd ^{3,5}		Provisional Approval
Elementary Education	BS ^{4,5}		Provisional Approval
	MEd ^{2,5}		Provisional Approval
Early Childhood Education	BS ^{5,5}		Provisional Approval
	MEd ^{4,5}		Provisional Approval
Secondary Education	MEd ^{2,5}	English	Provisional Approval
		Mathematics	Provisional Approval
		Social Studies	Provisional Approval
Art Education	BS ⁵		Provisional Approval
English	BA ⁵	Teacher Education	Provisional Approval
Mathematics	BA ⁵	Teacher Education	Provisional Approval
	BS ⁵	Teacher Education	Provisional Approval
Applied Psychology	MS ⁵	School Psychology	Provisional Approval
History	BA ⁵	Teacher Education	Provisional Approval
Political Science & Gov't	BA ⁵	Teacher Education	Provisional Approval
Sociology	BA ⁵	Teacher Education	Provisional Approval

1 Review by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) resulted in "conditional recognition."

2 Programs granted provisional approval until full approval of the unit is granted by NCATE

3 Reviewed by CHE consultant

4 Review by the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) resulted in "national recognition with conditions: at the initial preparation level.

5 Review by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) resulted in "recognition with conditions" at the initial and advanced preparation levels.

II. Lander University

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on November 13-17, 2004, at Lander University. At its March 2005 meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board reviewed the materials and reports for Lander University and rendered the decision to “continue accreditation, with conditions” of the School of Education at Lander University at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. The initial and advanced programs are each evaluated on six NCATE standards. Both programs met five of the six standards, and had a significant number of areas cited for improvement. Standard 2, the assessment standard was not met. The University can submit to NCATE documentation by October 1, 2005, on meeting Standard 2, or it may opt to host a “focused visit” on Standard 2 on or before the Spring 2007 semester. Areas cited for improvement are as follows:

- (Initial Preparation) The history program has not been nationally recognized (Standard 1). (It has since obtained national recognition.)
- (Advanced Preparation) The master’s program in elementary education has not been approved through the South Carolina state program review process (Standard 1).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a unit-wide assessment system that drives unit decision-making (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a systematic plan for collecting, analyzing, and evaluating data on candidate performance (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have an overall plan for collecting data systematically across all programs (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Follow-up data from alumni and program completers are not part of the unit assessment system (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a system for utilizing data for program improvement (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a plan for systematically determining whether assessments are predictors of candidate success (Standard 2).

- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a formalized process for regular data analysis, for report generation and dissemination, or for how the unit will systematically respond to data findings (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a system that allows aggregation of data involving multiple variables (i.e., performance of candidates across performance measures) (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Candidates do not have opportunities to work with diverse faculty (Standard 4).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Heavy unit faculty workloads adversely impact faculty development and other creative activities supportive of candidate development as professional educators (Standard 6).

The CHE consultant reviewed one program, the program leading to an **M.Ed. 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 in the Department of Teacher Education may want to examine the fundamental conceptualization of the program in terms of their ability to offer both upper (Grades 5-8) and lower (Grades 1-4) elementary options. Given the constraints on faculty load and ongoing financial challenges, a more generalized approach (one elementary option) to the M. Ed. program may be beneficial.
2. Faculty who teach in the M.Ed. program are teaching courses on an overload basis, rather than as part of an established teaching load. Thus, in the absence of adequate numbers of full-time faculty to deliver graduate courses, there is concern about the commitment by the institution to graduate education in the Department.
3. The role of the Director of Graduate Studies should be re-examined to determine responsibilities related to monitoring candidate performance, the need for additional release time, and advising loads. Because faculty are volunteering to teach in the M.Ed. program on an overload basis, the bulk of the work of graduate education falls on one person, the Director of Graduate Studies.
4. It appears as if the number of courses offered could be streamlined, allowing the program to establish a consistent and predictable pattern of course offerings throughout the academic year.

5. Faculty expectations of candidate proficiencies related to technology have been identified, but not systematically infused or assessed in the program.
6. The unit may want to consider developing a long-range plan (3-5 years) for graduate education within the Department of Teacher Education. The plan would outline the education needs of candidates, needed resources including faculty, delivery systems, and a plan for the expanded assessment requirements. In addition, the plan should include recruitment and retention activities for minority candidates and faculty.

Lander University Department of Education has responded noting a factual error related to faculty composition and diversity. The Department forwarded several clarifications related to faculty teaching loads and candidate preparation.

Recommendations

1. Consistent with the UAB decision to “continue accreditation, with conditions,” the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission grant to programs in Lander’s Education unit provisional approval as noted in **Table 2** until the Fall 2006 focused visit occurs and progress is reassessed in meeting Standard Two by the UAB.
2. In addition, the committee recommends that the Commission require Lander’s Department of Education to report on unit and program improvement made in response to the UAB and CHE consultant’s findings in its 2006 Institutional Effectiveness report, due August 1.
3. The Committee recommends that the Commission not approve any new program requests in Education until the unit obtains full accreditation.
4. Finally, the Committee recommends that the Commission require that the two programs not receiving full approval from the SPAs (see Footnotes 2 and 3) be resubmitted until full approval is granted.

Lander University
Table 2

Program Title	Degree	Options/Tracks/ Concentrations	Recommendation
Special Education	BS ⁴		Provisional Approval
Elementary Education	BS ⁴ MEd ^{1,4}		Provisional Approval Provisional Approval
Early Childhood Education	BS ^{2,4}	General Montessori	Provisional Approval Provisional Approval
Secondary Education	MAT ⁴	Art	Provisional Approval
Music Education	BMed ⁴	Instrumental Choral Keyboard	Provisional Approval Provisional Approval Provisional Approval
Physical Education	BS ⁴		Provisional Approval
Spanish	BA ^{3,4}		Provisional Approval
English	BA ⁴		Provisional Approval
Mathematics	BS ⁴		Provisional Approval
History	BS ⁴		Provisional Approval
Visual Arts	BA ⁴		Provisional Approval

1 Reviewed by CHE consultant

2 National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) review resulted in "national recognition with conditions."

3 Program review by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) was not reported to NCATE

4 Program granted provisional approval until full approval of the unit is granted by NCATE

III. College of Charleston

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on October 30-November 4, 2004, at College of Charleston. At its March 13-17, 2005, meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) reviewed the materials and reports for College of Charleston and rendered the decision to continue full accreditation for the School of Education at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels.

At the initial teacher preparation level, programs in Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, Middle Grades Education and Special Education were reviewed by their respective specialized professional associations (SPAs) and received national recognition (full approval). Physical Education was reviewed by the SPA; however, it did not receive national recognition. At the advanced level, programs in Early Childhood Education and Special Education were reviewed and recommended for national recognition. The Master's of Education in Languages was reviewed by its SPA, but did not receive national recognition. The Master's of Education in Elementary Education and the interdisciplinary Master's of Education in Mathematics and Science for Teachers were reviewed by the CHE consultant. The undergraduate program in languages was reviewed, but did not receive national recognition.

The initial and advanced programs are each evaluated on six NCATE standards. Both programs met the six standards; however, the UAB cited the following areas for improvement:

- (Initial Preparation) The physical education program has not been nationally recognized (Standard 1).
- (Initial Preparation) The foreign language undergraduate programs are not nationally recognized (Standard 1).
- (Initial Preparation) The M.A.T. early childhood program does not include 100 hours of field experiences and clinical practice as required by State Standards for Field Experiences and Clinical Practice (Standard 3)
- (Initial Preparation) The M.A.T. elementary education program does not include 100 hours of field experiences and clinical practice as required by State Standards for Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.
- NCATE will conduct its next site visit in Fall 2011.

Because there is neither an accrediting agency nor a national specialty professional association prepared to review them, the CHE consultant reviewed the programs leading to an **M.Ed. degree in Elementary Education** and the interdisciplinary program leading to an **M. Ed. degree in Science and Mathematics For Teachers**. The consultant recommended continuing approval of both the M.Ed. in Elementary Education and the interdisciplinary M.Ed. in Science and Mathematics for Teachers; granting to each an extensive, positive review and suggesting the following areas for improvement:

M.Ed. in Elementary Education

1. Complete and begin to implement as soon as possible the comprehensive curriculum revision begun in 2003-04.
2. Ensure that the revised curriculum addresses issues raised by faculty and candidates in prior surveys, discussions, and other feedback, e.g., family involvement skills, student assessment skills.
3. Address any remaining candidate concerns about the quality of academic advising they receive.
4. And, taking cues from potential students (rather than from current students), explore alternative course delivery models that will increase the size and stability of enrollment in the program, e.g., Saturday classes, Friday/Saturday weekend classes, summer course schedules better aligned to P-12 school-year schedules, and both synchronous and asynchronous distance learning modalities.

M.Ed. in Science and Mathematics for Teachers

1. Describe more explicitly in program materials and in course syllabi how the overall program and each of its courses addresses the key elements of the unit's Conceptual Framework – its “Making the Teaching and Learning Connection” slogan, its three new themes or Elements of Teacher Competency (ETC), and its seven School of Education Teaching and Learning Standards. While this alignment may now be implicit, the alignment needs to be made more explicit for candidates in the materials they receive.
2. Continue to work on two program needs identified in the CHE Self-Study Report: (a) gathering and using additional data about candidates' development of dispositions at the level of “emerging master” and (b) integrating technology into the program's courses.

3. Taking cues from potential students (rather than from current students), explore alternative course delivery models that will increase the size and stability of enrollment in the program, e.g., Saturday classes, Friday/Saturday weekend classes, summer course schedules better aligned to P-12 school-year schedules, and both synchronous and asynchronous distance learning modalities.
4. Make certain that future descriptions of the College's Professional Education Unit extend beyond the School of Education to include interdisciplinary programs like this one (and the new M. Ed. Program in Languages) that are the shared responsibility of the School of Education and one or two other academic units.

The CHE consultant examined both the initial and advanced teacher preparation programs for compliance with the CHE Academic Degree Program Productivity Requirements. The results indicate that while nine of the professional education programs do not meet the productivity standards, all of the programs enroll candidates who are not seeking teacher certification. Total enrollments and the number of degrees awarded allow the programs to meet CHE productivity standards.

In its response to the CHE consultant's report, the College of Charleston School of Education indicated that only minor clarifications were needed.

Recommendation

1. The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission grant approval status for programs as noted below in **Table 3** and recognize the College for achieving full approval.
2. The Committee further recommends that the School of Education report on unit and program improvements made in response to the UAB and CHE consultant's findings in its 2006 Institutional Effectiveness report, due August 1, 2006.
3. The Committee recommends that the Commission require that the two programs not receiving Full approval from the SPAs (see Footnotes 2 and 3) should be resubmitted until Full approval is granted.

**The College of Charleston
Table 3**

Program Title	Degree	Options/Tracks/ Concentrations	Recommendation
Early Childhood Education	BS		Full Approval
	MAT		Full Approval
	MEd		Full Approval
Elementary Education	BS		Full Approval
	MAT		Full Approval
	MEd ¹		Full Approval
Middle Grades Education	BS		Full Approval
Special Education	BS		Full Approval
	MAT		Full Approval
	MEd		Full Approval
Physical Education	BS ²		Full Approval Provisional
Languages	BS		Approval
Science and Math for Teachers	MEd ¹		Full Approval
Secondary	English Language and Literature		Full Approval
	Mathematics		Full Approval
	History		Full Approval

1 Reviewed by CHE consultant

2 A review by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) resulted in “not recognized” status at the time of the site visit. However, Staff was informed subsequent to CAAL meeting on 9/1/2005 that “nationally recognized” status had been awarded by NASPE.

3 The Languages program did not receive national recognition from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)

Appendix I

NCATE Unit Standards

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework(s) established the share vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

I. CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit had an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

II. UNIT CAPACITY

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so the teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

The following pages provide the reader information about the meaning of the conceptual framework(s) and the six NCATE standards. Rubrics that accompany each standard address the critical elements of the standard and describe different levels of performance required to meet the standard. The rubrics are to be interpreted holistically; they are not to be used to make a separate judgment on each element of the standard. Most of the standards' elements in the rubric intentionally include a number of characteristics that comprise a specific level of accomplishment (i.e., unacceptable, acceptable, or target). A unit may address some of the characteristics within one level and others at a different level. The supporting explanations include a rationale for the standard and additional explanation of each standard's meaning.