

2008 Part C of the AACTE / NCATE Annual Report

Section 1 - Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	10421	AACTE SID:	1305
Institution:	Georgia Southern University		
Unit:	College of Education	Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C:	02/15/2009
Next Accreditation Visit:	S13	Last Accreditation Visit:	S06

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

Unit Head Name:	Dr. Lucindia H. Chance	Unit Head Title:	Dean
Unit Head Email:	lchance@georgiasouthern.edu	Unit Head Phone:	(912) 478-5649
Unit Head Fax:	(912) 478-5093	Institution Unit Phone:	(912) 478-5649
2nd Unit Head Name:		2nd Unit Head Title:	
2nd Unit Head Email:		2nd Unit Head Phone:	
2nd Unit Head Fax:			
1st NCATE Coordinator:	Dr. Stephanie L. Kenney		
1st Coordinator Title:	Associate Dean, Undergraduate Teacher Education &	1st Coordinator Email:	skenny@georgiasouthern.edu
1st Coordinator Phone:	(912) 478-5247	1st Coordinator Fax:	(912) 478-1068
2nd NCATE Coordinator:			
2nd Coordinator Title:		2nd Coordinator Email:	
2nd Coordinator Phone:		2nd Coordinator Fax:	
3rd NCATE Coordinator:			
3rd Coordinator Title:		3rd Coordinator Email:	
3rd Coordinator Phone:		3rd Coordinator Fax:	
CEO Name:	Dr. Bruce F. Grube		
CEO Title:	President	CEO Email:	bfgcube@georgiasouthern.edu
CEO Phone:	(912) 478-5211	CEO Fax:	(912) 478-0598

Section 3 - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs) during the 2007-2008 academic year?

677

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2007-2008 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section 4. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. change in Title II data that indicates the unit no longer meets the required state pass rates on licensure exams
2. change in the state-approved status (e.g., probation or low-performing) of the professional education unit as identified by the state licensing agency
3. change in institutional accreditation status
4. the addition or removal of programs.

- Redesigned Ed.D. in Curriculum Studies to include two distinct program strands (Curriculum Studies; Teaching and Learning) and eliminate/update concentration areas. This redesign addressed the concern of teachers who desire an advanced, scholarly degree in Teaching.

• Redesigned Ed.S. In Educational Leadership and designed an Educational Leadership Teacher Leader Endorsement. This accomplished the required alignment with the new BOR Leadership Principles and a new program alignment with the Moral Dimensions of the National Network for Educational Renewal. This program is the first to align with the Moral Dimensions. This is part of a long term project of the College of Education to more clearly reflect the Moral Dimensions in our CF as well as all of our educator preparation programs.

5. changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs. NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.

Numbers reported in our PEDS report reflect a significant increase over last year in certain areas of graduate enrollment. These increases are due, in part, to the programs that were changed either in level or delivery mode last year, such as the Master of Arts in Teaching (secondary program areas that were previously BSEd programs) and the fully on-line delivery model implemented in the Instructional Technology graduate program. Another activity that increased the number of graduate degrees was a concerted effort by graduate faculty across the College of Education to facilitate the candidates' efficient progression through and completion of their doctoral programs.

A significant impact of these increased numbers was felt particularly by faculty who teach across undergraduate and graduate programs, as the majority of our faculty do. This impact is depicted by our substantially increased total student credit hour production for these faculty. It is noteworthy that, although our faculty's heavy field supervision loads artificially depress their FTEs, their FTEs are still very high.

6. addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., a master's degree)
7. change in status of institution (i.e., merged, separated, etc.)
8. increased offering for the preparation of education professionals in off-campus sites
9. increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals outside the United States
10. changes in institutional and unit leadership
11. significant change in budget, which is defined as a 25 percent decrease in the overall unit budget from the previous reporting year
12. significant change in the size of the full-time faculty, which is defined as a 25 percent decrease from the previous reporting year
13. delivery of a program in whole or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner
14. change in institutional control or ownership
15. significant change as a result of unforeseen conditions such as a natural disaster

Section 5. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared 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.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit's conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

At our Annual Unit Assessment Retreat in Spring 2008 we determined that our COE Conceptual Framework and Four Commitments will be reviewed jointly by the COE Administrative Team and the Assessment/Accreditation Committee during 2008-2009. Two areas already identified for clearer articulation are (a) our focus on school and community partnerships that facilitate P-20 simultaneous renewal and (9) our focus on teaching and learning the democratic practices in schools that facilitate equal learning opportunities for all children and youth. The first redesigned program to reflect this focus is the Ed.S. in Educational Leadership and the Educational Leadership Teacher Leader Endorsement. The 2008-2009 CF review and resulting changes will be reflected in Part C of our 2009 report.

Section 6. Unit Standards

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate

the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. Candidates in art, English, history, and mathematics do not achieve an 80% pass rate on state-required content knowledge exams.	(ITP)
2. Candidate performance assessment criteria and reported data are not consistently aligned with unit, state, and national standards.	(ITP)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

<p>1. Candidates in art, English, history, and mathematics do not achieve an 80% pass rate on state required content knowledge exams (ITP)</p> <p>The COE and Arts and Sciences Teacher Preparation faculty continue to use the strategies outlined in our 2006-2007 Update in an effort to continuously improve candidate GACE Content test pass rates. While the majority of students are now in the Master of Arts in Teaching program and must pass the GACE as a prerequisite to program entry, a few candidates are finishing the BSEd programs. These are the students represented in the Pass rates for 2007-2008 program completers provided on the table below.</p> <p>2007-2008 Program Completers Pass Rates (art, English, history and mathematics) Program # Passed/Attempted on Tests I and II and (Percentage Passed) Art Ed. Test I: 5/5 (100%) Test II 5/5 (100%) English Ed. Test I: 12/12 (100%) Test II 12/12 (100%) History Ed. Test I: 13/13 (100%) Test II 12/13 (92%) Math Ed. Test I: 6/6 (100%) Test II 6/6 (100%)</p> <p>2. Candidate performance assessment criteria and reported data are not consistently aligned with unit, state, and national standards. (ITP)</p> <p>The Department of Teaching and Learning faculty used the newly aligned common key assessments across undergraduate and graduate programs during the 2007-2008 assessment cycle. Each program used a two-part rubric, with one part addressing the Georgia Framework (common across all programs) and the second part addressing the programs' SPA standards. Data collected and aggregated from the first part of each rubric was analyzed at the department and unit levels. This aggregate data was reported on our Annual Unit Assessment Toolkit spreadsheet, the tool used for annual review of candidate and unit services data. The data collected and aggregated from the second part of each program's rubric was analyzed at the program level, specifically for program level review/renewal. This data can be seen in aggregate format on the Teaching and Learning Toolkit spreadsheet used in our Spring 2008 Annual Unit Assessment. It is noteworthy that at the time of our 2008 AFI Report, when presented with evidence of these rubrics and the concurrent GACE pass rates, the Professional Standards Commission Review Board removed both AFIs reported on here.</p>

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

--

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

[Redacted]

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not have an established process for candidates, school faculty, and university faculty to conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout clinical practice. (ADV)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

1. The unit does not have an established process for candidates, school faculty, and university faculty to conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout clinical practice (Advanced)

At the time of our 2007 report, the MEd in Teaching and Learning program was the only advanced program that remained in need of a clear and well-supervised/assessed field experience component. This program now also has three key assessments that are course-linked and completed in the field. Data were gathered on these key assessments during 2007-2008 and analyzed/reported for our Spring 2008 Unit Assessment. This data can be seen in aggregate format on the Teaching and Learning Toolkit spreadsheet used in our Spring 2008 Annual Unit Assessment.

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools. Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

[Redacted]

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

[Redacted]

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

[Redacted]

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. Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

[Redacted]

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

[Redacted]

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

[Redacted]

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.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

If you have another comments, use the space below:
