



National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

***** *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Dr. Gerard R. Giordano
Dr. Carol Anne Costabile-Heming
Dr. Cynthia B. Barta
Dr. Chukwunyere E. Okezie

State Team:

Dr. Richard D. Harrison
Dr. Susan Lynn
Dr. Ruth Caillouet
Dr. Michael P. Mahan
Dr. Michael L. Lariscy

State Consultant:

Dr. Bobbi A. Ford

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Continuous Improvement Visit to:

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

**College of Education and Health Professions
4225 University Avenue
Columbus, GA 31907-5645
February 17-19, 2013**

Type of Visit:

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

Columbus State University

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 4: Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Target	Target

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

Columbus State University is a four-year, public institution within the University System of Georgia. It is located in Columbus, Georgia. The main campus is located in Midtown Columbus, a suburban community. The smaller River Park campus, serving as home to the fine arts department, is located in the urban Downtown area. Columbus State offers undergraduate and graduate programs.

Columbus State serves a nine-county region with a population totaling over 500,000 residents. The demographics of the region present the University with opportunities to serve a diverse student population with regard to race, education, and socioeconomic level.

In fall 2009, Health Sciences and the School of Nursing joined the College of Education, which was then renamed as the College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP). The COEHP comprises three departments (Counseling, Foundations, and Leadership; Health, Physical Education, and Exercise Science; and Teacher Education) and one school (Nursing). The unit houses all educator preparation faculty housed in the College of Education and Health Professions and those educator preparation and content faculty members who are housed in other colleges. The COEHP Dean serves as the head of the

educator preparation unit; she has authority for the design, delivery, and evaluation of educator preparation programs.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The accreditation team comprised members appointed by the state and the national organization. The individuals from both groups worked together during the visit and collaborated on all decisions, including the writing of the final report. The education specialist from the state office acted as a facilitator; she assisted the team by providing information about state regulation, protocols, and procedures.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

All programs are offered on the main campus, which comprises two locations within the city of Columbus.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

The local schools were not in session during the site visit due to a holiday. However, the chairs of the national and the state teams made the school visits during the pre-visit. Additionally, the unit provided videos of candidates interacting with supervising teachers, students, and faculty members in the local schools.

No other unusual circumstances were associated with the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework 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 is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

The conceptual framework 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 is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

In 2009, the College of Education and Health Professions NCATE Steering Committee initiated a self study of the unit's conceptual framework driven by a number of changes at the institutional, college, and program levels since the 2005 continuing approval review. The core beliefs and values underpinning the framework were reexamined by three subcommittees with representation from P-12 school partners. Subcommittee recommendations were compiled and then reviewed by the Steering Committee.

Following approval by the Steering Committee, the revised Conceptual Framework was presented to educator preparation faculty and to the Educator Preparation Program Council for additional feedback and subsequent approval. The revised framework was approved by the faculty in spring 2010 and by the Educator Preparation Program Council (EPPC) in fall 2010.

The preparation of educators is viewed as the shared responsibility of the university with the programs housed in the College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP), the College of the Arts (COA), and the College of Letters and Sciences (COLS). The Educator Preparation Unit Committee (EPUC) is now call the Educator Preparation Assembly. It comprises representatives from content faculty and education faculty in all educator preparation programs. The Educator Preparation Program Council (EPPC) is an advisory board comprised of superintendents, the Provost and Deans from the colleges involved in educator preparation, the Director of the Center for Quality Teaching and Learning, and the Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation that meets 1-2 times each semester to review program and unit data and to discuss issues related to educator preparation for better collaboration and information sharing among educator preparation leaders at the university and the P-12 school systems. All of these activities are guided by the Educator Preparation Conceptual Framework that puts forth three basic tenets: (1) excellence in teaching; (2) excellence in scholarship; and, (3) excellence in professionalism.

The three tenets of the conceptual framework are closely tied to the institutional mission of achieving academic excellence through teaching, research, creative inquiry and student engagement; achieving excellence in the student experience; and achieving recognition as a leader in community development, regional economic development, and public-private partnerships. This in turn is tied to goal one of the institution's strategic plan: to achieve excellence in undergraduate and graduate education to meet student and community needs. Candidates continually acquire, integrate, refine, and model excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism as they develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to positively impact student learning.

The Conceptual Framework is knowledge based with the revision specifically updating of the literature review for each of the three key themes to reflect current thinking and practice that included a discussion of best practices in online teaching. In addition updates to references to the Georgia Code of Ethics and current courses related to ethics and professionalism were modified. The unit assessment system reflects the conceptual framework as well as professional and state standards utilizing specialty associations in curriculum review and development and by encompassing the 2011 standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Standards. Technology is utilized in the incorporation of the standards into the assessment system used to instruct, mentor, and assess candidates in initial and advanced programs.

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1

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.

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

All educator preparation programs leading to initial certification are approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (Georgia does not require SPA submission for educator preparation programs leading to initial certification.) Music is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), Art is accredited by the National Association of Art and Design (NASAD), and Special Education is nationally recognized by the Council on Exceptional Children (CEC).

Teacher candidates understand content-specific pedagogy. The unit employs a Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP). It uses it to assess planning, preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. MAP data indicate that more than 90 percent of candidates met expectations prior to clinical practice. Testimonials from supervising teachers confirmed that students understand and can apply advanced pedagogical strategies.

Teacher candidates focus on student learning. Candidates are evaluated throughout their field experiences on student learning MAP components. These components include the assessment of student learning, the use of questions and discussion techniques, student engage strategies, and providing feedback to students. MAP data at the candidates' exits from clinical practice revealed that more than 80 percent exceeded expectations. During interviews, supervising teachers confirmed that students effectively focus on student learning. The principal of a local high school indicated that he has hired multiple graduates of CSU precisely because of this trait.

Candidates in advanced teacher programs demonstrate professional competencies. Exhibits confirmed that they are evaluated through courses, exit exams, research projects, and portfolios. Interviews with candidates revealed that they were aware of these assessments, took them seriously, and, in retrospect, valued the contributions that they made to their professional competence.

Candidates in all programs demonstrate professional and, where appropriate, pedagogical knowledge and skills. Exhibits confirmed that they are evaluated by reflections about best practice, participation in learning communities, and demonstrations of their commitment to their professional areas of expertise.

Current candidates indicated that they reflected continually about professional issues, were assessed by their professors on the bases of these reflections, and anticipate that they will continue to reflect on professional issues after they have graduated.

Persons who had graduated from the program at different times during a 10-year span indicated that professional reflection was a hallmark of the programs throughout that multiyear era.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Candidates in teacher education at the initial and advanced levels have mastered the content they teach and can explain important principles and concepts. Several statistics reveal continuous improvement.

- The unit pass rate on the Georgia Assessment for Certification of Educators (GACE) content tests in 2010-2011 was 92 percent .
- All COEHP educator preparation programs had a pass rate of 83 percent or better.
- Eight programs had a 100 percent pass rate.
- Eleven programs had pass rates that exceeded the state average on at least one required test for that field of study.

Candidates in the initial and advanced programs for other school professionals demonstrate the competencies that have been set by professional associations and/or the state. The competencies, which demonstrate continuous improvement, are confirmed by multiple exhibits.

- School Counseling is accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP).
- School Counseling candidates have had a 100 percent pass rate on state tests.
- The program in School Library Media has participated in and passed a state review.
- Candidates in School Library Media have had a 100 percent pass rate on state tests.
- The program in Educational Leadership had participated in and passed a state reviews.
- Candidates in Educational Leadership had a 100 percent pass rate on state tests.
- The Doctor of Education degree in Curriculum and Leadership matriculated its first cohort of candidates in the spring of 2010. Seventy-five percent of the cohort members have passed comprehensive examinations.
- In initial programs, dispositions are assessed during methods/practicum courses and clinical practice. More than 90 percent of candidates met all dispositions.
- In advanced programs for teachers, dispositions are assessed in one or more required education courses. In programs for other school professionals, dispositions are assessed throughout the program. More than 90 percent of candidates met all dispositions.
- Responses on employer surveys indicate that candidates overwhelmingly meet or exceed standards.
- Responses on graduate surveys indicate that candidates feel they have had the training to meet the professional standards in their employment positions.

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None cited for this standard.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
1.Candidates in Art Education and Biology do not demonstrate content mastery. (ITP)	Pass rates on state exams confirm that Candidates in Art Education and Biology do demonstrate content mastery.

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

1.4 Recommendations

For Standard 1

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 2

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.

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.

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

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 unit and its programs. The unit's assessment system has been in place since the late 1990s and has been continuously refined since that time. Its current iteration, as revised in the spring of 2011, is described in the unit's Professional Education Unit Assessment Handbook. Based on interviews and review of the IR addendum, it was evident that the school partners are involved with the development and refinement of the assessment system.

The unit's assessment system reflects the three components of the unit's conceptual framework—teaching, scholarship, and professionalism and is aligned with state and professional standards. The initial programs have four gates or transition points that are aligned with the Georgia Professional Standards (GPS). The advanced programs have three gates; and, the doctoral program has four gates. The evidence provided by the unit indicated that the Assessment System was used by the unit to regularly collect, analyze and formulate procedure and policy based on data collected by the assessment system. The Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation collects all aggregated data for the unit and each program. Reports are generated in the summer and analyzed during fall and spring meetings with the faculty and the Advisory Council.

The unit indicated that it collects data from a variety of sources, including candidate performance data, applicant data, faculty feedback, graduates, employers, and data from other members of the professional community to drive decision-making and to improve programs and unit operations on a systematic basis. Candidate performance data are collected at transition points throughout their programs. Evidence from candidates include basic skills test scores, background checks, reference letters, writing samples, and other documentation as appropriate to the program of study to meet admission requirements. Faculty members evaluate each candidate's assessment and share these data with individual candidates for reflection and improvement. If a candidate performs below expectations on any of the components, faculty work with the candidate to develop a plan for improvement. Sufficient evidence was presented to illustrate that the unit assists candidates who do not meet expectations at other transition points. Onsite interviews confirmed that the Executive Council faculty members from initial and advanced programs utilize remediation plans developed in conjunction with counseling and advising of candidates for whom teaching seems clearly out of reach at this time in their lives and are advised of this compassionately but directly with counseling about possible alternatives.

The assessment system is evaluated and modified annually and the unit regularly examines data and makes modifications as needed. The evaluation of the assessment system includes review of individual complaints by clinical supervisors, mentors, and teachers concerning candidates and candidates' complaints about teachers. A second component of the annual assessment system review process focuses on ratings of the assessment system by assessment committee members. Data from this survey are summarized and then reviewed by the committee as a whole. Annual program reports completed by all programs in the unit serve as a final component for evaluation of the assessment system. These processes collectively inform the unit regarding how well the system is working and what aspects need revision.

The unit has a process by which it seeks to ensure assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias at both the initial and advanced levels. The use of standards-based rubrics ensures that faculty use identical criteria for evaluating candidate performance and also used multiple assessments in decision making processes at each transition point. The Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP) rubric created by the Educator Preparation Faculty in AY 2000-2001 uses multiple assessments and an evaluation form to evaluate candidates.

Transition points have been identified for all initial and advanced programs. Initial transition points for Bachelor's, Post-Baccalaureate, & M.A.T. are: (1) Entry into Teacher Education Program, which entails GACE Basic Skills Test Scores and/or content credit hour completion as required by the state; (2) Entry to Student Teaching or Internship, which requires Benchmark Assessments and content tests (M.A.T. programs only); (3) Exit from Initial Programs; and, (4) Induction for Graduates with Initial Certification.

Advanced Program Transition Points for M. Ed. and Ed. S. are: (1) Entry to Advanced Degree Programs; (2) Exit from Advanced Degree Programs; and, (3) Follow-up for Graduates from Advanced Programs (M. Ed. and Ed. S). Transition Points for Entrance to Ed. D. Program are: (1) Entry into Ed.D. Program; (2) Coursework completion; (3) Admission to Candidacy; and, (4) Exit from Ed.D. Program. Each transition point includes multiple assessments. Interviews with initial and advanced candidates revealed that they were well aware of the assessment benchmarks for decision making and the specific assessments which are included at each decision point. All candidates were assessed many times before successfully completing the requirements prior to graduation and certification.

The unit indicates that two main information technologies used in maintaining the unit assessment system are CougarNet/Integrated Student Information System (ISIS) and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission's Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR). The unit has recently made a transition to a new electronic data collection system (LiveText). Beginning with fall semester 2012, limited assessment data are now being collected with this system. It was evident that the unit is satisfied that the new system will meet the data collection and analysis needs. The LiveText system allows for various standard reports and specialized reports to be generated in order to analyze the performance of candidates and programs.

In the future, the LiveText system will maintain data on candidate performance outcomes (e.g., planning for instruction, assessment of student work), track candidates' progress throughout their programs, and provide efficient ways for faculty to review and provide feedback on candidate work. The unit is in the process of standardizing and moving critical performance tasks, evaluation instruments, and follow-up instruments to the LiveText system.

The evidence reviewed during the onsite visit indicates the unit maintains records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution are kept on file by the Associate Dean. Interviews revealed that complaints or issues with faculty or the program are resolved in an informal and collegial manner. Students confirmed that any issues brought to faculty, department chairs, or the dean's office, were resolved to the satisfaction of the student. Records on individual students are maintained on issues that specifically relate to a given student.

A number of significant programmatic improvements are being made based on the initial results of data collection at the program level.

Recent data-driven changes that have occurred according to the Executive Council, Assessment Committee and the exhibit room documents are:

- Implemented a pilot program for a full year (two semesters) practicum/student teaching experience.
- A member of the Executive Council discussed changing placement times.
- The addition of Ed.D. and Ed.S. Special Education.
- Implemented collaborative online MAT program in Secondary Math and Science
- Revised the Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP)

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has engaged in continuous improvement by working to enhance candidate performance and program quality. The addition of the doctoral degree (Ed.D. in Curriculum and Leadership) led the unit and its partners to review and revise its assessment plan. The revised plan added the appropriate gates or transition points and includes the key assessments relevant to the new degree. The unit consistently seeks to improve the technologies used to support the assessment system. The addition of LiveText in the fall of 2012, as a local data management system, will provide easier access and reporting for all programs and increase the efficiency of data management.

A number of significant programmatic improvements are being made based on the results of data collection at the program level. Several examples from the Department of Education program review include:

- Pilot of the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), an instrument measuring the effectiveness of the initial teacher candidates.
- Pilot the use of core writing assessments in initial education foundation courses.

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The unit, with the involvement of its professional community, regularly evaluates the assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates the candidate proficiencies that are specified in professional and state standards.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that

presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.
---	---	--

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 3

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.

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence was provided by the unit and in on-campus interviews on how the unit designs, implements, and evaluates field experience and clinical practice. The evidence indicated a strong collaboration between the unit and school partners. Field experiences and clinical practices are designed, delivered,

and evaluated with school partners and unit faculty members. The unit and the school partners jointly place candidates in field experiences and clinical practices. Several examples of how schools and the unit share expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice were provided by the unit and in interviews. One example provided on how the schools and unit collaborate to support candidates learning was the Principals' Roundtable. The Principals' Roundtable includes representatives from P-12 partner schools and university faculty and administrators who work in partnership on revisions to field experiences and clinical practice. Unit faculty members reported that changes had been made to clinical experiences from discussions at the round table meetings. One change includes candidates beginning their clinical practice prior to the start of the P-12 school year. Other examples provided were the workshops the College of Education and Health Professions hosted for cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and faculty. The workshops provided training on the co-teaching model and the revised MAP, Teacher Education's performance assessment instrument. A faculty member and two P-12 teachers conducted the co-teaching training session. Selected university supervisors and cooperating teachers conducted the MAP training sessions for these workshops.

Information on requirements candidates must demonstrate prior to admission to clinical practice was provided. To demonstrate mastery of content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge, all initial teacher candidates must complete coursework, have satisfactory ratings on the final MAP and dispositions evaluations completed, a "C" or better in all content and professional courses, and a minimum GPA of 2.5 (undergraduate) or 3.0 (graduate) prior to clinical practice. M.A.T. candidates can have no more than two grades of "C" in their graduate coursework. Candidates must demonstrate satisfactory performance in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism prior to being admitted to clinical practice. Candidates who were interviewed stated that they knew what was expected of them before becoming an education major.

The unit also provided evidence on requirements for other school professionals candidates must complete prior to clinical practice. Initial candidates must have satisfactory or better ratings on the field experience and dispositions assessments and must have a minimum 3.0 GPA in all graduate coursework with no more than two grades of "C". The rubrics provided outlined the expectations for candidates who must demonstrate satisfactory performance in creating and maintaining safe and supportive school environments that promote accomplished teaching and high levels of learning. Advanced candidates who were interviewed also indicated that they knew what was expected of them before entering their specific program.

Exhibits showed that initial candidates must have satisfactory ratings on their final MAP and dispositions evaluations, satisfactory completion of documenting student performance assessment, and complete all clinical practice or internship requirements by the end of their clinical practice or internship. Requirements for exiting internships for advanced candidate were also provided. Advanced candidates must complete program specific requirements including various hours in field-based activities and satisfactory ratings on the performance and disposition assessments. Candidates who were interviewed stated that they were made aware of the exit requirements prior to enrolling in the program.

Student interviews confirmed that they participate in a variety of field experiences before clinical practice. Each of the courses with a field experience component provides candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge they have learned in the classroom prior to working with P-12 students. Activities varied from tutoring students in a community setting to teaching a lesson in a P-12 classroom. Candidates were very enthusiastic about the different opportunities they had been exposed to prior to clinical practice. They were complimentary of the field experiences and how helpful working in classrooms prior to clinical practice was.

The site visit confirmed how field experiences and clinical practice are reflected in the conceptual framework. A presentation by university faculty on the conceptual framework outlined the guiding beliefs of the faculty. The presentation included several statements on the importance of faculty guiding candidates through learning experiences in which they acquire and refine professional knowledge, proficiencies, and dispositions/habits. Candidates confirmed that the faculty members support them throughout their programs. Many of the candidates reported returning to the unit for advanced degrees because of the support they received from faculty members.

Interviews with candidates and faculty provided evidence on how they use information technology to facilitate P-12 learning. Candidates provided pictures of how they use technology in various settings in the P-12 classroom. Lesson plans written by the candidates also included examples of how they are expected to use current technology in delivering a lesson and supporting P-12 student learning. Candidates also have the ability to borrow technology from the university to use during their field experience and clinical experience.

Criteria for school faculty are clear and known. Accomplished school professionals are selected for mentoring candidates during their clinical practice. The unit provided evidence on the requirements for cooperating school library media specialists supervising media specialist internship candidates. Cooperating school library media specialists who supervise internship candidates must have media specialist certification and a minimum of 3 years experience as a media specialist. Interviews with the cooperating teachers indicated that they knew the criteria for becoming a mentor. Cooperating teachers and unit faculty also shared how school faculty received training on the assessment rubrics.

Interviews with candidates and faculty provided evidence on how clinical faculty members use multiple assessments on candidate performance and provide regular support to candidates. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors evaluate candidates in field experiences and collaborate on feedback given to candidates. Candidates reported receiving feedback on their performance and how they use that information to improve their teaching.

Advanced teaching candidates reported how they apply coursework learned in the classroom to their own practice. Candidates shared how they are now using more project-based lessons in their own classrooms. Other school professionals presented information on how they analyze data, use technology, and research to improve their practice.

Evidence was provided on how multiple assessments are used to evaluate candidate performance and P-12 student learning during clinical practice. The assessments are linked to proficiencies in the conceptual framework and standards. Candidates reported getting feedback from "everyone" (candidates, school, and unit faculty) and using the information from the assessments to help improve their practice and increase P-12 student learning.

Validation of initial candidate placement, diversity settings, and appropriate levels and settings for all programs was provided during the interview sessions with program coordinators and candidates. Coordinators and candidates of advanced programs validated the procedure for ensuring that advanced candidates have experiences in diverse settings.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable for this standard.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The College of Education continued to work through the school partnership network to provide placements for field experiences and clinical practice for teacher candidates and counseling and educational leadership candidates. Additional schools have been added to the network to meet the growing demand for field placements.

In 2011-2012, representatives from P-12 partner schools, university faculty, and administrators collaborated in a Principals Roundtable and made revisions to the clinical practice. Those revisions included having candidates begin their clinical practice at the beginning of the school year. Candidates now have the opportunity to experience the opening days of the school year.

In 2009-2010, university supervisors for student teaching and internship began using online evaluations. Cooperating Teachers complete an assessment of each candidate's performance in every field experience and clinical practice placement, and MAP and dispositions data. Having this data available in the database facilitates data collection and analysis. Individual and group reports can now be run to provide exit data for initial certification candidates.

With the implementation of the online M.A.T. programs, there was a need for additional university supervisors in areas outside of the unit's region. The unit made contact with other universities to build a network of qualified supervisors for online M.A.T. candidates. Supervisors working with the online M.A.T. candidates must meet the same criteria as those associated with candidates on campus.

The unit received a grant to implement a UTeach program. This program is specifically for secondary math and science teacher candidates. Candidates must complete the requirements for a major in their field along with education courses to meet the requirements for certification. Education courses include field experiences and clinical practice requirements.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The strength of this unit includes providing candidates with field experiences early in the program. Candidates have opportunities to work with P-12 students prior to being admitted into the teacher education program. Once a candidate is admitted into the teacher education program he or she has many opportunities to work with P-12 students prior to entering clinical experiences.

The unit has developed a system, which provides candidates with multiple opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students during their fieldwork experiences and clinical practice. Candidates consistently have opportunities to experience different grade levels in a variety of educational settings.

Interviews with P-12 administrators indicated that candidates are well prepared to teach in a classroom. Principals welcome candidates into their schools and consider them to be an asset to improve student learning.

The unit has hired university supervisors that are highly qualified and well respected past practitioners. University supervisors offer a tremendous amount of support and feedback for the candidates during their clinical practice.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 4

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.

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has articulated candidates' proficiencies related to diversity. Candidates are expected to use best practices to improve student learning in diverse P-12 classrooms and at the university level. Best practices include using a variety of instructional strategies, integrating technology, collaboration, reflection, and working with diverse learners. Examples of courses, field experiences, and clinical practice that help candidates develop an understanding of diverse learners including English language learners were provided in exhibits and through interviews. Lesson plans written by candidates contained ways they chose to differentiate instruction. Candidates also shared how they reflected on their ability to work with diverse students.

Interviews with candidates and faculty provided evidence on how proficiencies related to diversity are assessed. Candidates and faculty members shared how the diversity assessment data are used to provide feedback for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.

Evidence provided indicated that candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse school, unit, and other faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups. During the poster session it was noted that there were candidates and faculty members from several different minority groups.

Data on the diversity of school faculty members who supervise candidates during field experiences and clinical practice were provided. A summary of the diversity of cooperating teachers and teacher demographic data for two partner school systems indicated that for the fall 2011, 59 of 96 (61.5 percent) and during the spring semester of 2012, 68 of 106 (64.2 percent) teachers completed and returned the forms. Out of these two groups, 13 of 127 (10.2 percent) were minorities. Various interviews with faculty and candidates provided evidence of the knowledge and experiences faculty members have to help candidates understand and work with students from diverse groups, including ELL, and students with exceptionalities.

Candidates have multiple opportunities to interact and work with other diverse candidates. Interviews and exhibits indicated that candidates work on committees and projects with candidates from diverse groups. The unit has made a good faith effort to increase or maintain a diverse candidate population. The unit diversity committee reported providing programs and activities to maintain the diverse candidate population on campus.

The unit has developed a system to track candidates during field experiences and clinical practices to insure that candidates have an opportunity to work with diverse P-12 students. Candidates' field experiences and clinical practice are tracked through an information system to insure they are placed in a variety of educational settings. Interviews with candidates indicated they have multiple experiences working with diverse ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and exceptional P-12 student populations. An interview with the office of student advising and field experiences indicated that even though the ELL population in the area is decreasing, candidates are still placed in schools that provide services of ELL P-12 students.

Evidence on how feedback from peers and supervisors is used by candidates to reflect on their ability to help all P-12 students learn was provided through interviews with faculty and candidates. Candidates reported using the feedback they received from one experience to change how they work with diverse P-12 students.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has worked to increase the number of minority faculty and candidates enrolled in initial and advanced teacher preparation programs. Diverse faculty members and candidates have increased as a result of efforts by the unit and university.

The unit's diversity committee continued to provide leadership and to promote diversity initiatives on campus. Some of the committee's activities include a tutoring program with a local school district, presenting cultural lessons that emphasized inclusion and diversity, providing a guest speaker for university students, faculty, and community members, and a variety of other programs, which provide services for minority students.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Candidates have opportunities to work with diverse P-12 student populations. They purposely are placed in P-12 setting where they interact with multiple ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and exceptional groups.

Due to the changing area population, the unit has searched for additional opportunities for candidates to work with ELL P-12 students. The additional opportunities have included fieldwork experiences and clinical practice that candidates complete internationally. Although these prototypical programs are currently in initial stages, they still are functional and available to candidates.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that

presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.
---	---	--

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty. (ITP, ADV)	Students have adequate opportunity to work with diverse faculty as a result of recent hires.

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 5

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.

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Unit faculty have doctorates in their areas of expertise. School faculty are licensed in the areas that they

teach and supervise. Clinical faculty have recent professional experiences in schools. Evidence indicates that the unit uses best practices in teaching to improve student learning in diverse P-12 classrooms and at the university level.

Unit faculty are highly knowledgeable about the content areas in which they teach. Their instruction emphasizes contemporary research practices and is designed to develop candidate proficiencies in line with professional, state and institutional standards. Unit faculty model good teaching by integrating diversity throughout the curriculum, employing technology and addressing different learning styles. Teaching is regularly assessed at the unit level through student evaluations. Emphasis on teaching quality is a part of the annual review process for both full time and part-time faculty.

Unit faculty actively engage in research. Interviews with candidates and faculty confirmed that faculty regularly involve candidates in research which results in presentations at professional meetings and publications in refereed journals. Unit faculty are successful in securing internal and external funding for their research including funding from the Ivey Foundation, UTeach Grant (\$1.4 million), and ARRA Early Head Start (\$2 million). The promotion and tenure process values and rewards active scholarship as demonstrated in the Rubric for Annual Performance Review.

Unit faculty are actively engaged in service to the university, the profession and the community. Unit faculty serve in leadership roles in state and national professional associations and agencies.

Full time unit faculty undergo an annual review of performance during which teaching, scholarship, and service are evaluated. Performance evaluations are intended to improve the performance of the faculty member under review. Part-time faculty are evaluated annually on teaching, scholarship, and professionalism. As requested in the offsite report, the unit provided examples of evaluation instruments used to evaluate part-time faculty.

Unit faculty participate actively in professional development which includes their own further development through workshops and conference participation as well as the facilitation of professional development for both school and other unit faculty. The Faculty Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning provides professional development opportunities for faculty.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has implemented a process for the systematic evaluation of part-time faculty. Since 2009, instructional evaluations demonstrate that all part-time faculty meet performance expectations.

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Unit faculty are actively engaged in research and regularly involve students in the conducting and dissemination of action research. Unit faculty are active in university, community and professional organizations, and serve in leadership roles.

The unit has a thorough system of evaluation for unit faculty. Part-time faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis.

Full time and part-time faculty engage in collaborative projects to improve candidate performance. This is evidenced by a freshman learning community which pairs education foundation courses with English courses designed to improve the level of writing.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Part-time faculty members are not systematically evaluated.	The unit provides evidence that part-time faculty members undergo evaluation. Since 2009, instructional evaluations show that all part-time faculty meet performance expectations. There is a part-time faculty handbook which outlines unit procedures.

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met

Advanced Preparation	Met
----------------------	-----

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 6

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.

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP) serves as the unit for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. The Dean of COEHP serves as the unit head and reports directly to the Provost, who is also the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The unit has a governance structure, which though complex, allows for collaboration and consultation with faculty and staff within COEHP as well as with other campus units and external constituents. Interviews confirm that unit faculty participate actively in organizational governance, serving in a variety of roles on the 11 unit committees.

Admission and degree requirements are articulated clearly and consistently in university publications, unit materials, and online resources. Clear information about the application process and key program transition points are easy for candidates to find and access.

Evidence confirms that the unit's budget is sufficient to support curricular programs and the preparation of candidates and is commensurate with the budgets of other units with clinical components.

Faculty workloads are 12 hours for undergraduate and 9 hours for graduate teaching per semester. Interviews confirm that faculty have access to professional development opportunities and that the unit has adequate facilities and technology to support the research, teaching, and learning activities of the candidates and faculty members.

The unit is housed in Jordan Hall. Faculty have access to computer and printing resources, as well as to the most recent developments in technology including interactive boards, personal response systems (clickers), iPads, and classroom management software. Campus support services provide extensive library and technology support services. New faculty and adjunct faculty have access to orientations and seminars in teaching and learning and technology. Campus support services provide extensive technological support for distance learning and online course delivery systems.

The unit has adequate resources to implement its assessment plan as evidenced when requested in the offsite report that verified that the unit has adequate information technology resources. The Center for Quality Teaching and Learning offers workshops on technology and its implementation in the classroom. The Distance Learning Design and Delivery Department provides training and support in the design, development, delivery and assessment of instruction via online and distance learning

technologies. Part-time faculty receive sufficient training via a special orientation session as well as through MAP training.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

The unit's organizational structure ensures that communication and collaboration occurs across programs within the unit and with those external to the unit. Other unit Deans expressed strong praise for the COEHP Dean's leadership and collaborative approach to decision making. Strong communication channels and collaborative practices ensure that decisions are communicated effectively to all constituents both internal and external to the unit. In interviews, other units emphasized that faculty across disciplines value the work done in teacher education.

Evidence indicated that the unit budget has increased consistently over the past three years and is commensurate with other campus units with clinical components. The budget supports the unit's goal of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism. Discussions with the University President and Provost revealed that despite 5 years of decreasing state appropriation funds, the university was able to increase faculty lines, reduce the faculty-student ratio, and maintain consistent funding levels for academic programs.

The unit uses careful selection procedures for the hiring of faculty. The unit provides sufficient funding to facilitate professional development of faculty and staff. In interviews, faculty consistently confirmed satisfaction with the availability of funding for travel to professional meetings. The Center for Quality Teaching and Learning serves as an outreach center offering technology workshops and individual sessions for educators from Preschool through University Faculty, as well as providing technology training opportunities for community partners.

The unit has access to state-of-the-art facilities at the RiverPark campus, with beautiful spaces devoted to student learning and faculty engagement. The university also uses a number of these spaces for revenue as offices and buildings are leased to area businesses. Facilities and support services ensure that faculty and students have access to and receive training for the use of current and emerging technologies. Faculty and candidates receive technology support from both the University Information and Technology Services group (UITS) and from the Center for Quality Teaching and Learning (CQTL). UITS offers informational technology help while CQTL offers instructional technology assistance.

Faculty, candidates, and staff have access to state-of-the-art facilities, multimedia classrooms, and up to date technology, which is used to help them advance unit objectives. The unit has developed an innovative model for providing advanced graduate coursework exclusively through on-line technology. Existing technology and data management will be enhanced by the implementation of the new LiveText data management system. The library presentation shows a movement toward increasing technology resources, including most recently the addition of Chromebooks for cloud based resources. University System of Georgia resources, including Georgia Interlibrary Loan and Galileo (Georgia Library Learner Online), are used to expand on limited print based holdings. The library also houses several archives and

is building its collection of thesis and dissertation holdings. A separate music library with listening rooms and other facilities is located in the Schwob School of Music.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Not applicable to this standard.

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Not applicable to this standard.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Not all part-time faculty members are adequately trained on assessments used to evaluate candidates.	All part-time faculty who use the MAP and dispositions evaluation instruments are required to attend a training session at least once a year.

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Target
Advanced Preparation	Target

IV. Sources of Evidence**Documents Reviewed**

Persons Interviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

Exhibit List.pdf
Interview List.1.pdf

See **Attachments** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).