

Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study
MAT/MEd Secondary History Education

Columbus State University

March 2013

Electronic Exhibit Room: <http://pscncate.columbusstate.edu/index.php>

Username: pscncate

Password: csucoehp

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE MAT/MEd Secondary Social Studies Education

Major Findings of the Program's Quality and Productivity

Program Quality: *Very Strong*

In February 2013, a continuing approval review of the Educator Preparation Unit at CSU was conducted by a Board of Examiners (BOE) consisting of representatives from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC). The 2008 NCATE Standards and the Georgia 2008 Standards were used to assess the unit and its programs. The BOE judged all standards to be met for the unit and for all initial and advanced programs. There were no areas for improvement cited, and the team noted multiple areas of strength.

Overall, the M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary Social Studies Education programs are very strong and prepare highly qualified history teachers who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. This is demonstrated by GACE pass rates of 90% or above, consistent ratings of meets or exceeds expectations on performance evaluations, overall GPAs of 3.0 or better, and satisfactory completion of a culminating research project.

Program Productivity: *Satisfactory*

Enrollment in the M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary History Education remained constant from 2007-2012. Courses are offered on a one- or two-year cycle, and enrollment in required courses is good. This helps to contribute to the cost-effectiveness of the department. The program has a diverse group of majors a wide range of age groups. Graduates of the program are in high demand.

The number of M.Ed. Secondary History degrees conferred by CSU is small (an average of 3 per year) but has been fairly consistent over the past four years and is comparable to the number of degrees conferred by other USG state universities. As the only USG institution within a 90 mile radius of Columbus that offers a master's degree in secondary social studies, CSU provides history teachers in its service region an opportunity that they might not have otherwise, to gain expertise in history education.

List of Recommendations for Improving Program Quality

Closer relationships between the clinical supervisors and the academic program faculty is indicated. In the same light, selection and training of cooperating teachers is a crucial piece to maintain a quality program. This is an ongoing challenge insofar as teachers and partner schools routinely change year to year. Collaboration between the content area (history) and the education department is improving, but still needs growth.

List of Recommendations for Improving Program Productivity

In an atmosphere of reduced budgets, diminishing scholarship opportunities, furloughs,

increasing certification requirements, and aggressive competition from newly formed educational institutions, recruiting for teacher education is tougher than ever. Yet we have maintained a consistent enrollment in the darkest of times. We promote our program by demonstrating to inquiring candidates our care, excellence, and adaptability. Like our university, our program is known for being particularly friendly to military families. We should maintain this emphasis. As the “baby-boom” generation is in the process of retirement, it seems likely that the job-market will demand more new-teacher candidates than ever. This is a tremendous opportunity for us. Through outreach such as “discovery days” our program faculty takes a high-profile role to show candidates the strengths of our program. Word of mouth from our graduates has been a significant source of new candidates and we should continue to work through our alumni to promote the value of this program.

Conclusion about the Program's Viability at CSU

The M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary Social Studies Education programs at CSU are viable. As indicated by the evaluation of the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners in February 2013, the quality of the programs is very strong. All NCATE/PSC standards were judged to be met for all initial and advanced programs with no areas for improvement and multiple areas of strength cited. In addition, program quality is enhanced by special opportunities available at CSU. History education majors have access to resources and professional development opportunities offered through the Ivey Center for the Cultural Approach to History. The viability of the program is also ensured by the sharing of resources among all secondary history education programs at CSU. Graduate history courses at the 5000-level also enroll undergraduates on a cross-listed basis. Furthermore, the College of Education and Health Professions, Department of History, Ivey Foundation, and P-12 teachers work collaboratively on the design and implementation of the secondary history education programs at all levels (B.S., M.A.T., M.Ed., and Ed.S.). Representatives from each of these groups work together to make improvements to the history education programs at CSU and to impact history education in our region. The M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in secondary history are valuable resources for teachers in our region who want to grow professionally and gain expertise in the field of history education. Graduates of the M.Ed. Secondary History program are also a valuable resource for our undergraduate program in secondary history. A substantial number of program graduates teach in systems served by CSU, especially Muscogee County. Our graduate programs in secondary history have helped to create a cadre of leaders within our Partner School Network. Graduates often serve CSU as pre-student teaching cooperating teachers and cooperating teachers for student teaching. They are an invaluable asset in assisting with the development of our undergraduates. Though small, the number of M.Ed. Secondary History degrees conferred by CSU has been fairly consistent over the past four years and is comparable to the number of degrees conferred by other USG state universities. As the only USG institution within a 90 mile radius of Columbus that offers a master's degree in secondary history, CSU provides history teachers in its service region an opportunity to gain expertise in history education. This is an opportunity that they might not have if CSU did not offer this degree program. With the current demographic of retiring baby boomers, we need to provide every possible opportunity for teachers to grow professionally and enhance their knowledge and skills in teaching history.

Program Improvement Plan

This section is a draft and will be completed by the dean in consultation with the VPAA at the conclusion of the self-study conducted by the department.

In response to the findings of the Comprehensive Program Review, the faculty members and administrators of the M.Ed. in Secondary History Education propose the strategies outlined below to improve the quality, productivity and viability of the program. These strategies will be facilitated by the Secondary History Program Advisory Council (PAC).

Summary Recommendation and Supporting Rationale

Recommendation: *Maintain the Program at the Current Level.* The program quality is very strong, but the number of degrees conferred each year is small. Based on the changes in certification, scholarships, teacher accountability (furloughs, keys, merit pay) and the economy in general, it remains a challenge to grow the enrollment. Until we are able to recruit more students into undergraduate programs in history education, opportunities for expansion of the M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in secondary history will be limited.

As previously mentioned, CSU will continue to work to improve the current M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in secondary history by responding to new initiatives (e.g., Common Core Georgia Performance Standards), improving the curriculum, providing better support and resources for students, and intensifying recruitment efforts. By enhancing the quality of the program, we hope to attract more potential students.

THE PROGRAM'S DETAILED SELF-STUDY

Section One - Program Background and Overview

I. Brief Program Overview

The M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in Secondary History Education prepare highly qualified history teachers who possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to promote high levels of learning for all students in grades 6-12. In history content courses, history education courses, professional courses, and field experiences, candidates have multiple opportunities to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism. Creating opportunities for candidates to demonstrate excellence in these three areas is consistent with the Educator Preparation Conceptual Framework and is reflected in the broad goals of the secondary history education programs. These goals are briefly summarized as:

MAT Secondary History Education

Student Learning Outcomes:

Graduates will be able to:

1. Identify and use research and resources of the field
2. Design instruction to promote active learning and critical thinking
3. Identify and use appropriate media and technology in designing and delivering effective instruction
4. Value cultural diversity as an instructional resource and design and implement instruction effective with diverse learners
5. Connect planning and instruction to authentic assessment of student learning
6. Will demonstrate a commitment to the teaching profession and to the field of social science education

MEd – Secondary Social Science Education

Student Learning Outcomes:

Graduates will be able to:

1. Demonstrate expertise in identifying and using research and resources of the field.
2. Demonstrate expertise in designing instruction to promote active learning and critical thinking.
3. Demonstrate expertise in identifying and using appropriate media and technology in designing and delivering effective instruction
4. Value cultural diversity as an instructional resource and demonstrate expertise in designing and implementing instruction that is effective with diverse learners
5. Demonstrate expertise in connecting planning and instruction to authentic assessment of student learning

6. Demonstrate a commitment to the teaching profession and to the field of social science education

M.A.T. candidates seeking initial teacher certification, develop proficiency in applying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to impact P-12 student learning. They also begin to develop expertise in their teaching field through the completion of several advanced level courses taken with other M.Ed. candidates.

Candidates pursuing a M.Ed. degree in Secondary History Education develop and demonstrate *expertise* as they progress through the program. Graduates of the program are prepared to apply their expert knowledge of history and history teaching and learning in grade 6-12 classrooms, thus helping to meet the demand for highly qualified history teachers.

The M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in Secondary History are closely aligned with CSU's mission of achieving academic excellence and preparing individuals for a life of success, leadership, and responsibility through community awareness, engagement, and service to others. Focusing on growth toward skillful "whole" performance rather than incremental mastery of discrete skills, candidates in the secondary history education graduate programs demonstrate expertise as they develop, refine, and enhance their knowledge and skills to improve the learning of all students in grades 6-12.

Stakeholder's Satisfaction With the Program

Data from graduate and employer surveys administered annually by the University System of Georgia Board of Regents indicate that stakeholders are highly satisfied with the education programs at CSU. On the graduate survey, graduates are asked to rate their preparation in the areas of content and curriculum; knowledge of students, teaching, and learning; learning environment; classroom, program, and school-wide assessment; planning and instruction; and professionalism. Graduates consistently give high marks (i.e., ratings of Agree or Strongly Agree) on 91% or more of the items surveyed. Since 2008, the overall range of agreement to survey items was 76% to 100%.

Employers of CSU prepared teachers complete a similar survey. Since 2008, employers have given high marks (Agree or Strongly Agree) on 94% or more of the items surveyed. The overall range of agreement to survey items was 75% to 100%.

We also receive feedback from principals and teachers through the History Education Program Advisory Council and the Principals' Roundtable. Feedback from these groups has been very positive overall, and principals frequently call when they need to hire history teachers to see if CSU has graduates who could possibly fill those positions.

Section Two - Indicators of Program Quality

In February 2013, a continuing approval review of the Educator Preparation Unit at CSU was conducted by a Board of Examiners (BOE) consisting of representatives from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC). The 2008 NCATE Standards and the Georgia 2008 Standards were used to assess the unit and its programs. The BOE judged all standards to be met for the unit and for all initial and advanced programs. There were no areas for improvement cited, and the team noted multiple areas of strength. Following is a summary of the Institutional Report submitted to NCATE and findings taken from the BOE final report.

II A. Quality of Faculty

• Appropriateness of Faculty Credentials

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. **The program director is an Assistant Professor still in the process of gaining full comprehension of the duties, responsibilities, and best practices for the program. Within a year or so he should be fully acclimated to the operations of the program.**

• Use of Part Time Faculty

Each semester, the unit calls on skilled practitioners to serve as part-time instructional faculty and/or university supervisors. The combination of full-time and part-time faculty creates a diverse and dynamic teaching staff that appropriately offers a balance between the pedagogical and practical challenges facing today's educators.

University supervisors and clinical faculty are qualified to supervise at the level and/or in the content field where they are assigned. These include a number of talented recent retirees from public schools (both classroom teachers and principals) employed specifically to work with student teachers and interns. All university supervisors, as well as full- and part-time faculty who supervise and evaluate teacher candidates during field experiences, have training in the consistent use of the Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP), the college's performance assessment instrument for initial teacher preparation programs.

Part-time faculty are evaluated annually on teaching and professionalism. As requested in the offsite report, the unit provided examples of evaluation instruments used to evaluate part-time

faculty. 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.

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.

• **Diversity of Faculty**

Candidates in educator preparation programs at CSU participate in multiple learning communities that are diverse in terms of faculty, candidates, and P-12 students. Of the 271 full-time instructional faculty at CSU in fall 2011, 68 (25.1%) were minorities, 154 (56.8%) male, and 117 (43.2%) female. In the COEHP, there were 35 professional education instructional faculty (excluding the Dean and two Associate Deans) who regularly provide instruction for candidates in educator preparation programs. Of those, seven were African-American (20%), one (3%) Hispanic, two (6%) Turkish, and one (3%) Japanese-American. Fourteen (40%) were male and 21 (60%) female. In the COEHP, every effort is made to recruit, hire, and maintain a faculty that is diverse in gender, ethnicity, and race and thus provide an opportunity for all candidates to experience and learn from divergent perspectives.

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.

The unit has worked to increase the number of minority faculty. Diverse faculty members have increased as a result of efforts by the unit and university.

• **Opportunities for Faculty Development**

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 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 Faculty Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning provides professional development opportunities for faculty. 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 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.

• **Program Improvement Plans**

We have a strong program maintained by well-qualified faculty and appropriate course work. Data suggest our program is producing history teachers who possess greater knowledge when compared to candidates from other programs in the state and nation. The faculty of our program is dedicated to the success of all candidates and will strive for a 100% job placement for our candidates.

Program Advisory Committee indicated a need to examine some finer point of the program such as advising, providing a more instruction in the area of class management, and exploring the time slots of courses offered for night students and summer classes.

II B. Quality of the Teaching

• **Indicators of Good Teaching**

Faculty's utilization of best-practice methodology is a special emphasis in educator preparation programs. Some faculty use as their basis for "best practice" the constructs delineated in *Methods That Matter* (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde; Heinemann, 2005). This work is a synthesis of recommendations of national professional organizations (NCTE, NMSA, NCTM, NSTA, etc.). Other faculty take their cue from an array of scientifically-based methods consistent with No Child Left Behind legislation or constructivist learning theory. Although these views of best practice differ substantively, the climate among faculty is one that stimulates individual professors to think seriously about their own practice in light of their personal (and emerging) understanding of teaching strategies best suited to both teacher candidates and learners in school systems served by CSU. [*Perspectives in Learning*](#), the COEHP's professional journal, frequently publishes articles by faculty and students that highlight best-practice pedagogy.

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.

• **Indicators of Good Advising**

CSU's Graduate School and the COEHP Office of Graduate Studies oversee admission and

orientation of graduate students. Professional Education Program Coordinators provide advisement to graduate students while the SAFE Office provides assistance with certification requirements.

Individuals seeking initial teacher certification through a post-baccalaureate or Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program must have their transcripts evaluated to determine the courses needed for certification. To initiate this process, individuals must submit copies of all their transcripts to the College of Education and Health Professions Student Advising and Field Experiences Office (SAFE) in Jordan 107 (706-568-2191), and request a transcript evaluation in the intended area of certification. The SAFE Office sends the transcripts to the appropriate program coordinator or advisor, who then reviews the individual's previous coursework to determine if any of those courses can count toward certification. When the evaluation is complete, it is submitted to the Department of Teacher Education Office, and the individual is notified by letter and can set up an appointment with his/her advisor to discuss a program of study.

Prospective post-baccalaureate or MAT students must also apply for admission to the university. Individuals desiring to enroll in graduate courses must apply for graduate admission and be admitted to a College of Education and Health Professions (COEHP) graduate program with regular or provisional admission status. Prospective students are referred to the CSU Admissions Office in University Hall or to the Admissions website at <http://admissions.columbusstate.edu/index.php>. Additional information on MAT programs is available at <http://te.columbusstate.edu/degrees.php>.

Individuals with a clear renewable teaching certificate may apply for admission to the MEd, EdS, or EdD degree program. Once admitted to the university as a graduate student, a Graduate Orientation hold is placed on the student's account. The student must complete the online orientation, print the advising form at the end of the orientation and have his/her advisor sign the form after s/he has been advised, and submit the form to COEHP Coordinator of Graduate Records so that the hold can be removed. This must be completed before the student will be able to register for classes. Additional information about COEHP graduate degree programs is available at <http://coehp.columbusstate.edu/degrees.php>.

When a student completes the program of study for a degree, the student's advisor is asked to complete a degree progress sheet showing that the student has met all program requirements. Faculty maintain an updated degree progress sheet for each advisee to ensure that all requirements are being met. Notes from advising sessions are included on the degree progress sheet. Electronic copies of degree progress sheets are kept on file on the P-drive so that the department chair may access these files as needed to assist students.

Advisors are familiar with important deadlines (registration, course withdrawal, graduation, etc.) and inform their advisees appropriately. They are also familiar with the university appeals process and assist advisees, as needed, in resolving disputes. Matters related to student conduct are handled through the Office of the Dean of Students. Academic appeals are handled at the department level. When necessary, department decisions may be appealed to the appropriate Dean and then to the Provost.

• **Departmental Reward System**

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.

In recognition of the competence and expertise of COEHP faculty, three new awards were created in fall 2007 to bring greater attention to excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service-based leadership. Although the award selection was originally designed to be the privilege of the Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development committee, it became evident during the initial call for nominations that our college has many qualified and exemplary professionals based on the number of nominating letters. Every spring, there is a college-wide vote on nominated finalists. Annually, each award has at least three qualified candidates who are nominated by administrators, students, and colleagues for their competence and professional merit.

• **Program Improvement Plans**

Our annual review for faculty process will continue to promote our faculty's excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism. Surveys collected from participants will be reviewed by the administration and the Program Advisory Committee to assure that changes are suggested and implemented.

II C. Quality of Research and Scholarship

• **Opportunity for Student Research Projects**

The M.A.T./M.Ed. programs require candidates to complete a culminating research project demonstrating that they are meeting national, state, and institutional standards as they synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills developed in their course of studies. Data from the GMAP (1a, c, e; 2b; 3b-e) and culminating projects show that candidates understand and can apply theories related to student learning and that they analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions (GMAP 3e; 4c). All candidates met or exceeded expectations on these components of the GMAP, with 54% or more exceeding expectations.

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.

• **Faculty Publications, Presentations, and Grants**

CSU's professional education faculty is productive in terms of research, publications, and presentations. For example, in 2010-2011, COEHP professional education faculty published 1 book, 1 book chapter, 24 refereed journal articles, and 4 non-refereed journal articles. In addition, faculty wrote 23 major reports and produced 19 other types of scholarly work including grant proposals and manuscript reviews. Several faculty members are published in the COEHP peer reviewed journal, [*Perspectives in Learning*](#). The editorial board for *Perspectives in Learning* includes four professional education faculty members with one serving as the journal's editor. The journal, which was first published in spring 2000, features scholarly contributions

from faculty and from graduate and undergraduate students in collaboration with faculty, peers, and community partners. All publications relate to teaching and learning, and manuscripts may be submitted for review by authors both within and outside the university. See [Exhibit 5.3.d #9 \(i\)](#) for samples of faculty publications.

Much of the research generated by professional education faculty members is shared at professional conferences. Faculty present independently, collaboratively, and with their students at local, state, regional, and national/international conferences or meetings. During the 2010-2011 academic year, professional education faculty presented at 34 international/national conferences, 32 regional/state conferences, and 23 local conferences or meetings. See [Exhibit 5.3.d #9 \(ii\)](#) for samples of faculty presentations.

Faculty have also been successful in receiving external funding to support educator preparation. In 2010-2011, professional education faculty submitted 22 grant proposals with 13 being funded for annual awards totaling approximately \$564,393. Early in AY 2011-2012, CSU was awarded two large five-year grants ([UTeach Grant](#) worth \$1.4 million and [Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Grant](#) worth \$1.2 million) to support math and science teacher preparation. These two grants are a collaborative effort between professional education faculty in the COEHP and math and science faculty in the College of Letters and Sciences. See [Exhibit 5.3.d #9 \(i\)](#) for samples of faculty grant proposals.

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.

The principal program faculty member has published in three peer reviewed journal, one chapter in a book, and 35 peer-reviewed podcasts for the local school district. He has been invited to present at four national and regional conferences. In collaboration with a local scholar, he has a book under review by Mercer University Press.

The program coordinator wrote and was funded 400,000 dollars by a grant from the Caroline Lawson Ivey Foundation to promote the Cultural Approach to teaching history. The program is in the process of renewing this grant and has applied for an NEH grant for 200,000.

A doctoral fellow in the program has been invited to present at two academic conferences; one national and one international, and will be writing his dissertation on the Cultural Approach to History.

• **Program Improvement Plans**

With the addition of the Cultural Approach to History center, opportunities for scholarship, grant-writing, and research will be multiplied. Ongoing bi-annual reports to the board of the Ivey Foundation will assure that the productivity and quality of the program faculty is top-notch.

II D. Quality of Service

• Activities to Enhance Program, Department, College, Institution, Community and/or Region

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.

CSU professional educator preparation faculty display extensive and distinguished service on campus, in the community, in the Georgia/Alabama region, and nationally. Such service is highly consistent with the unit's mission and with the Conceptual Framework, serving the greater purpose of positively affecting student achievement, whether the achievement of teacher candidates, counselors, and administrators or the achievement of children and adolescents. See [Exhibit 5.3.e](#) for examples of faculty service and collaborative activities.

• Program Improvement Plans

In the area of counseling, our program relies heavily on the services of the History Department insofar as they do all of the undergraduate advising. The Program Advisory Committee has recommended that the advisors work more diligently to assist students in creating a semester-by-semester plan toward graduation, with a close eye on the course rotations in each of the seasons.

II E. Quality of Faculty and Student Achievements

• Faculty Honors

In recognition of the competence and expertise of COEHP faculty, three new awards were created in fall 2007 to bring greater attention to excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service-based leadership. Although the award selection was originally designed to be the privilege of the Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development committee, it became evident during the initial call for nominations that our college has many qualified and exemplary professionals based on the number of nominating letters. Every spring, there is a college-wide vote on nominated finalists. Annually, each award has at least three qualified candidates who are nominated by administrators, students, and colleagues for their competence and professional merit.

• Student Honors

Outstanding graduate students in each education program are honored annually at the CSU Honors Convocation and at the COEHP Awards Ceremony. From time to time, education students are honored with scholarship awards to support their continuing education. **The program's graduate assistant, Earl G. Barnett, was selected by the College as the 2012 recipient of the Ford Award for Servant Leadership. Six students in the program have been recipients of the Ivey Scholarship; a 1,000 dollar award for students who show promise as teachers of the Cultural Approach to History.**

• Graduate Achievements (Licensure, Certification, Admission to Graduate School, Job Offers, etc.)

Graduates of the M.A.T. program in Secondary History Education are in demand by local school systems. After completing the M.A.T. degree program, they receive a clear renewable teaching certificate for Georgia. **Last year six M.A.T. students relied heavily on professional references from the program director, and all six ended up finding employment in the field.**

The M.Ed. leads to a certificate upgrade and subsequent pay raise for teachers completing the degree program. Teachers develop further expertise in history and history education by completing the M.Ed. program of study.

II F. Quality of Curriculum

• Relationship Between Program's Curriculum and Its Outcomes

The M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in Secondary History Education prepare highly qualified history teachers who possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to promote high levels of learning for all students in grades 6-12. In history content courses, history education courses, professional courses, and field experiences, candidates have multiple opportunities to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and professionalism. Creating opportunities for candidates to demonstrate excellence in these three areas is consistent with the Educator Preparation Conceptual Framework and is reflected in the broad goals of the secondary history education programs.

M.A.T. candidates seeking initial teacher certification, develop proficiency in applying the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to impact P-12 student learning. They also begin to develop expertise in their teaching field through the completion of several advanced level courses taken with other M.Ed. candidates.

Candidates pursuing a M.Ed. degree in Secondary History Education develop and demonstrate *expertise* as they progress through the program. Graduates of the program are prepared to apply their expert knowledge of history and history teaching and learning in grade 6-12 classrooms, thus helping to meet the demand for highly qualified history teachers.

The M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in Secondary History are closely aligned with CSU's mission of achieving academic excellence and preparing individuals for a life of success, leadership, and responsibility through community awareness, engagement, and service to others. Focusing on growth toward skillful "whole" performance rather than incremental mastery of discrete skills, candidates in the secondary history education graduate programs demonstrate expertise as they develop, refine, and enhance their knowledge and skills to improve the learning of all students in grades 6-12.

The greatest challenge for aligning curriculum to outcomes is promoting teaching that is innovative, dynamic, engaging, and hands-on, while preparing to send graduates into an educational culture that is often traditional, high-stakes-testing based, uniform and regimented.

• Incorporation of Technology

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.

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.

• **Utilization of Multidisciplinary Approaches**

History encompasses every discipline. Those who study science largely study what previous scientists have concluded. Those who teach English teach the historical evolution of the language and draw from historic literature. Even math is often the regurgitation of the formulas of yesterday's mathematicians. As such, our methods courses emphasize the teacher's use of differentiating both instructional techniques as well as the lenses through which the content is taught. The Cultural Approach to History, which is our own paradigm for the teaching of history, is particularly aimed at utilizing a multi-disciplinary approach in the History classroom.

• **Utilization of Multicultural Perspectives**

The Educator Preparation Conceptual Framework clearly articulates the unit's commitment to diversity. Excellence in teaching embodies the use of best practices to improve student learning in diverse P-12 classrooms as well as at the university level. Excellence in scholarship embodies the seeking out and exploring of multiple viewpoints, embracing diversity as it enriches our intellectual lives and positively impacts our professional performances. Scholars engage in a life-long learning process, continually acquiring, integrating, and applying knowledge and skills to achieve excellence in teaching and to improve the learning of all students. Professionalism is demonstrated through in-depth knowledge of a field of study and an effort to meet the highest standards set forth by professional organizations. These standards include a commitment to diversity.

A commitment to diversity is also reflected in the 2011 InTASC Standards and NBPTS propositions upon which the Conceptual Framework is based. Curricula, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessments are aligned with these principles and standards and reflect a commitment to diversity in the following ways:

- All COEHP syllabi include a statement regarding our commitment to diversity.
- The diversity proficiencies initial candidates are expected to meet include the following dispositions: Interacts appropriately and positively with others; Treats others with courtesy, respect and open-mindedness; and Displays the ability to work with diverse individuals. ([Exhibit 1.3.e #1](#))
- The Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP) ([Exhibit 1.3.c.1 \(i\)](#)), the unit's performance assessment instrument used in all initial programs, is aligned with the 2011 InTASC Standards ([Exhibit 1.5.c #6](#)) and includes the following diversity proficiencies initial

candidates are expected to meet: 1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students; 1c: Selecting instructional goals (i.e., suitability for diverse students); 1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources (i.e., resources for students); 2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport; 2b: Establishing a culture for learning; 3a: Communicating clearly and accurately; 3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques; 3c: Engaging students in learning; 3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness (i.e., response to students); and 4c: Communicating with families.

- The diversity proficiencies advanced candidates are expected to meet include: Interacts appropriately and positively with others, while appreciating and valuing human diversity; and Demonstrates the belief that all students can learn. ([Exhibit 1.3.e #2](#) Graduate Dispositions)
- The Graduate Model of Accomplished Practice (GMAP) ([Exhibit 1.3.c.2 \(i\)](#)), the unit's performance assessment instrument in advanced teacher preparation programs, is aligned with NBPTS propositions ([Exhibit 1.5.c #7](#)) and includes the following diversity proficiencies advanced candidates are expected to meet: 1a: Recognizes individual differences in students and adjusts teaching; 1b: Treats all students equitably; 1c: Designs lessons to match student abilities and foster interest; 1d: Provides evidence of teaching to develop multiple domains; 1e: Understands how students develop and learn; 2b: Presents lesson and content so that students learn in a variety of ways; 3b: Uses multiple strategies to meet goals; 3c: Motivates students to be engaged in learning; 3d: Creates an effective learning environment; 5b: Collaborates with parents; and 5c: Uses community resources.

In keeping with our commitment to diversity, the faculty designed curricula and experiences aimed at increasing all education candidates' knowledge of and sensitivity to the diverse nature of P-12 students ([Exhibit 4.3.b](#)). Educator preparation faculty believe teachers must be able to work successfully with a diverse population of colleagues and learners. Similarly, the faculty believe skillful beginning teachers are able to ensure that all adolescents with whom they work achieve significant academic growth.

At the graduate level, an analysis of syllabi provides evidence that faculty address diversity in M.Ed. and Ed.S. foundations and research courses as well as through major course requirements such as unit plans, case studies, and action research projects in school library media, school counseling, leadership, and an array of teaching fields. For example, in EDUF 6115 Educational Psychology, candidates examine the interrelationship between motivation, learning, and teaching with an emphasis on application to the needs of diverse learners. Other examples showing how candidates are prepared to work with diverse groups of students are provided in [Exhibit 4.3.b #2 & 3](#). At the graduate level, candidate performance is assessed in at least one required course ([Exhibit 2.3.d #3](#)) in each program using the GMAP and Graduate Dispositions. Candidates reflect on data from these evaluations and develop plans to improve their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for helping all students learn.

• **Program Improvement Plans**

History education students will be encouraged to intensify their involvement in community partnerships, research and publication. Collaboration with faculty and community professionals will hopefully open up opportunities for students to begin to build their C.V. through real-life achievements.

II G. Quality of Facilities and Equipment

• Availability of Classroom and Laboratory Space

Candidates have access to [facilities](#) on main campus to support their development as professional educators. Facilities used for educator preparation include 18 multimedia classrooms, three computer labs, and a conference center with three sophisticated classroom/laboratories equipped with interactive white boards and advanced computers capable of digital media productions.

• Availability of Equipment

Facilities used for educator preparation include 18 multimedia classrooms, three computer labs, and a conference center with three sophisticated classroom/laboratories equipped with interactive white boards and advanced computers capable of digital media productions. Computers in specified classrooms also include a variety of educational software (e.g., Google Earth, Chronicling America, Prezi) for use in instruction in history education courses. Furthermore, candidates now have enhanced opportunities to work with state-of-the-art technology in P-12 schools due to technology resources and training provided for participating schools and teachers through a [DoDEA grant](#). Resources include Bretford Carts, tablet computers, iPod touches, SMARTboards, iPevo, digital microscopes and projectors, slates, and student response units. In addition, faculty and candidates have access to the Ivey Center for the Cultural Approach to History and teacher resource center stocked with resources to enhance history instruction.

While each of the rooms has a projector and an active board, more attention could be given to technological maintenance in the classrooms and offices. Often the overhead projectors are running overheated, needing filters changed. The power point remotes are routinely without charged batteries. We frequently experience audio problems, apparently due to the wiring. Some of the computer workstations are structurally fragile and the wiring sometimes appears to be disordered.

• Program Improvement Plan

We will continue to look to our administration to provide support for improvements in software, hardware, and up-to-date technology for implementing best practices.

Section Three - Indicators of Program Productivity

III A. Enrollment in Program for Past 5 Years

The enrollment patterns for the M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in Secondary History are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Number of Declared Majors in M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary History

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	5 year average
MAT						
Full-Time			5	3	4	4
Part-Time			1	5	3	3
<i>Total</i>			6	8	7	7
MEd						
Full-Time	4	6	5	1	1	3
Part-Time	5	10	8	9	7	8
<i>Total</i>	9	16	12	10	8	11
<i>Total MAT/MEd</i>			18	18	15	17

Prior to 2009-2010, candidates seeking initial certification at the master's level completed the traditional M.Ed. program in addition to initial certification coursework. The total number of majors in the M.Ed. program in 2007-08 and 2008-09 included those seeking initial teacher certification as well as certified teachers seeking an advanced degree. In 2008-2009, a Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) program was developed to provide a streamlined course of study for individuals seeking initial teacher certification. With this change, the total number of students enrolled in master's degree programs in secondary history remained at 18 in 2009-2010 and then decreased to 15 in 2010-11. This reduction is likely a reflection of the broader economic crisis facing the nation, but particularly reflective of a strong need and emphasis placed upon recruitment of Science, Tech, Engineering, and Math (STEM) educators and a reduced market for Social Studies educators.

In 2011-2012, enrollment in M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary History Education programs decreased from a combined total of 18 in 2010-11 to 15, a decrease of 16%. A similar decline occurred in all other secondary education programs, with the exception of the M.A.T. in Secondary English, but the percentage decrease was lower in the other programs. Reasons for this decline in enrollment are not clear but may be partly due to economic conditions and/or additional demands placed on teachers by school systems with increased accountability measures. Further study is needed to determine the reasons for this decline in enrollment and to see whether or not it will become a trend.

Table 3.2 shows the total enrollments in M.A.T. and M.Ed. secondary education programs housed in the Department of Teacher Education at CSU. Since 2007-2008, enrollment in the M.A.T./M.Ed. Secondary History Education programs has been comparable to enrollment in

other graduate secondary education programs. In average enrollment, Secondary History Education ranks second among the M.A.T./M.Ed. programs listed in the table.

Table 3.2 Number of Declared Majors in M.A.T./M.Ed. Programs

		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	5 year average
Secondary English	MAT			18	19	20	19
	MEd	29	26	18	18	16	21
Secondary Mathematics	MAT			12	13	8	11
	MEd	11	19	12	15	7	13
Secondary Science	MAT			7	7	5	6
	MEd	18	15	10	5	3	10
Secondary Social Science	MAT			6	8	7	7
	MEd	9	16	13	10	8	11
<i>Totals</i>	MAT			43	47	40	43
	MEd	67	76	53	48	34	55
	Combined	67	76	96	95	74	82

The History Program Advisory Committee (PAC) oversees the M.Ed. program in Secondary History and works to improve the curriculum, courses, and resources offered to teachers. Currently, we are reviewing the curriculum in the M.Ed. to meet the needs of increased diversity, technology, and ELL ed. needs for our students. We will monitor enrollment numbers to determine the effects of these changes on our enrollment.

III B. Degrees Awarded Over Past 5 Years

As indicated in Table 3.3, the number of M.A.T. and M.Ed. degrees conferred each year in Secondary History is small but has increased since 2007-2008. The five year average is comparable to Secondary Science and Secondary Social Science programs but less than Secondary English.

Table 3.3 Number of Degrees Conferred

		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	5 year average
Secondary English	MAT		3	7	5	8	6
	MEd	12	6	6	11	6	8
Secondary Mathematics	MAT			1	2	4	2
	MEd	0	3	1	3	5	2
Secondary Science	MAT			1	4	1	2
	MEd	6	3	5	2	0	3
Secondary Social Science	MAT		2	0	2	6	3
	MEd	0	2	6	3	4	3

III C. Comparison With CSU & University System of Georgia Programs

As indicated in Table 3.4, among the twelve USG state universities that offer master's degrees in secondary education, CSU ranks fourth in average number of degrees conferred. Plans for

improving the position of CSU's secondary education programs among comparable USG programs include enhanced recruitment and retention efforts, improved services and support for secondary education majors, and continued support for students and classroom teachers through a variety of professional development activities.

Table 3.4 Master's Degrees Awarded in Secondary Education Programs at USG State Universities

Institution	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	5 year average
Albany State University	7	4	1	2	5	4
Armstrong Atlantic University	4	0	0	0	0	1
Augusta State University	10	3	0	0	0	3
Clayton College & State University	0	0	0	0	6	1
Columbus State University	20	18	19	27	32	23
Fort Valley State University	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia College & State University	57	50	70	101	90	74
Georgia Southwestern State University	4	4	3	1	0	2
Kennesaw State University	0	18	36	55	90	40
North Georgia College & State University	23	29	21	32	20	25
Savannah State University	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0	0	0	0	0	0
State University of West Georgia	16	11	13	11	10	12

III D. Retention Rates

Table 3.5 Retention Rate

	Fall 2006		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010	
	# in cohort	Number returning in Fall 2007	# in cohort	Number returning in Fall 2008	# in cohort	Number returning in Fall 2009	# in cohort	Number returning in Fall 2010	# in cohort	Number returning in Fall 2011
Secondary English	12	6 (50%)	14	11 (78.6%)	6	2 (33.3%)	17	15 (88.2%)	11	7 (50%)
Secondary Math	2	2 (100%)	6	5 (83.3%)	11	5 (45.5%)	9	8 (88.9%)	8	4 (100%)
Secondary Science	2	2 (100%)	7	4 (57.1%)	5	5 (100%)	7	5 (71.4%)	4	4 (100%)

Secondary Soc Sci	2	2 (100%)	3	3 (100%)	7	4 (57.1%)q	7	7 (100%)	5	5 (100%)
-------------------	---	----------	---	----------	---	------------	---	----------	---	----------

The retention rates in the Secondary History program since 2006 remained near 100%. This may be attributed to consistency of expectations, faculty, and close mentoring on the part of the program coordinator.

III E. Student Learning Indicators (using a variety of data sources)

Key assessments for M.A.T. candidates include the following:

- GPA
- Georgia Assessments for Certification of Educators (GACE) tests
- Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP) for Teacher Candidates, a teaching performance assessment
- Dispositions
- Documenting Student Performance

Key assessments for M.Ed. candidates include the following:

- GPA
- Graduate Model of Accomplished Practice (GMAP), a teaching performance assessment
- Dispositions Assessment
- Research project

Data indicate that M.A.T. candidates know the content they teach and can explain important principles and concepts. Average GPAs from 2009-2012 ranged from 3.38-3.94 at program exit. Also, the pass rate on the Georgia Assessment for Certification of Educators (GACE) history tests from 2008-2011 was 100%. The GACE is used to assess the knowledge and skills of prospective Georgia public school secondary history teachers. The tests are criterion-referenced, objective-based assessments designed to measure a candidate's knowledge and skills in relation to established standards, and are aligned with National Council of Teachers of History standards for secondary history programs and with state standards for the P-12 student curriculum (Georgia Performance Standards). The passing score for each test is established by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and is based on the professional judgments and recommendations of Georgia educators.

Teacher candidates in the M.A.T. Secondary History program understand the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy and can apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in the standards to facilitate learning. CSU's Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP) is used to assess planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. An analysis of MAP data over the last three years (2009-2012) showed that on each component, 90% or more of the candidates evaluated prior to entering clinical practice met or exceeded expectations, while 100% of the candidates evaluated at exit from clinical practice met or exceeded expectations.

Data show that teacher candidates focus on student learning. They assess and analyze student learning, make adjustments to instruction, and monitor student progress. Candidates are evaluated throughout their field experiences on student learning related MAP components. During clinical practice, all candidates must complete the Documenting Student Performance

(DSP) activity wherein candidates design and deliver a unit of instruction, assess P-12 student performance on pre- and post-tests, analyze the results of the assessment, and provide a plan for intervention. An analysis of data from student learning related components of the MAP at exit from clinical practice revealed that the percentage of candidates rated as meeting or exceeding expectations was 100%.

Candidates in M.Ed. programs in secondary education (English, math, science, social science) have an in-depth knowledge of the content they teach. Average GPAs by program are above 3.0 at program exit, and program completers have no more than two grades of C in their program of study (all other grades must be A's and B's). Culminating research projects provide additional evidence of content knowledge as candidates synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills developed in their course of study.

Candidates demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the content of their field and the theories related to pedagogy and learning. They select and use a broad range of strategies and technologies that promote student learning. Candidates are assessed by instructors in selected courses using the Graduate Model for Accomplished Practice (GMAP). Data from GMAP evaluations show that at program exit, all candidates met or exceeded expectations on all components of the GMAP. In addition, all candidates met or exceeded expectations on all components of the Dispositions Assessment.

All M.A.T. and M.Ed. candidates in the secondary education programs complete a culminating research project. Data from these culminating projects show that candidates understand and can apply theories related to student learning and that they analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions. All candidates met or exceeded expectations on the components of the GMAP related to student learning.

III F. Graduation Rate of Program

Table 3.6 shows the three-year graduation rates for M.A.T./M.Ed. Secondary Education programs.

Table 3.6 Three-Year Graduation Rate (*)

	Fall 2005		Fall 2006		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009	
	# in cohort	Graduating by 2008	# in cohort	Graduating by 2009	# in cohort	Graduating by 2010	# in cohort	Graduating by 2011	# in cohort	Graduating by 2012
Secondary English	5	3 (60%)	12	6 (50%)	14	11 (78.6%)	6	0 (0%)	17	11 (64.7%)
Secondary Math	2	1 (50%)	2	2 (100%)	6	1 (16.7%)	11	3 (27.3%)	9	4 (44.4%)
Secondary Science	3	0 (0%)	2	1 (50%)	7	1 (14.3%)	5	4 (80%)	7	4 (57.1%)
Secondary Soc Sci	3	1 (33.3%)	2	2 (100%)	3	2 (66.7%)	7	3 (42.9%)	7	6 (85.7%)

* The cohorts above are degree-seeking graduate students who entered a CSU graduate program in the fall (or previous summer) semester. Graduation rate calculated based on number of students completing program within three-year time period.

Over the last five years, three-year graduation rates for M.A.T./M.Ed. programs in secondary Social Science have averaged 66%. Some candidates, particularly those in the M.A.T. program, may take more than three years to complete their degree because of additional history

coursework requirements. Candidates whose bachelor's degrees are in areas other than history, history education, or a closely related field must often take a significant number of prerequisite history courses, thus adding to the length of their program of study. Also, most master's degree candidates are part-time students who are teaching full-time. Their teaching schedules and other obligations may not allow them to complete all required coursework in three years. With clearer advising and time management guidance, we hope we will help to improve graduation rates.

III G. Cost Effectiveness of Instructional Delivery

As shown below in Tables 3.7 and 3.9, the budget for the Department of Teacher Education represented approximately 6-7% of the total instructional costs for Columbus State University (CSU) from 2008 to 2010. In Fall 2011, 911 (11%) of the 8307 students enrolled at CSU were majoring in a program offered in the Department of Teacher Education. In addition, the department budget helps support undergraduate teacher education programs (i.e., secondary education, foreign language, and fine arts) housed in other colleges. This suggests that teacher education programs as a whole are cost effective.

From 2008 to 2012, the Department of Teacher Education budget was supplemented by grant funds ranging from approximately \$42,000 to \$132,000. During this time period, there was a 15% decrease in state funding for the department, even though the number of education majors and credit hour production increased. For graduate secondary education programs alone, enrollment increased by 10% from 2008 to 2012 (see Table 3.2), and credit hour production increased by approximately 23% (see Table 3.8).

Table 3.7 Department of Teacher Education Budget

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
State Funds	\$2,340,134	\$2,162,502	\$1,993,635	\$1,823,652	\$1,977,860
Grant Funds	\$41,841	\$61,223	\$131,963	\$129,421	\$102,877
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$2,381,975</i>	<i>\$2,223,725</i>	<i>\$2,125,598</i>	<i>\$1,953,073</i>	<i>\$2,080,737</i>

Table 3.8 Secondary Education Credit Hour Production

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	5 year average
5000 Level Courses	5	0	27	21	9	12
6000 Level Courses	499	459	771	704	590	605
7000 Level Courses	22	55	42	32	46	39
<i>Total</i>	<i>526</i>	<i>514</i>	<i>840</i>	<i>757</i>	<i>645</i>	<i>656</i>

Table 3.9 Total Instructional Costs per Credit Hour and Headcount at CSU

	2008	2009	2010
Instructional Costs	\$31,868,466	\$31,193,232	\$34,596,532
Total Credit Hours Generated	164,732	171,280	178,470
Total Headcount	7,590	7,953	8,179
Cost per Credit Hour	\$193	\$182	\$194
Cost per Headcount	\$4,199	\$3,922	\$4,230

As shown in Table 3.10, average course enrollment in graduate courses for secondary education majors is below 15. Required history education courses in the M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary History programs are offered on a one- or two-year cycle, in order to make them more cost-effective. In addition, the programs require some of the same courses (e.g., Foundations of Education, Educational Psychology, Action Research, Trends and Issues, Teacher Inquiry, etc.) that are required in other M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs. These courses have higher enrollments and thus help to contribute to the cost-effectiveness of the department.

Table 3.10 Average Course Enrollment - Fall Semester

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	5 year average
5000 Level Courses	1	0	5	7	2	3
6000 Level Courses	13	11	13	10	10	11
7000 Level Courses	6	9	6	3	3	5
<i>Overall Average</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>11</i>

Number of Faculty

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	5 year average
Full-Time Faculty	3	2	4	2	4	3
Part-Time Faculty	2	3	1	3	1	2

2008-2009 Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity

	Total Instructional Expenditures	Instructional Expenditure/SCH		Instructional Expenditure/FTE Student	
		CSU	National	CSU	National
Secondary Education	\$499,139	\$215	\$156	\$4,687	\$4,495

Section Four - Program Viability

IV A. Summary of Program's Viability

The M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary History Education programs at CSU are viable. As indicated by the evaluation of the NCATE/PSC Board of Examiners in February 2013, the quality of the program is very strong. All NCATE/PSC standards were judged to be met for all initial and advanced programs. There were no areas for improvement and multiple strengths were cited. In addition, program quality is enhanced by special opportunities available at CSU. History education majors have access to resources and professional development opportunities offered through the Ivey Center for the Cultural Approach to History.

The viability of the program is also ensured by the sharing of resources among all secondary history programs at CSU. Graduate history courses at the 5000-level also enroll undergraduates on a cross-listed basis. Furthermore, the College of Education, History Department, Ivey Center, and P-12 teachers work collaboratively in the design and implementation of the secondary history programs at all levels (B.A, M.A.T., M.Ed., and Ed.S.). Representatives from each of these groups work together to make improvements to the history education programs at CSU and to impact history education in our region. The M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in secondary history are a valuable resource for teachers in our region who want to grow professionally and gain expertise in the field of history education. Students in the M.Ed. program take what they learn and apply it in their own classrooms to help their students learn history.

Graduates of the M.A.T. and M.Ed. Secondary History programs are also a valuable resource for our undergraduate program in secondary history. A substantial number of program graduates teach in systems served by CSU, especially Muscogee County. Our graduate programs in secondary history have helped to create a cadre of leaders within our Partner School Network. Graduates often serve CSU as pre-student teaching cooperating teachers and cooperating teachers for student teaching. They are a valuable asset in assisting with the development of our undergraduates.

Though small, the number of M.Ed. Secondary History degrees conferred by CSU has been fairly consistent over the past four years and is comparable to the number of degrees conferred by other USG state universities. As the only USG institution within a 90 mile radius of Columbus that offers a master's degree in secondary history, CSU provides history teachers in its service region an opportunity to gain expertise in history education. This is an opportunity that they might not have if CSU did not offer this degree program. We need to provide every possible opportunity for teachers to grow professionally and enhance their knowledge and skills in teaching history.

IV B. Summary of Program Improvement Plan

The Social Studies Ed Program Advisory Council (PAC) oversees the M.A.T. and M.Ed. programs in Secondary History and works to improve the curriculum, courses, and resources offered to teachers. Recommendations to improve program productivity are as follows.

- The faculty of our program is dedicated to the success of all candidates and will strive for a 100% job placement for our candidates.
- Provide additional support for students in graduate history courses through advising and/or offering prerequisite courses or professional development opportunities that better prepare students for the graduate history courses.
- With the addition of the Cultural Approach to History center, opportunities for scholarship, grant-writing, and research will be multiplied. Ongoing bi-annual reports to the board of the Ivey Foundation will assure that the productivity and quality of the program faculty is top-notch.
- In coordination with Dr. Brewbaker's Recruitment Committee, attract more students into the undergraduate history and history education programs.