

March 2, 2006

**MEMORANDUM**

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

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

**Consideration of the NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluations at  
Clemson University and The Citadel**

**Executive Summary**

**Background**

The Commission entered into a partnership agreement with the S.C. Department of Education and the National Council for Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1995 to conduct joint reviews of teacher education programs at our public colleges and universities. Our current partnership protocol requires that an on-site visit occur at each of the institutions every five years with representatives of the three partners serving on the evaluation team. The first review cycle occurred between 1996 and 1999 which resulted in all eleven of our teacher education programs institutions receiving NCATE accreditation which was effective for five years.

Historically, NCATE has reviewed teacher education programs on a five-year cycle (changed in 2005 to a seven-year cycle pending approval of the new state partnership agreement). Since the time of our last review cycle, NCATE has undertaken a major revision of the standards that are used to assess teacher education units. NCATE revises its standards every five years to ensure that the standards reflect the most current research on teaching. The new standards developed in 2000 are performance-based, and a teacher education unit must be able to demonstrate that it has in place an assessment system that can determine the level of its graduates' knowledge and skills. For example, NCATE reviewers look for evidence that teacher candidates know the subject matter they plan to teach as shown by their ability to explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional and state standards. The NCATE 2000 standards are

substantially different from the 1995 standards, and substantially more difficult to meet, in large part because they require units to be able to demonstrate through data that graduates of their programs have the knowledge and skills to teach successfully P-12 students. The accreditation process has shifted its focus from what are typically called "input measures" to "output measures." That is, what do the graduates of the program know, what can they do, and how can the unit prove that graduates know and can do what the unit claims?

NCATE standards are applied to the teacher education unit for an evaluation of the entire unit. In addition, NCATE coordinates the evaluation of individual programs through an established review process by specialized professional associations (SPAs) and national accreditation organizations. Under our partnership protocol, programs that do not have a review by a SPA or an accrediting organization are reviewed by a consultant hired by the Commission for that purpose, who joins the on-site review team.

During this review cycle, the Commission hired four national consultants who evaluated the programs that were not reviewed by SPAs and do not lead to initial teacher certification. These programs are typically at the graduate level and may include programs such as a Masters of Education in Elementary Education or Special Education. One CHE consultant joined each NCATE team to conduct an on-site review and validate documentation presented in the institution's self-study reports. The consultant also examined all programs for compliance with the Commission's program productivity standards.

#### **Program Evaluation at Clemson University and The Citadel**

In Spring 2005, Clemson University and The Citadel underwent their NCATE site visits, which consisted of a five-day visit by a team of national and state reviewers. The visiting team is called the Board of Examiners (BOE). This body presents a report to NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) which assesses whether or not the education unit meets each of six standards. The UAB makes the accreditation decision based on the BOE's findings. Institutions visited in the spring of 2005 had accreditation decisions made by the UAB in October 2005.

The first section of the attached report represents a compilation of the results of NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board findings, the CHE consultant's findings with respect to graduate programs not reviewed by the SPAs, and the evaluation results for all individual programs within the teacher education unit at the two institutions visited during Spring 2005. Included in this report are the institutional decisions of the UAB along with any weaknesses cited for a unit, a list of the programs reviewed at the institutions, the approval status of each program, and the productivity analysis of programs at each of the two institutions covered in this section of the report.

As is the practice with all CHE program reviews, each program receives from CHE one of four recommendations: 1) commendation of excellence; 2) full approval; 3)

provisional or probationary approval; or 4) recommendation for termination. For programs in Education, provisional approval is awarded under four circumstances: 1) the unit does not receive full NCATE accreditation, in which case all programs in the unit are given provisional approval until the next evaluation which usually occurs two years later; 2) the program has not received full approval from the specialized accrediting/professional body; under State Board of Education policy, a program has two years from the UAB decision to obtain full approval from the SPA; 3) the program does not meet CHE's program productivity requirements; or 4) the CHE consultant recommends provisional approval given a number of substantive weaknesses identified in the program.

#### **Recommendations Associated with Clemson University and The Citadel Evaluations**

1. The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends to the Commission that it grant to the programs in Education at Clemson University and The Citadel the designations presented in the report as follows:

Clemson University  
The Citadel

See pp. 4-8  
See pp. 9-12

2. The Committee recommends that the Commission urge Clemson and The Citadel to submit or resubmit program reviews to the Specialty Professional Associations (SPA) at the earliest opportunity until full approval is obtained for all programs for which a SPA evaluation process exists; until full SPA approval is obtained, program status awarded by CHE remains at "provisional approval."
3. For Clemson, the Committee recommends that the Commission require that a progress report be submitted to the Commission by June 1, 2006, indicating a strong plan for program change with measurable goals and objectives for the programs in **Technology & Human Resource Development: B.S. Industrial Technology, M.H.R.D. in Human Resources Development, MCTE Career and Technology Education, and Ed.D. in Career & Technology Education**, or indicating termination of program(s) determined after shortly to be non-variable.
4. For The Citadel, Committee recommends that the Commission accept no new program requests in Education until the unit obtains full accreditation, as opposed to "accreditation with conditions" from NCATE.
5. The Committee recommends that the Commission require that both institutions submit to the Commission as part of their Institutional Effectiveness Reports, due August 1, 2006, a progress report that summarizes the responses made by the institutions for improvement with respect to the UAB findings as well as the findings of their CHE consultant.

**Summary Report of the NCATE/State Partnership Program Evaluation at  
Clemson University and The Citadel**

**I. Clemson University**

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on February 5-9, 2005, at Clemson University. At its October 16 - 23 2005, meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) reviewed the materials and reports for Clemson University and rendered the decision to continue full accreditation for the School of Education at Clemson University at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels.

At the initial teacher preparation level, programs in Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, Special Education, Mathematics Teaching, Science Teaching and Secondary Education were reviewed by their respective specialized professional associations (SPAs) and received national recognition. Industrial Technology Education was reviewed by the SPA and received conditional recognition. Modern Languages – Secondary did not receive approval. At the advanced level, programs in Administration and Supervision, Special Education and Reading were reviewed and recommended for national recognition. The Master's of Education in Counselor Education was reviewed by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs and received national recognition. The Master's of Education in Elementary Education, Master's of Education in Secondary Education, Master's in Industrial Technology Education, Ed. D. in Vocational and Technical Education, Ph.D. in Educational Leadership, and Ph. D. in Curriculum and Instruction were reviewed by the CHE consultant. All other initial and advanced programs were evaluated on six NCATE standards by the Board of Examiners team. Both initial and advanced programs met the six standards; however, the UAB cited the following areas for improvement:

- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not ensure that all candidates in elementary and early childhood programs possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet the intent of the School to Work Transition Act (Standard 1).
- (Initial Preparation) Although the overall Praxis Pass Rate is 92.3%, the pass rate is below 80% for candidates on seven Praxis II subject area tests (Political Science, Economics, Psychology, Sociology, History, Geography and Foreign Language) (Standard 1).
- (Initial Preparation) The Spanish Education Program is not nationally recognized (Standard 1).

- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The Career and Technology Education programs are not aligned to reflect the national standards and the Clemson conceptual framework (Standard 1).
- (Advance Preparation) The assessment system within the Career and Technology programs does not use data to track candidate progress and drive decision making at the candidate or program level (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Some critical data for candidate continuation in programs are not included in the assessment system (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) The unit does not have a formal component of the assessment plan that addresses unit-wide operations (Standard 2).
- (Initial Teacher Preparation) Not all programs meet the state required minimum of 100 hours of clinical experience prior to student teaching (Standard 3).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty (Standard 4).
- (Initial and Advanced Preparation) Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers (Standard 4).
- (Advanced Preparation) Course evaluations are not consistently applied across all programs (Standard 6).

Because there is neither an accrediting agency nor a national specialty professional association prepared to review them, the CHE consultant reviewed the programs leading to a **B.S. degree in Technology and Human Resource Development, M.H.R.D. degree in Human Resources Development, M.C.T.E. degree in Career and Technology Education, M.Ed. degree in Elementary Education, an M.Ed. degree in Secondary Education, M.Ag.Ed. degree in Agriculture Education, Ed. D. degree in Career and Technology Education, Ph. D. degree in Educational Leadership and Ph. D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction** were reviewed by the CHE consultant. The consultant recommended continuing approval for five degree programs; however the **B.S. degree program in Technology and Human Resource Development, the M.H.R.D. degree program in Human Resources Development, the M.C.T.E. degree program in Career and Technology Education and the Ed. D. degree program in Career and Technology Education** were recommended for termination.

The consultant verified that the **M.Ed. degree in Elementary Education, M.Ed. degree in Secondary Education, M.Ag.Ed. degree in Agriculture Education, Ph. D. degree in Educational Leadership and Ph. D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction**

are in compliance with the CIIE Academic Degree Program Productivity Requirements, while the **B.S. degree program in Technology and Human Resource Development**, the **M.H.R.D. degree program in Human Resources Development**, the **M.C.T.E. degree program in Career and Technology Education** and the **Ed. D. degree program in Career and Technology Education** programs do not meet these CHE standards. The initial and advanced programs reviewed by the Board of Examiners team all met the CHE standards for Academic Degree Program Productivity.

### **Recommendations**

1. The Committee recommends that the Commission grant full approval status for programs as noted below in **Table 1**, and accept the termination noted.
2. In addition, the Committee recommends that the Commission require that Clemson report on unit and program improvements made in response to the UAB and CHE consultant's findings in its 2006 Institutional Effectiveness report, due August 1, 2006.
3. Finally, the Committee recommends that the Commission require that a progress report be submitted to the Commission by June 1, 2006, indicating a strong plan for program change with measurable goals and objectives for the programs in **Technology & Human Resource Development: B.S. Industrial Technology, M.H.R.D. in Human Resources Development, and Ed.D. in Career & Technology Education.**

**Clemson University**  
**Table 1**

<b>Program Title</b>	<b>Degree Options</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Curriculum & Instruction	Ph.D. <sup>1</sup>	
	Elementary Education	Full Approval
	Secondary Education	Full Approval
	Reading	Full Approval
	Special Education	Full Approval
Administration & Supervision	M.Ed.	Full Approval
Educational Leadership	Ph.D. <sup>1</sup>	Full Approval
Special Education	B.A.	Full Approval
	M.Ed.	Full Approval
Counseling & Guidance	M.Ed.	Full Approval
Elementary Education	B.A.	Full Approval
	M.Ed. <sup>1</sup>	Full Approval
Early Childhood Education	B.A.	Full Approval
Secondary Education	B.A.	Full Approval
	English	
	Modern Languages	
	Mathematics	
	Social Studies	
	M.Ed. <sup>1</sup>	Full Approval
Agricultural Education	B.S. <sup>2</sup>	Full Approval
	MAGEd <sup>1,2</sup>	Full Approval
Technology & Human Resource Development <sup>3</sup>	B.S. <sup>1,4</sup>	Provisional Approval
	Industrial Technology	
	Customized Training	
	Option	Termination
	M.H.R.D. <sup>1,5</sup>	Provisional Approval
	Human Resources Development	
	M.C.T.E. <sup>1,6</sup>	Provisional Approval
	Career & Technology Education (Industrial Technology)	
	Ed.D. <sup>1,7</sup>	Provisional Approval
	Career & Technology Education	

Mathematics Teaching	B.S.	Full Approval
Reading	M.Ed.	Full Approval
Science Teaching	B.S.	Full Approval

1 Reviewed by CHE consultant

2 Reviewed by South Carolina Department of Education

3 On July 1, 2005, the Clemson Education Unit dissolved the program area of THRD.

4 The Education Unit plans to move the Bachelor's degree program in Industrial Technology to a Secondary option and Customized Training has been terminated.

5 The faculty members involved with the program leading toward a Master of Human Resource Development are developing a response to the NCATE review (CHE Report) that adequately and appropriately addresses the deficiencies. The MHRD will move completely to the University Center in Greenville Beginning Fall 2006.

6 As of July, 2005, the Education unit is not enrolling students into the M.C.T.E. program in Career & Technology Education and currently conducting an internal review on the program.

7 As of July, 2005, the Education unit is not enrolling students into the Ed.D. program in Career & Technology Education and currently conducting an internal review on the program.



## **II. The Citadel**

A Continuing Accreditation visit was conducted by the NCATE Board of Examiners on April 2-6, 2005, at The Citadel. At its October 16 - 23 2005, meeting, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) reviewed the materials and reports for The Citadel and rendered the decision to "continue accreditation, with conditions" for the School of Education at The Citadel at both the initial and advanced teacher preparation levels.

At the initial teacher preparation level, programs in Secondary Education and Physical Education were reviewed by their respective specialized professional associations (SPAs). The Bachelor's degree concentrations in Secondary Mathematics and Social Studies received national recognition. Concentrations in Comprehensive Science, English, and Biology were reviewed by the SPA and were not approved. The Bachelor's degree program in Physical Education was not approved by the SPA.

At the advanced teacher preparation level, the Master's and Specialist degree programs in Educational Leadership were reviewed by the SPA and received national recognition. The Master of Arts in Teaching and the Specialist degree in School Psychology received national recognition. The Master's degree program in Student Counseling and Personnel and the Master's degree program in Reading Education were not approved by the SPAs.

The initial and advanced programs are evaluated on six NCATE standards. The initial program did not meet Standards 1 (Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Disposition) and 2 (Assessment System and Unit Evaluation), and the advanced program did not meet Standard 2. The UAB cited the following areas for improvement:

- (Initial Teacher Preparation) The English education program is not nationally recognized (Standard 1).
- (Initial Teacher Preparation) The unit does not have evidence that all candidates possess adequate and appropriate pedagogical content knowledge to be successful teachers (Standard 1).
- (Initial Teacher Preparation) The unit lacks data that demonstrate that candidates meet all of the identified dispositions (Standard 1).
- (Initial Teacher Preparation) The unit's assessment of dispositions is not aligned with the conceptual framework (Standard 1).
- (Initial Teacher Preparation) Candidates do not have adequate skills in the development of assessments for use with P-12 students (Standard 1).

- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) The identified assessment activities do not provide sufficient nor systematic aggregated data for program and unit use (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) The role of the professional community in the development of the assessment system is not evident (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) Not all evaluation measures used for assessment align with elements of the unit's conceptual framework (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) The unit does not systematically review all assessments for fairness, accuracy, and consistency (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) With the exception of the educational leadership and school psychology programs, technology is not used to maintain the assessment systems, thus impeding analysis for necessary program improvement (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) Aggregated data are not consistently shared with faculty and candidates for program improvement (Standard 2).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) Faculty evaluation data are not used systematically to improve teaching, research, and service through professional development (Standard 5).
- (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation) Clinical adjunct faculty are not systematically provided with regular training and professional development (Standard 5).

The CHE consultant reviewed programs leading to the M.Ed. and Ed.S. degrees in Educational Leadership, the M.Ed. degree in Student Counseling and Personnel, the B.S. and M.Ed. degrees in Secondary Education, the B.S. degree in Physical Education, the M.Ed. degree in Reading Education and the Ed.S. degree in School Psychology. The consultant recommended continuing approval of all eight programs and verified that both the initial and advanced teacher preparation programs are in compliance with the CHE Academic Degree Program Productivity Requirements. The Citadel School of Education accepted the findings in the CHE consultant's report.

## **Recommendations**

1. Consistent with the UAB decision to "continue accreditation, with conditions," the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission award to all programs in The Citadel's School of Education provisional approval as noted in Table 2 until the UAB reconsiders the unit's status based on a visitation to be held no later than Fall 2007.
2. The Committee recommends that the Commission accept the terminations noted.
3. The Committee recommends that the Commission require that The Citadel must also report on unit and program improvements made in response to the UAB findings in its 2006 Institutional Effectiveness report, due August 1, 2006.
4. In keeping with customary practice and policy, the Committee recommends that the Commission consider no new program requests in Education until the unit obtains full accreditation.
5. Finally, the Committee recommends that the Commission require that the one program (M.Ed. Reading Education) not receiving full approval from its respective SPA (see Footnotes) be resubmitted until full approval is granted.

**The Citadel  
Table 2**

<b>Program Title</b>	<b>Degree</b>	<b>Options/Tracts/Concentrations (If applicable)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Educational Leadership Leadership	MEd <sup>1,2</sup>	Elementary School Administration	Provisional Approval
		Secondary School Administration	Provisional Approval
	EdS <sup>1,3</sup>	Superintendent	Provisional Approval
Student Counseling & Personnel	MEd <sup>1,4</sup>	Elementary School Counselor	Provisional Approval
		Secondary School Counselor	Provisional Approval
Secondary Education	BS <sup>1</sup>	Comprehensive Science <sup>5</sup>	Terminated
		English <sup>5</sup>	Terminated
		Social Studies <sup>6</sup>	Provisional Approval
		Mathematics <sup>5</sup>	Terminated
		Biology <sup>5</sup>	Terminated

	MAT <sup>1</sup>	English <sup>7</sup>	Provisional Approval
		Mathematics <sup>8</sup>	Provisional Approval
		Biology <sup>9</sup>	Provisional Approval
		Social Studies <sup>10</sup>	Provisional Approval
Physical Education		BS <sup>1,11</sup>	Provisional Approval
Reading Education		MEd <sup>1,12</sup>	Provisional Approval
School Psychology		EdS <sup>1</sup>	Provisional Approval

1 Reviewed by CHE consultant.

2 Review by Educational Leadership Constituent Council at the Advanced preparation level for Elementary School and Secondary School Administration resulted in "national recognition."

3 Review by Educational Leadership Constituent Council at the Advanced preparation level for Specialist in Educational Leadership resulted in "national recognition."

4 Review by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs at the advanced preparation level resulted in Accreditation through October 2013.

5 Subsequent to the NCATE review, The Citadel terminated these four secondary programs due in large measure to very low or not student enrollment.

6 Reviewed by the National Council for the Social Studies at the Initial Bachelor's Degree level resulted "national recognition."

7 Reviewed by the National Council of Teachers of English at the MAT level resulted in "national recognition."

8 Reviewed by the National Council of Teacher of Mathematics at the MAT level resulted in "national recognition."

9 Reviewed by the National Science Teachers Association at the MAT level resulted in "national recognition."

10 Reviewed by the National Council for the Social Studies at the MAT level resulted in "national recognition."

11 Reviewed by the National Association for Sport & Physical Education at the initial Bachelors level resulted in "national recognition."

12 Review by the International Reading Association at the advanced preparation level resulted in "national recognition, with conditions."

## Appendix I

### NCATE Unit Standards

#### Conceptual Framework

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

#### I. CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

##### Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

##### Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

#### II. UNIT CAPACITY

##### Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

##### Standard 4: Diversity

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

*Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development*

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

*Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources*

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