Section I. Program Completer
How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2011-2012 academic year (September 1, 2011-August 31, 2012)?

Include candidates who

- completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license,
- are licensed teachers who completed a graduate program, and
- completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools.

Include the candidates who have completed a bachelor’s, post-bachelor’s, master’s, specialist, or doctoral program. Programs may or may not be tied to a state license or credential.

Section II. Display of Candidate Performance Data
Where is candidate performance data displayed on your institution's website?
Graduation rate, average cumulative GPA, PRAXIS II pass rate, retention in teaching rate, and ADEPT evaluation pass rate for program completers:
http://www2.furman.edu/academics/Education/Documents/CandidateDataWeb.pdf

Section III. Substantive Changes
Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your institution or unit during the 2011-2012 academic year?

1. Addition or removal of a preparation program at any level (e.g., a master degree).
   No Change / Not Applicable

2. Changes in program delivery from traditional to distance learning programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.
   No Change / Not Applicable

3. Change in control of institution. Please indicate any changes in control or ownership of the institution such as a merger with another institution, separation from an institution, purchase of an institution, etc.
   No Change / Not Applicable

4. Increased in program offerings for education professionals at off-campus sites both within and outside the United States.
   No Change / Not Applicable

5. Significant changes as the result of a natural disaster or other unforeseen circumstances.
   No Change / Not Applicable

6. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Delivery of a program in whole or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner.
   No Change / Not Applicable

7. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Budget
   No Change / Not Applicable

8. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Candidate enrollment
   No Change / Not Applicable

9. Significant change (25 percent increase or decrease) in Size of the full-time faculty
   No Change / Not Applicable
Section IV. Areas for Improvement

Summarize activities, assessments and outcomes toward correcting AFI(s) cited in the last Accreditation Action Report, if applicable.

Section V: Continuous Improvement Pathway

1. Check the standard your unit has selected to move toward target level for your next onsite visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Std. 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Summarize progress toward target level performance on the standard(s) selected.

We believe that the Unit’s compliance with Standard 3 has reached, or is moving toward, target level in all three elements of the standard.

The Unit and its partners collaborate in designing, implementing, and evaluating the Unit’s Conceptual Framework (CF), field experiences/clinical practice, and professional development activities.

Although the Conceptual Framework served the Unit well through the last NCATE re-accreditation visit (2006), revisions have been made to it since that time. Cooperative teachers, school district personnel, and other stakeholders provided collaborative feedback about our candidates and their field experiences, and this feedback prompted us to update/revise the CF’s sections, particularly with reference to candidate skills and candidate dispositions (spring 2012). We have incorporated these changes in course syllabi, candidate expectations, and program evaluations.

Collaboration has also occurred during the Senior Block, which is an integrated set of three upper-level methods courses linked to an intensive Senior Practicum (approximately 490 hours) in a local school. Both the placement and candidate performance during the Senior Practicum are characterized by collaboration between the Unit and its partners. The ongoing collaboration of these entities should insure that target-level performance continues in this area.

Field experiences are systematically evaluated in order to provide data that inform program and field experience improvement. Candidates provide data regarding the quality of their field experiences directly to the course professor; via course evaluations; and through exit and alumni surveys.

During Clinical Practice, candidates demonstrate their positive effect on student learning through portfolios that include artifacts based on state and/or SPA standards; samples of student work; and examples of effective planning, assessment, and instructional/management strategies. All candidates must complete a unit work sample that is specifically aimed at student learning outcomes based on student response to instruction.

On the graduate level, field experiences are spread throughout concentration courses in each special area. Continuing and advanced program candidates work closely with school personnel at their own school site or at assigned sites through the summer practicum or full year internship programs. The internship for other school personnel in the School Leadership program consists of six credit hours (three hours more than required by South Carolina State Department of Education regulations) and lasts an entire year, rather than just one term.

Because data reviewed by the Coordinator of the Teacher to Teacher Program and the Director of Program Development indicated the need to track field experience placements with greater accuracy, the Unit has created a new database for candidate placements. The Unit will be monitoring the preliminary use of this new database during the next academic year.

3. Summarize data to demonstrate that the unit continues to meet Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation in the area of unit operations. Submit sample data/evidence/exhibits, one or two samples.

The Unit has a comprehensive assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicants for admission to the preparation programs, on candidate and graduate performance, and on unit operations. This information has been used to evaluate and improve the Unit and its programs.

At the continuing and advanced program levels, the Conceptual Framework is converted to a survey that asks the candidates to indicate how well the program has prepared them in their chosen field of study. This occurs during the capstone course in the M.A. program.
Candidate performance is assessed at key transition points that are common to all initial preparation programs – program entry, transition to Early Experience, transition to teaching internship, and program completion. Similarly, candidate performance is assessed at key transition points that are common to all continuing and advanced programs. Furthermore, the initial preparation programs all use the same basic set of criteria or evaluation measures with the addition of specific measures unique to each program.

The Program Review Committee of the Teacher Education Program has the primary responsibility for updating and overseeing the implementation of the assessment system. During the 2011-2012 academic year, the Program Review Committee determined that there were some weaknesses in the Unit’s system for collecting, distributing, and reviewing candidate and Unit assessment data. As a result, the Program Review Committee made revisions to the assessment system; these revisions are currently being piloted by the Unit. The revised assessment system is one of the documents that accompanies this report.

Data reviewed by the Coordinator of Secondary Education indicated that some secondary candidates participating in the Senior Block (an extended practicum that occurs in the spring of the candidates’ senior year) were unable to have their most challenging classes observed for classroom management evaluations. As a consequence, the Coordinator of Secondary Education decided that candidates should submit video excerpts from their most challenging classes for the purpose of classroom management evaluations. This did in fact improve the quality of fieldwork feedback regarding various skills that candidates are required to demonstrate. At the end of the current academic year, the Coordinator of Secondary Education will determine if this practice should be continued.

We continue to note that cooperating teachers tend to rate candidates higher than university supervisors rate those same candidates on various assessment instruments. We hope to continue to address this issue through enhanced preparation of, and communication with, cooperating teachers. By doing so, we will be able to maintain the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the Unit’s operations. We have attached a document that indicates the differences between the ratings given by cooperating teachers and university supervisors for candidate dispositions.

Exhibits that support the narrative: Description of Revised Assessment System Analysis of Dispositions Assessment April 2013
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