Newberry College

Institutional Report Addendum

August 2, 2011

Submitted to the

NCATE Board of Examiners and

State Teams

In consideration for the

On-site Accreditation/State Approval Review

September 17 – 20, 2011

The Professional Education Unit at Newberry College thanks the BOE/State team members for their thorough off-site review and feedback. This report includes a response to each item noted in the report as an area of concern. Within each section there are references to exhibits which have been posted to the website: http://newberryncate.pbworks.com/w/page/34951031/Newberry-College-Teacher-Education-Program.

STANDARD ONE

Areas of Concern

Item 1: Candidate scores on the Praxis II appear to be low. What do course grades in content areas show about candidate content knowledge?
Rationale: Many content area scores are near the minimum pass rate for the state.

Response 1: While we are addressing the BOE's question as it relates to grading and rigor, data show that our graduates know their content. In almost all majors, mean scores of Newberry College TEP candidates surpass state-required minimums. In addition, two key pieces of data demonstrate strong content knowledge.

1) The internship evaluation has a section on it devoted to specific content standards aligned with appropriate SPA standards (section 5). Candidates are performing at the proficient or excellent level on this portion of the internship evaluation. These scores are determined by the college supervisor in dialogue with the cooperating teacher, both of whom are content experts. Candidate demonstration of content knowledge is one of our six Program Learning Outcomes for the Teacher Education Program. As such, we review data related to candidate content knowledge in our data analysis schedule.

2) Employers report in focus groups and informal conversations that Newberry College graduates know their content and how to teach it. Classroom teachers working with candidates express that candidates know their content. Our experience is that mentors have high expectations in regard intern content knowledge because of mentors' investment in the their own curricula and students. We discovered that our Employer Survey and Post Graduate Survey do not specifically ask about graduate content knowledge. This area will be added to the next survey administration.

While the PRAXIS II scores may not reflect the depth of our candidates' content knowledge, school partners express otherwise. We need to understand this disconnect and explore it. Perhaps our candidates are not successful test takers and need more assistance in the types of questions presented on PRAXIS so they can better demonstrate their knowledge on paper. If that is the case, we have two avenues to implement.

- Dr. Charles Hatch, a leading PRAXIS expert in the nation, lives in Newberry, SC. He volunteers to work with candidates individually for approximately 8 hours per week. While we know his efforts are helping the students who work with him, we need to collect data about who is seeking his help and what the results are. He is also willing to give us more of his time

in the coming year to assist in this effort by working more closely with faculty and small groups of students.

- In the past, we have encouraged faculty to take the PRAXIS content exams by offering to pay for their tests. In the instances where this has happened faculty have made changes in the content they teach or the way in which they teach it. We need to require all faculty teaching in the content majors to take the PRAXIS II exams and discuss how they will change their course content as a result.

In May 0f 2011, at the end of the year department meeting, we set goals for the coming academic year. As can be seen in meeting minutes, one important goal we set was to increase the rigor in our classes. For us, this has to do with grading practices. Initial data from an ETS graduate exam given in May 2011 indicates that Newberry College graduates overall perform poorly in reading, writing and math skills while 72% of our students (college wide) graduate with above a 3.0. This means they earned more (some significantly more) A's than B's. Yet, according to ETS, less than 30% are proficient at basic skills such as reading, writing and arithmetic. This seems to be a common trend in the 77 colleges and schools with which Newberry was ranked in the ETS data analysis.

Due to statistics in our ETS analysis as well as the BOE's question related to PRAXIS scores, we as a College and as a TEP within the College, will spend time reflecting on this data and thinking about what a grade really means at Newberry College. Individual faculty will be given data regarding grade distribution in their classes along with comparison data for the faculty as a whole. We will discuss what our grades mean and come to a common understanding – possibly a rubric – outlining what an A means, what a B means, etc. We also may need to spend some time looking for patterns in this data to see if there are students with high GPA and low ETS scores or if there are students with high GPAs and low PRAXIS scores.

We now have clear evidence that we as an institution need to spend instructional time helping students develop their critical thinking, reading and writing skills, as well as content knowledge. At Newberry College, we pride ourselves on adding value to our students' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. While holding high standards for admission to the TEP, we work to change the intellectual condition in which our students arrive and help them grow to high standards during their time here. We are implementing three options to address this need.

1) Our program and courses are becoming lock step so that candidates are taking courses at the appropriate time in their development. 100-level courses should be taught at a first year level and 400 level courses at a fourth year level. Students need to learn skills, then apply them to more difficult material in order to develop those skills. Since 2006, the TEP has made great strides in having students take courses at the right time for their development; however, we still have work to do. For instance, due to the size of some of the programs early on, secondary methods classes were offered once every other year. This sometimes forced a sophomore with very little content background to take a methods course he or she was not ready for. Likewise, some seniors would have to take this course too late in the program to effect any change in their thoughts about how to teach the content. We made revisions to the program and the methods courses are now taken

in the junior year and offered every year.

2) We are also scaffolding field experience contexts and tasks to promote growth in pedagogy and content knowledge over time. The new field experience model allows for four intensive experiences each with emphasis on making field experiences more meaningful as the candidates progress.

3) We need to conduct a content review in each secondary education specialty offered at Newberry College to evaluate and review the content area coverage and update to meet the needs of the programs. For example, we know that a Chemistry/Secondary Education major is going to be strong in content because he/she works toward a full major in chemistry and completes the secondary education tract. However, a Biology/Secondary Education major takes fewer content courses than does a Biology major. Dr. Tina McCartha, chair of the Department of Science and Math is going to lead this effort among all of the secondary programs in the Fall of 2011.

Exhibits for Standard 1, Item 1:

1. LiveText Data from Content Evaluations
2. 2011-2012 departmental goals showing goal about rigor
3. ETS Data Power Point
4. Tasks and Rubric for EDU 300
5. Program Learning Outcomes

Item 2: How candidate use of technology is evaluated is not clear.
Rationale: No data are provided on this component of the program.

Response 2: All teacher candidates complete EDU 382, Teaching and Technology. This course uses the Intel Teach to the Future Curriculum and is taught by an Intel Master Teacher. In addition to the Intel requirements, students learn to operate and implement Smart and Promethean boards, personal response systems (clickers), and Inspiration software as effective instructional tools. State standards based resources such as ETV Streamline, KnowItAll.org, and the SC SMART center websites are also required resources to be implemented into the unit plan portfolio for EDU 382.

Candidates continue to implement technology during lessons taught during field experiences and the internship. Evidence can be found in the lesson plans submitted to the college supervisor and on the observation records (available for review at the onsite visit).

A scan of all courses taught in 2010-2011 in teacher education indicates that 45% of courses contain one or more student learning outcomes and assessments related to technology. Candidates generally do not become proficient in instructional technology until they complete EDU382. Therefore, much of student use of technology in the 200 and low 300 level courses is limited to submitting assignments electronically or using technology for research and classroom presentations. These are also skills that they will need to implement as future teachers in their 21st century classrooms.

Exhibits for Standard 1, Item 2:

1. EDU 382 Unit Plan Assignment
2. EDU 382 Unit Plan Rubric
3. Syllabus Scan with Technology Objectives

STANDARD TWO

Areas of Concern

Item 1: The revised assessment system has been in place only for a short period of time so there is limited data.
Rationale: The revised assessment system has been in place only since 2010.

Response 1: The Teacher Education Program at Newberry College has been collecting and using data for unit and program improvement since 2006, as evidenced in the 2008 TEP Unit Assessment System description, which summarizes ongoing assessment practices in place since 2006. Data warehousing and reporting was begun using LiveText in the Fall of 2007. Extensive unit and program revisions and modifications have been made on the basis of data points collected through the TEP Unit Assessment System since 2006. Significant program revisions made prior to the 2010/11 school year include changes made in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Physical Education, Music Education, and Secondary Mathematics, as outlined in the Institutional Report, Standard 2, C.1. Early data-driven program changes can clearly be seen in Program Reports, minutes of meetings, and in other documentation. In addition, unit data were used to assess achievement of goals set in 2007 as part of a 5-year plan for unit growth.

The 2006 system was revised and improved during the 2010/11 school year in response to an internal desire for unit and program improvement as well as an overall College move to a culture of assessment, in which the DOE has acted as a central guide and leader. Generally speaking, from 2006 to 2010 data were collected, but used more loosely.

Improvements to the TEP Unit Assessment System beginning in 2010/11 include the following.

- Alignment of TEP program learning outcomes with the Newberry College mission and goals, as well as participation in the new College assessment and accountability system. On an annual basis, the unit is required to submit documentation and evidence of program learning outcomes, plan for assessment and set criteria for success, collect and summarize data, and reflect on needed changes. The TEP has designated a Program Assessment Coordinator (PAC) who works as a liaison between the AAC and TEP.

- Institution of requirements for faculty to submit reflections on student survey data collected in their courses. These reflections are submitted to the Department Chair and included in each faculty member's Annual Report.

- Institution of a formalized complaints, compliments, and suggestions Procedure, and review of resulting data with department members, the TEC, and the CITE team as needed for the purpose of improving unit operations.

- Institution of a schedule for the distribution and analysis of data, including a comprehensive Data Day where all faculty involved in the TEP meet to reflect on data related to our intended outcomes in order to plan unit and program improvements.

Assessment within the TEP at Newberry College is seen as vital to unit and program success and growth. To that end, in coming years, the TEP will continue to refine and build its assessment system. Plans include the following.

- Institution of a quality control and monitoring system by the Program Assessment Coordinator to ensure timely and consistent collection of key assignment data across all courses each semester.

- Longitudinal reports of key assignment data will be generated and provided to faulty instructors for reflection and individual course improvement.

- Course key assignment and course learning outcomes will be reviewed for alignment with new program learning outcomes across the DOE.

Exhibits for Standard 2, Item 1:

1. 2008 TEP Unit Assessment System
2. DOE Presentation: Assessment of 5-Year Plan
3. Data Day Invitation

STANDARD THREE

Areas of Concern

Item 1: Implementation of the new field experience model is in the nascent stage; feedback and evidence of collaboration are limited.
Rationale: Most of the grants driving the collaboration began in 2010.

Response 1: Collaboration with public school partners is one of the main strengths of the program at Newberry College. Implementation of the new field experience model is underway and changes are based on data and information provided by public school partners. Formal and informal conversations with public school partners, as well as TEP candidates, revealed that our old field experience model was too shallow and tended to overwhelm our public school partners because of the number of placements made each semester. Evidence can be found in the minutes from the June 2010 Field Experience Retreat, October 2010 focus group meetings, and TEC meeting minutes.

Newberry College has a long history of intensive collaboration with our public school partners. A primary way in which we collaborate, develop relationships, and strengthen those relationships at the classroom, school, and district levels is through our grant initiatives. It is important to understand that, while our grant work does often focus on and include field experiences for our teacher candidates, it also allows us to find and develop a quality pool of mentor teachers.

The first grant, which led to powerful collaboration with public schools, was awarded in April of 2009. This program, *Inquire to Engage in Chemistry*, successfully completed its first two years in June of 2011. Sixteen public school science teachers from 4 high need school districts have been involved with college faculty for two years. This grant served as the catalyst for the next two grants which have been awarded.

The Robert C. Noyce Scholarship grant was awarded in September 2009. This program called RE-MAST (Recruit and Engage Math and Science Teachers) is working to recruit, prepare and mentor 26 math, biology and chemistry majors pursuing teaching in STEM content areas. In Year One, ten interns participated in the summer internship and eight of those are now pursuing secondary certification in a STEM content area. In Year Two, nine interns completed the summer internship. In Year Two, seven Noyce/RE-MAST scholars were selected and have completed one year of study in secondary education. One Noyce Scholar has graduated in mathematics. In Year three, six scholars are returning to the program and five new scholars are joining the program. RE-MAST selected 13 STEM teachers from three high need school districts to participate in the Master Mentors program thereby enhancing the infrastructure for education. They received Foundations of Mentoring training in Year Two that counted towards professional development hours. Mentors also met on campus four times throughout year two to talk about the program, clinical experiences and engage in professional development. Mentors work with RE-MAST interns, scholarship recipients and graduates for their two year service obligation. The Master Mentor program promotes collaboration, teaching, training, and learning by pairing RE-MAST students with highly trained mentors in their content area to help them develop their skills as teachers in the classrooms within high need schools. In June 2011, mentors completed Learning Focused Schools training, as part of the RE-MAST program, to enhance their ability to work with teacher candidates.

The most recent grant, awarded in 2010, allows Newberry College to serve as the South Carolina Center of Excellence in Teacher Retention. The RETAIN Center of Excellence will increase teacher retention in high need schools in South Carolina through five innovative, research-based initiatives.

- Conduct and publish research related to teacher retention in South Carolina.
- Extend the current state mentoring program from one to three years in the partner districts.
- Create an advanced mentoring program focused on the needs of alternatively certified teachers.
- Produce high-quality professional development centered on classroom data and assessment, action research, and teaching students of poverty.
- Design and implement a Guaranteed Teacher Program.

RETAIN public school partners include Fairfield County School District, Lexington 4 School District, and the School District of Newberry County. Twenty-seven RETAIN mentors make up Cohort 1 which concludes its first year in July 2011 by participating in Foundations of Mentoring Training.

While it is true that the grants driving collaboration are relatively new, all three provide close connections between the Teacher Education Program and public schools.

Exhibits for Standard 3, Item 1:

1. June 2010 Field Experience Retreat
2. October 2010 focus group meetings
3. TEC meeting minutes related to field experience

STANDARD FOUR

Areas of Concern

Item 1: Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.
Rationale: The unit has several recent efforts underway to expand efforts for diverse peer interactions yet diverse candidate percentages remain lower than the diversity within the geographical area served by the institution.

Response 1: Candidates do interact with diverse peers in their core classes as 33% of the student population at Newberry College is non-white. While there may not be large numbers of diverse candidates in the department, they do have opportunities to interact with them in other classes. The percentage of non-white students at Newberry College mirrors the state average of 36.4% non-white residents.

We have previously identified the recruitment of diverse candidates as an area of focus and are working on this issue through the Call me MISTER program, the ECE Fast Forward Program, the Noyce Scholarship Program and the Teacher Cadet College Partnership. Call Me MISTER provided an avenue for the recruitment of seven new African American male teacher candidates in 2010-2011 and five new MISTERS are entering the program in 2011-2012. Adding twelve men of color to the teacher education program has a dramatic impact on the diversity of candidates in our classes. The ECE Fast Forward program and the Noyce Scholarship program both provide age diversity. Four Noyce Scholars and 16 ECE Fast Forward majors are non-traditional students in terms of their age. In addition, one Noyce Scholar is Hispanic and three are African American. The Teacher Cadet College Partnership has grown from 11 to 15 high schools since the Institutional Report was written. With the exception of three high schools in the partnership (Chapin High School, Lexington High School and Lugoff-Elgin High School) all other Teacher Cadet schools have non-white student populations around or above the state average. The four new high schools recently added were targeted to join the partnership because they all have a high population of non-white students. Since this program is a valuable recruiting tool for the college and the TEP, we hope to continue to recruit talented candidates from diverse backgrounds from these high schools.

Exhibits for Standard 4, Item 1:

1. Teacher Cadet demographics

STANDARD FIVE

Areas of Concern

Item 1: Faculty involvement in scholarly activities is limited (Area for Improvement Continued from previous visit.)
Rationale: Faculty workloads are excessive, negatively impacting scholarly activity. The Faculty Policy Manual states, "full-time faculty teach 12–15 credit hours each semester for a total of 24-30 credit hours per academic year." This load is excessive for faculty with advising duties, teaching responsibilities, and college assigned responsibilities.

Response 1: Newberry College prides itself on being a liberal arts college with a focus on teaching. While the faculty manual does state that faculty teach 12 to15 hours, this is not the reality of how we operate. A full-time faculty load is 12 hours. In rare instances, faculty may teach more than 12 hours in an effort to serve student academic needs. However, this is not the norm. Information on actual teaching loads has been added as an exhibit.

The Institutional Report originally submitted only gave some samples of scholarship. We have created a new exhibit which shows the scholarship of all teacher education faculty.

Over the next five years there will be an increased emphasis on scholarship within the department. We have been known as a very strong teaching department. Because we value scholarship and want to move in this direction we have sought grants which have a scholarship focus. For example, the RETAIN Center of Excellence grant requires us to conduct and publish research related to grant priorities.

Exhibits for Standard 5, Item 1:

1. Actual teaching loads information
2. Scholarship chart

STANDARD SIX

Areas of Concern

Item 1: An insufficient number of faculty members have an adverse effect on the quality of the undergraduate education programs.
Rationale: The DOE enrollment increased from 59 teacher candidates in 2006 to 321 teacher candidates in 2011. A corresponding increase in DOE faculty personnel was not noted.

Response 1: In 2006, student enrollment was very low (approximately 59 in the total TEP). This low enrollment led to low teaching loads. In fact, in 2006-2007, the Department of Education had the lowest faculty efficiency of any department on campus. A goal in the Department of Education 5-Year Plan was to increase faculty efficiency. While it is true that faculty numbers have not increased much over the five year period, the Department of Education only began functioning efficiently in 2009-2010. In the past five years, the following positions have been added which directly impact teacher education: Half-time Assistant Professor paid for by RETAIN Center of Excellence grant (Jen Morrison), Full-time Assistant Professor in Music Education (Janet Long), Full-time Assistant Professor in Physical Education (Carla Cruikshanks), Full-time Assistant Professor of English Education (Amanda Hodges, begins August 2011, replacing the half-time teaching position held by Dale Brown), Full-time Assistant Professor of Chemistry/Science Education (Laura Lanni, begins August 2011).

In addition, numerous staff positions have been added in the past five years which have lessened the workload of faculty. These positions include Coordinator of Clinical Experiences, Teacher Cadet College Partner, Teaching Fellows Campus Director, Call Me MISTER Campus Director, Call Me MISTER Assistant Campus Director, Administrative Specialist (from half time to full time), Coordinator of Public School Partnerships (paid for out of RETAIN Center of Excellence grant), and RE-MAST Master Teacher (paid for out of Noyce grant).

Exhibits for Standard 6, Item 1:

1. Five Year Plan showing faculty efficiency and goal to increase it