NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:
Dr. Kermit G. Buckner
Dr. Elizabeth W. Ralston
Dr. Susan K. Johnsen
Dr. Kenneth D. Taylor
Dr. Carol A. Ryan

State Team:
Dr. Windy G. Schweder
Dr. Zach Kelehear

State Consultant:
Dr. Donald E. Stowe

NEA or AFT Representative:
N/A

Continuous Improvement Visit to:

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Eugene T. Moore School of Education
102 Tillman Hall
Clemson, SC 29634-0702
February 10-12, 2013

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

Clemson University

Team Reccomendations:

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

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

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

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

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

I. Introduction

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

Clemson University is a state-supported, land-grant institution founded in 1889 and located in the northwestern corner of South Carolina. Clemson is a Carnegie Classification High Research Activity institution and is ranked 25th best national public university by US News and World Report. The University is governed by a 13-person board and was an all-male military college until 1966 when it became civilian and coeducational. Clemson has a student body of approximately 19,000 and is accredited by SACS.

The unit offers 10 initial teacher education programs—four Secondary (Math, Science, English, & Social Studies), Early Childhood, Elementary, Special Education, Agricultural Education, Middle Grades MAT, and Secondary MAT in Math and Science. The unit has three advanced teaching programs (Masters degrees in Teaching and Learning, Literacy, and Special Education), and three other school personnel programs (School Counseling-CACREP accredited, Education Leadership-Building

Level, and Education Leadership-District-Level). It confers approximately 240 undergraduate degrees and 225 graduate degrees each year.

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

There were no deviations from the state protocol. This was a joint visit in which state and BOE team members served together. Two state BOE team members participated, wrote and voted as part of the BOE team. A state co-chair and SDE consultant participated in the off-site visit, the pre-visit and the on-site visit. State team members and the state consultant answered questions, assisted in the collection of evidence and participated in deliberations. The state co-chair and the consultant participated in the exit conference.

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

The MAT in middle grades education, the MAT in mathematics and science, and the M. Ed. in Teaching and Learning are offered at the University Center of Greenville campus which the unit considers to be part of the Clemson campus. These three programs are only offered at that campus. Faculty members who teach in these programs are treated the same as faculty who teach at the Clemson campus. They are fully involved in Clemson campus meetings and activities and were present during the visit. Candidates, graduates and faculty members from the University Center attended the interviews during the visit and data from all programs have been collected and analyzed in the same manner. The team collected information about the University Center programs through the IR, the exhibits, interviews and discussions with individuals in those programs. The team did not visit the University Center at Greenville campus during the visit, but one of the state team members had recently visited that Center and was able to describe it to other team members.

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

There were no unusual circumstances that affected this visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

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

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

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

The conceptual framework (CF) guides the work of the unit. It was created through consensus nine years ago and continues to provide a foundation for unit decisions and actions. It was designed to address what candidates need to know (knowledge), what they need to be able to do (skills), what they value (dispositions), and how they interface with their communities (connections). The conceptual framework can be compressed into the phrase: to prepare caring, capable, and connected professionals for the 21st century. The unit described the conceptual framework as a four-part document consisting of: Mission, Guiding Principles, Learner Outcomes and the Assessment System. Candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and ability to interface with their communities are the basis for program outcome expectations and define what is expected of candidates. Examples of program activities, assessments, and rubrics were provided which demonstrated the manner in which the conceptual framework guides program development, candidate activities and the measurement of candidate proficiency. Since the last BOE visit, minor changes were made to the learner outcomes in the framework. Those changes included modifications in the language used to be inclusive of advanced and other school personnel programs. During interviews, faculty members and administrators were able to describe the impact the framework had on programs. All the individuals interviewed agreed the CF described the knowledge, skills and dispositions graduates need. As the unit undergoes restructuring, the need to revisit the framework was acknowledged by several of the individuals with whom the team spoke.

To further define the conceptual framework, the unit provided the following definitions:

Caring comprises Beliefs and Actions.
• Beliefs: Our candidates are committed to ethical and democratic dispositions including respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view.
• Actions: Our candidates act in accord with the rights and responsibilities of all; are sensitive to developmental, social, and cultural differences; and encourage a democratic culture.

Capable consists of Knowledge and Practice.
• Knowledge: Our candidates are knowledgeable about the foundations of education and about their specialty area(s), including appropriate practices.
• Practice: Our candidates apply their knowledge through best practices that include the effective use of educational and information technology and appropriate assessments.

Connected contains Communication and Integration.
• Communication: Our candidates communicate effectively through a variety of representations (spoken, written, and digital).
• Integration: Our candidates synthesize their knowledge and practices to integrate interdisciplinary perspectives and applications by making connections to real life and by making global issues locally relevant.

The unit assessment system evolved from the CF and its component parts. All candidates (initial and advanced) are rated on each of the six CF Learner Outcomes at multiple times during his or her program. Ratings are based on a variety of artifacts throughout program coursework including field experiences and clinical practice. During the visit the team found ample evidence of the conceptual framework in assessments, rubrics and activities.

III. Unit Standards

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

Standard 1

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1 Overall Findings

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

Affirmed by the confluence of data arising from the off-site report, the addendum, the site visit, and interviews there is evidence that candidates know and demonstrate knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions. Additionally, the review has affirmed that state standards are met.

The off-site report presented to the institution required additional evidence of the following: assessment of candidate knowledge and skills related to student, family, and community roles in education (at both initial and advanced levels). In the unit's addendum and during the on-site visit, interviews and other data affirmed candidates reflected on their practice, and had a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they worked. Initial and advanced candidates are assessed on candidate knowledge and skills related to the engagement of community resources. In clinical practice the state teaching standard APS10-Professionalism is assessed at the initial program level by candidate unit plans and reflection related to professional activities that include community engagement. The cooperative teacher and university supervisor also assess initial candidates in clinical practice on Conceptual Framework Learner Outcome Connected Communication that includes effective communication with and among a variety of audiences. Prior to clinical practice, candidates are assessed through tools aligned with Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Standards that include a measurement of community engagement. Candidates in advanced programs are also assessed on community engagement as appropriate to program mission. The reports and interviews removed any concerns over this item.

In the addendum and at the visit it was determined that Clemson University's Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) conducts 1- and 3-year alumni surveys for each program. In 2008-09 and 2009-10 response rates for School of Education alumni ranged from 10-20%. In an effort to increase response rates, in 2010-11 the unit decided to supplement the Office of IE efforts by sending out a postcard notification of the survey prior to the IE Office's email communication. In addition, the unit mailed out hard copy forms to all alumni allowing each the choice of completing and mailing in a hard copy survey or of completing the survey online. This was followed up again by communication via email by the IE Office with an online link to the survey. The response rate for all unit programs averaged 29%. The Office of IE did not conduct an alumni survey in 2011-12 so the unit collaborated with Eduventures, a third party educational collaborative, in an alumni benchmarking study. Results were received in November 2012, and the response rate for Clemson School of Education alumni was 19%. In 2010, with a new database from the State Department of Education, the Unit identified a random sample of principals and superintendents to survey perceptions of level of preparedness of Clemson-trained educators one to five years out. Principals and superintendents were contacted with the names of selected alumni in their employ and provided them with a Survey Monkey survey link. The response rate in 2010 was 50% for alumni teachers and 70% for alumni principals. In 2011 the response rates were lower - 39% for alumni teachers and 54% for alumni principals.

Since the last visit, the unit has created a MAT program in secondary mathematics and science. The unit eliminated its career and technology education programs and modern languages program. The unit has revised many of its programs since the last visit. Major redesign has culminated in the development of double majors for all secondary programs and the elementary education program now has two tracks in math and science or in language, literacy and culture. Interviews with faculty and candidates in these programs, and a review of programs of study, affirm that the off-site report is consistent with evidence coming from the on-site review.

Teacher candidates know the content that they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts. Candidates in advanced programs demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of content as well. Content knowledge at the initial level is measured using two assessments: Praxis and Course Content. State licensing test data (Praxis II) range from an 87% pass rate (English) to 100% (most other areas). This test is required of initial candidates to apply for certification. The testing pass rate for other school professionals (educational leadership, Literacy, Special Education, Teaching and Learning) was at least 89%. Content knowledge for initial program candidates is assessed through coursework and at multiple points in program: entry, prior to student teaching, exit from student teaching, at program completion, and after program completion. A review of Title II reports affirms successful content knowledge for all program completers. Additionally, course grades are used as the second content assessment in elementary, MAT middle level, agricultural education, and all secondary programs. Special education uses an individual education program project, while early childhood education uses an assessment project. Evidence from the on-site visit affirms candidate mastery of content in these programs.

Ten of the 16 programs achieved full recognition in the first submission of program reports to the SPAs. The unit offers several programs for which a SPA does not exist. In those cases the state provides assessments that are SPA-alike. The Agricultural Education program is one of these programs. It underwent an extensive and thorough state review one year ago in preparation for this BOE team visit. All programs which have a SPAs, with the exception of Elementary Education, have achieved SPA recognition. Based on the reported data candidates can explain concepts in professional, state, and institutional standards. Advanced programs show in-depth knowledge of content through two assessments. Three programs use Praxis II (Literacy, Building level, and District level) while MEd program in Special Education and Teaching and Learning use a comprehensive exam in place of Praxis. The MEd programs in Special Education and Teaching and Learning use a comprehensive exam in place of the Praxis. The pass rate on the comprehensive exam for the MEd in Special Education is 100%; no data are yet available for the MEd in Teaching and Learning. Exit, alumni and employer surveys consistently reveal a similar pattern of success for candidate knowledge. Also, interviews with recent graduates reveal a growing emphasis by faculty to collect information that might be derived from surveys of graduates. Recent graduates felt comfortable offering feedback to faculty and were eager to have more opportunities to do so.

Teacher candidates affirmed the relationship of content and pedagogy. They have a broad range of instructional strategies. They facilitate learning with special attention to innovative technologies. The use of technologies was highlighted in both the on-site visit and the interviews. Virtually the entire building in which the School of Education is located has been updated in the last two years with important technologies being added.

Pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates is evidenced by the two assessments required for assessing content knowledge and skills at the initial level. There is evidence that candidates know instructional strategies that draw upon content and pedagogical knowledge. Through unit lesson plans and then through a portfolio evaluation candidates show evidence of differentiating instruction for student differences as they also build opportunities for including the use of technology. Also evident in candidate portfolios are multiple opportunities for reflection on practice, for applying different schools

of thought related to teaching and learning, and for translating research to practice. This evidence-based practice supports the claim that candidates can present information in clear and meaningful ways. Advanced candidates were able to select and use a broad range of instructional strategies and technologies and were able to explain the choices they made. Evidence from the off-site report and interviews at the on-site visit affirmed evidence for this element.

Both in pedagogical content and in the CF learning outcomes there is an emphasis on the design and implementation of lessons plans with technology. There is specific attention and evaluation of a candidate's ability to incorporate technology through both the ADEPT process and the Assessment Plan which emerges from the CF. Also, interviews revealed a tradition in preparation programs of reviewing, discussing, and applying ISTE standards for teachers.

By means of two assessments, there is evidence that advanced candidates demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning. Specifically, an examination of lesson planning and practicum experience is completed and aligned with ADEPT standards. Data appearing in Table 2 reveal a range of scores of 90% to 100% of candidates performing at acceptable levels or meeting target levels in knowledge and skills on ADEPT. Various other applications of knowledge are used for other school personnel programs, such as field experience and action research projects through which candidates conduct research and apply skills. Data are found in the CF learner outcomes as well as exit, alumni, and employer surveys. Candidates also apply professional and pedagogical knowledge in their framing of school practice within a community and family context. The interviews with candidates and graduates during the on site visit affirmed the evidence offered in the off-site report.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates are evidenced most notably in the SPA Program Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments. Initial certification candidates apply professional and pedagogical knowledge as they develop lesson plans, do curriculum reviews and reflect on experience. A review of those projects provides clear evidence of an emphasis on the capacity of candidates to consider school, family, and community contexts, to consider prior experiences of students, to reflect on their practice, to know major schools of thought that might inform delivery of content. Additionally, there are multiple opportunities for candidates to analyze research when considering linking pedagogy to learner styles.

Advanced candidates are aware of current research and policies. In field experiences, internships, and action research projects candidates are expected to conduct research and apply skills. These expectations are highlighted in the SPA Program Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessments checklist. Additionally, in interviews with advanced program candidates, evidence was collected that there were opportunities for collaborative research (between faculty and advanced students) and subsequent opportunities to present results at national conferences. All of these assessments require candidates to reflect on practice, to engage in professional activities, to understand school, community, and family contexts, and to understand current research and apply best practice.

Student learning for teacher candidates is emphasized in various stages of the candidate's program of study. They are able to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for students based on development levels and prior experience. For example in initial programs candidates in initial teacher preparation programs complete at least 100 hours of field experiences and a culminating student teaching experience in which the candidates are required to write unit lesson plans that university supervisors and cooperating teachers critique. These lesson plans include a pre-assessment that is used to guide instruction, another assessment that is used at the end of the unit to measure P12 student growth, and a reflection of suggested changes if the lesson were to be taught again. Program-level data reveal candidate proficiency on these assessments ranging from 89% to 100%. Data from ADEPT standards 3A, 3B, and 3C reveal candidate proficiency in using data to guide instruction and effect student

achievement. Findings from exit, alumni, and employer surveys substantiate these findings.

Advanced level candidates have a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning. They are able to analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make informed decisions. Specifically, at the advanced level (the MEd in Special Education, the MEd in Building Leadership, and the EdS in System Leadership) candidates use multiple field-based projects to assess impact on student learning. Specifically, all programs in the advanced level give close examination to curriculum issues so as to build on student developmental levels and to cultivate positive learning environments. Of particular note is the innovative approach the leadership program has used to assess impact. In that program an investigation found that principals prepared are leading schools where student achievement and student growth outpace the rest of the state. One hundred percent of respondents on exit, alumni, and employer surveys agree or strongly agree that Clemson graduates are sufficiently equipped to have a positive impact on student learning.

Candidates are familiar with professional dispositions and professors provide emphasis on these dispositions in syllabi, and through modeling. Candidate dispositions for all candidates (both initial and advanced and other school personnel) are reflected in two CF Learner Outcomes: Caring Beliefs and Caring Actions. An important feature of preparation programs is the emphasis on candidate dispositions, including candidate recognition of the importance of the individual and a belief that all individuals can learn. Candidates are familiar with expected dispositions as is found in the fact that candidate performance on CF Learner Outcomes for Caring Beliefs (in the individual, his/her individuality, and potential for learning) and Caring Actions (actions that respect understanding of developmental, social, and cultural differences) are collected in courses and at a variety of levels. Also notable is the unit's commitment to diversity of field placements as suggested in the Greenville partnership initiative. This initiative allows the unit to provided many more diverse placements than it would otherwise be able to do due to the diversity in that school district. When coupled with the assessment of dispositions through the e-survey, the unit was better situated to understand the impact that their intentional field placements had on student learning as well as on school/community relations. Interviews and observations from the site visit confirmed evidence offered in the off site report.

At the advanced level these data are also collected in course work and field experiences. Along with assessing dispositions through campus activities the programs have mapped questions on exit, alumni, and employer surveys. Out of the triangulation of data it is clear that candidates are performing at proficiency in terms of dispositions. Additionally, candidates demonstrate classroom behaviors consistent with fairness and belief that all students can learn. The programs at the advanced level, similar to the initial level noted above, place their candidates in diverse schools. The Educational Leadership programs, as determined through interviews with faculty and candidates, continue to work at ways to diversify placements, while acknowledging that challenges remain.

The evidence examined indicates candidates are able to support a positive environment in which students can learn, and are able to embrace diversity of students, community, and families. They are able to work with these stakeholders in a consistent, fair, and authentic way. Interviews with graduates and candidates, coupled with a review of syllabus items, affirms the claims made in the IR.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

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

The narrative above highlights the many areas under which Continuous Improvement expectations are met. These items, first identified in the IR, were validated at the poster sessions, in faculty interviews, in administration interviews, in graduate discussions, and in candidate sessions. Areas of emphasis are listed below.

1a. Content Knowledge: More than 80% of unit's programs completers pass content examinations. Candidates in advanced programs have in-depth knowledge of the content they teach.

1b. Pedagogical Content: Candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies, can facilitate student learning with clear and meaningful instruction, and use technology to augment delivery. Interviews revealed a special effort by faculty and graduates to understand and utilize emerging technologies.

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills: Based on interviews and observations during the on-site visit, there was evidence that candidates considered the influences on learning rising from the family, school, and community contexts. Through professional readings and practica candidates recognize the role of knowing students well as a precondition to effective instruction. Advanced candidates engage in professional development activities and have a deep understanding of the contexts in which learning happens.

1d. Student Learning: Based on a review of documents, data, and interviews. there is evidence that candidates can assess student performance data and use that assessment to guide instruction as well monitor student progress. At the advanced levels candidates have a command of major theories related to assessing student learning and they are aware of ways to utilize local resources to support student learning.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for other School Personnel: Candidates for other professional roles understand the knowledge needed in their fields and recognize the standards at a variety of levels. Candidates know families, communities and students as they assess student performance in guiding teaching practice. More than 80% of the completers have passed examinations and were successful in obtaining licensure. Technology was integrated in the experiences of candidates.

1f. Student Learning: Positive class environments for all student learning was supported in the roles assumed by candidates. In interviews and based on lesson plans, the candidates showed evidence of understanding developmental levels of students, the diversity of communities, and the policy contexts in which they work. Also, interviews revealed a spirit of positivity modeled by faculty thus communicating in a direct way that philosophy is consistent with practice.

1g. Dispositions: Based on a review of syllabi, on interviews with candidates, and on faculty conversations there was evidence that candidates are familiar with professional dispositions and they understand the power of working effectively with students, families, and colleagues in a way that reflects the appropriate professional dispositions.

1.2.b.i Strengths.

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

Not applicable to this standard

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not ensure that all candidates in the elementry and early childhood programs possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet the intent of the School to Work Transition Act. (ITP, ADV)	The unit has included items regarding the state standards related to EEDA and the Education Economic Development Act. Based on documents and interviews, there is evidence all candidates, including those in elementary and early childhood, acquire knowledge of EEDA Standards for teachers, school leaders, and counselors in their coursework and are assessed on this knowledge.
Although the overall Praxis Pass rate is 92.3%, the pass rate is below 80% for candidates on seven Praxis II subject area tests.	Praxis Pass rate is at or above the pass rate for all programs using this assessment, as evidenced by Title II reports.
The Spanish Education Program is not nationally recognized.	This program has been eliminated.
The Career and Technology Education programs are not aligned to reflect the national standards and the Clemson conceptual framework.	This program has been eliminated.

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.4 Recommendations

For Standard 1

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 2

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

Standard 2: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Overall Findings

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

The site visit confirmed that the unit has an assessment system based on professional, state, and institutional standards as reflected in its conceptual framework. As to professional standards, most programs include data from assessments reported in their respective Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) documents, or, for those programs for which a SPA does not exist, in state reports which are SPA-alike. For example, the Agricultural Education program underwent an extensive and thorough state review two years ago in preparation for the upcoming NCATE visit. All programs with the exception of Elementary Education have achieved SPA recognition. That program is in review after making substantial curriculum revisions including adding an emphasis on the arts.

The assessment system is also connected to state standards as reflected in the South Carolina standards for teaching performance certification (ADEPT), and to the unit's conceptual framework. As confirmed in a meeting with external advisory members and school partners, assessment data are regularly evaluated by the professional community. Data on candidate and program performance are collected from surveys of cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Further, the unit conducts surveys of employers including principals and superintendents. Each semester meetings are held with cooperating teachers, university supervisors, school principals, and district personnel to generate discussions and recommendations regarding program effectiveness. The unit also utilizes advisory board meetings and retreats as part of the assessment system.

The assessment system is comprehensive and serves to inform decisions about candidate progression through the program, as well as unit operations. Regarding candidate performance, the unit tracks progress using transition points with key assessments including an assessment specifically designed to evaluate candidate performance in regard to institutional standards, the CF Learner Outcomes. An assessment of dispositions is conducted at intervals across all programs. The assessment system makes use of both formative and summative measures to determine candidate admission, progression, and successful program completion. As reported by school partners, the unit faculty engage school faculty in the assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions and provide appropriate interventions when candidates experience problems.

Unit operations are assessed through surveys and focus groups consisting of candidates, faculty, and school partners. Significant improvements in unit operations have occurred in terms of field experiences, the assessment system, and the administrative structure of the unit as an outcome of these actions. Exit surveys are completed by student teachers, their mentors, and their supervisors as well as public school administrators. Recognition events held at the end of each semester provide another forum for stakeholders to assess unit operations. Among recent improvements are revisions to the field experience requirements to ensure more diverse experiences for candidates in all initial licensure programs. Improvements have also been made in some advanced programs, particularly the M.Ed. in Literacy. Another change resulting from feedback from school partners has been the re-configuration of the capstone experience to move assignments from the student teaching semester to the preceding term.

The unit has addressed the issue of potential bias in its assessments by formally training all new faculty members, including part time and adjunct, in the effective use of rubrics to evaluate candidate performance. Meetings have been held with previously trained faculty to insure that consistent application of the assessment instruments is maintained. Further, school based faculty members who are engaged in the evaluation of clinical and field experiences have been trained on the assessment of institutional, state, and professional (SPA) standards. Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted with the result that many assessments have been found to have a low percentage of inter-rater reliability. A meeting with program faculty in December resulted in the identification and consideration of factors that contributed to low correlations from the pilot study with each program charged with the task of improving the inter-rater reliability of their instruments, rubrics, and scoring protocols.

The unit employs multiple assessments from both internal and external sources to inform candidate progress, program quality, and unit operations. As to internal sources, the unit considers candidate performance on assessments that connect to transition points such as the CF Learner Outcomes, state standards, SPA standards, candidate exit surveys, and surveys of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. External assessments include subset scores on PRAXIS Principles of Teaching and Learning, employer surveys, alumni surveys, and ADEPT passing rate and South Carolina TAP graduate impact data.

The unit has adopted policies and procedures that insure that data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, and analyzed to inform decisions regarding candidate success, program quality, and unit operations. This is accomplished through regular meetings of the Moore College Assessment Team, faculty retreats, and annual meetings of advisory groups and school partners. The PEU's (Professional Education Unit) Office of Accreditation and Assessment maintains and facilitates this process. A significant improvement in this regard is the development of a process for closing the loop that is guided by the Director of Assessment and Accreditation working with the Core Assessment Team.

Records of candidate complaints are maintained along with documentation on how complaints are resolved. Complaint and appeal processes are clearly communicated to candidates via the unit's website and student handbooks.

The assessment system is supported by the use of LiveText for candidate data in both its initial programs. Also, the Clemson mainframe stores data related to the progression of graduate candidates that is continually updated by the Graduate School. Data are collected and analyzed using these technologies, with summary reports and candidate artifacts maintained in LiveText.

Data collected by means of the assessment system are used to make program improvements. Meetings with school partners, external stakeholders, and faculty both inside and outside the unit confirmed this fact. The unit regularly and systematically includes opportunities for members of the professional

community to engage in program review through meetings of program faculty, external stakeholders, and retreats. Further, with some financial support from an internal source, A4 grant program, the unit has conducted studies to determine program effectiveness, including an examination of the test scores on the Principles of Teaching and Learning exam and the Principal Effectiveness Study. This research project applied statistical analyses to data regarding schools led by principals prepared by Clemson on a number of quality factors and indicated that Clemson-prepared principals led schools judged more effective than those prepared at other institutions. Further, a study conducted by the South Carolina Department of Education in collaboration with the Eugene Moore School of Education recently considered Value Added methodology in analyzing the impact of Clemson graduates. Additional studies have been done by analyzing the performance of candidates who were unsuccessful in student teaching as well as those who were not successful in passing the South Carolina ADEPT, an evaluation conducted with graduates after two years of teaching.

Faculty members have access to candidate data that are stored in the LiveText system. Candidates have access to their own assessment data via LiveText as well. The addendum provided by the unit and interviews during the on-site visit confirmed candidates do engage in program improvement activities.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

Not applicable

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

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

The on-site visit confirmed that the unit has made significant improvements in its assessment system since its last accreditation visit. One of the major changes has been the creation of a SPA Taskforce that identified the six to eight key assessments for each program that has a Specialized Professional Association and then developed rubrics respective to the appropriate SPA assessments. "SPA-like" assessment plans were then developed for programs that did not have a SPA, referencing South Carolina standards judged appropriate for that area.

A second improvement has been the more frequent and more engaged involvement of advisory groups to review data and make recommendations for program improvement, including the creation of a new advisory board charged with the task of identifying strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations for program improvement. Meeting with school partners provided ample evidence that these advisory groups are having a significant influence on program design including the addition of more emphasis on classroom management, assessment, and preparation of candidates to work in diverse settings.

Further, the unit has made greater use of external data sources and has implemented procedures for triangulation of data. LiveText is credited for the unit's improvement in the procedures used to track candidate progress and to generate reports used to evaluate program effectiveness. The creation of an Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA) in 2009 has provided improved oversight of the

assessment system, making data collection and analysis more intentional and systematic. The OAA provides faculty training in how to apply scoring rubrics to the key assessments, conducts inter-rater reliability studies of assessments, and facilitates program and unit level discussion of assessments, rubrics, and data analysis.

Another improvement has been the engagement of multiple stakeholders in the regular use of the system for data collection, analysis, and decision-making. Topics related to candidate performance have become frequent topics for discussion at faculty meetings within the unit as well as program level meetings and advisory committee meetings. An annual report, the Program Response Report, is used to stimulate reflection and suggestions for program improvement. One such improvement that has resulted from this process was a change in the delivery of the required special education course and the closer connection of the field experience with class discussions held in seminar and subsequent changes in the selection of placement sites. In a related area, a new position, Director of Partnerships has been added as a result of data from school partners and others.

The unit also makes considered use of data to improve unit operations. For example, a recent study of candidates who did not successfully complete student teaching is being used to inform a reconsideration of transition point gate-keeping. Also, the unit is analyzing data derived from pass rates on the South Carolina teaching standards (ADEPT) as part of its improvement plan. Inter-rated reliability studies are being conducted to evaluate current assessment instruments and processes.

As concluded by the unit in its response to Standard 2, its assessment system is comprehensive, accessible, used regularly, and monitored so that it can serve the purpose of informing program improvement.

2.2.b.i Strengths.

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

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
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. ADV	The unit has eliminated the Career and Technology programs from its offerings.
Some critical data for candidate continuation in programs are not	Data required for tracking candidate progress is included in the

included in the assessment system. ITP ADV	assessment system.
The unit does not have a formal component of the assessment plan that addresses unit-wide operations. ITP ADV	The unit formally addresses unit operations in its assessment plan.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 3

Standard 3: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Overall Findings

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

Deepen school collaboration and partnerships, increase ownership of clinical experiences and integrate them fully throughout all programs, and diverse and thoughtful clinical placements are three of the unit's continuous improvement goals, which show their emphasis on this standard. The evidence presented in the institutional report, observations by the on-site team, and interviews with unit faculty, school-based faculty, and candidates supported the previous evidence that was provided for the off-site review (e.g., advisory board minutes, Memoranda of Understanding, annual reports, field placement charts, assessment and evaluation results, handbooks, professional development Power Points, field matrices, SPA assessments, syllabi, and transition points for different programs).

The unit has a MOU form that is used with school districts, and has partnership meetings with Greenville, Anderson, Oconee, and Pickens school districts. The unit has made a concerted effort since its last visit to develop partnerships with schools located in more diverse communities. These

partnerships have included the development of the Greenville Partnership Initiative, which has created more diverse placements for candidates and the Greenville, Oconee and Anderson School Districts 4 and 5, which also provide professional development in math inquiry strategies to over 100 teachers from ten middle schools.

At both the initial and advanced levels, the unit has meetings with cooperative teachers, principals, and university supervisors. Survey data (N=147) indicate that the vast majority of the respondents are pleased with the unit's supervision of candidates. Interviews with unit supervisors, supervising teachers, and university faculty indicate that they feel included in designing, implementing, and evaluating field experiences together. One supervisor mentioned that communication is a "hallmark" of Clemson. "We are a part of the program." Another mentioned that after "conversations with the cooperating teacher, we made adjustments to projects." The Leadership Program also collaborates with a consortium of ten districts in designing projects to improve the principal preparation program.

The unit collaborates with program faculty, schools, and school districts in determining specific field and clinical placements at both the initial and advanced levels. All of the placements are coordinated through the Office of Field Experiences. Clinical faculty who direct different programs develop relationships with principals and school districts, identify quality placements collaboratively, provide placement information to the Office of Field Experiences, and monitor placements in collaboration with the cooperating teacher and the school. When challenges arise with placement issues, cooperating teachers indicate that the unit's faculty members "respond within 24 hours" to address problems. For this reason among many, cooperating teachers and principals describe the unit's candidates as "their favorites" and often make requests for candidates to be placed in their schools. To ensure that the quality of the collaborative partnerships continue, there are regular clinical meetings of all program directors and advisory boards.

The candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors participate in school and district collaborative professional learning activities that have included workshops on balanced literacy, data analysis, science content and innovative teaching, leveling library materials, issues related to sexual assault/child abuse, and improving evaluation forms. Greenville County School District identifies needs for professional development that the unit faculty members provide to schools. In addition, topics of interest are presented at each of the advisory board meetings at both the initial and advanced levels. Fall topics included early childhood placements and diverse placements; one of the spring topics will focus on technology.

The unit has defined tracking and transition points guiding candidates through all the programs at the initial and advanced levels. Initial candidates need to meet program entry criteria for clinical practice (e.g., 95 hours of course work, pass the Praxis I, attain a 2.5 GPA) with exit criteria including successful student teaching and passing Praxis II tests. Assessment data indicate that 98% of candidates scored Developing or Proficient on the South Carolina teaching standards and 92% of candidates scored Proficient or Distinguished on the Conceptual Framework Learner Outcomes. They also demonstrate proficiency on SPA assessment standards.

Initial programs meet the South Carolina requirements for field experience prior to clinical practice, with initial programs exceeding the state required minimum of 100 hours of clinical experience prior to student teaching. Candidates tutor students, observe classrooms early childhood settings and at the middle and high school levels, and spend 45 hours in the same school where they do their student teaching in the spring. Proficiency is demonstrated using SPA Model standards and the Conceptual Framework Learner Outcomes. At the advanced level, candidates in building and district leadership programs must complete two 100-hour internships. They demonstrate proficiency by completing internships and clinical projects as evidenced by syllabi and handbooks. They also must analyze student

support services and school board meetings. MAT candidates are admitted based on previous content courses, the passage of all prerequisite courses in the program, and specific criteria that are defined in handbooks.

All candidates at the initial and advanced program levels are required to use technology in their formal lesson plans during practicum and student teaching and demonstrate proficiency. Part of the MOU with schools includes a requirement that participating classrooms be equipped with technology. For this reason, all of the cooperating teachers have classrooms with Smart Boards, IPads and other technology that facilitates student learning. All candidates in the initial program are required to take a one-hour course that shows them how to use technology tools for specific tasks such as visualization, social media, and collaboration. In addition one-hour courses are also linked to methods courses in the core content areas at both the elementary and secondary level with the exception of secondary English, who take the course during their student teaching and secondary science, who take their course in the biological sciences. Candidates must also develop an electronic portfolio for practicum and student teaching. Moreover, candidates in the special education program are required to graph student data in the CBM project and use technology to develop an IEP. At the advanced level, candidates in the building and district level leadership program develop an internship contract that includes a project that uses technology to improve P-12 student learning. In the literacy program, candidates use technology to motivate struggling adolescent readers who do not respond well to traditional printed texts. Assessment data indicate that candidates score at the proficient or distinguished level in their ability to use technology.

The unit has specific criteria for cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and clinical faculty that are outlined in handbooks at both the initial and advanced levels. The following handbooks are available at the initial program level: teacher education, agricultural education, early childhood, elementary student teaching, mathematics student teaching, MAT middle level student teaching, science student teaching, secondary English student teaching, social studies student teaching, and special education student teaching. At the advanced level, handbooks are available for educational leadership and special education.

Regular and continuing support in the form of professional development and modeling is provided to candidates through partnerships, university liaisons, university faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers. For example, an important component of the Greenville agreement is that University Supervisors provide professional development at the request of the school. According to the IR, each partner school is assigned a university liaison who facilitates communication among the Clemson University Offices of Partnership and Field Experience, P-12 schools, the University Supervisor, and the cooperating teacher. Minutes suggest that each of the programs at the initial and advanced levels has an advisory board that offers suggestions to the program.

Candidates in the initial programs are formally observed at a minimum of eight times during their student teaching—four times by their cooperating teacher and four times by the university supervisor. Generally candidates reflect about their performance prior to a meeting with the teacher and/or supervisor. All candidates also prepare an electronic portfolio that includes a teacher work sample, long-range plan, a unit plan with pre and post assessments, and a reflection regarding professional development activities. At the end of student teaching, completed portfolios are presented not only to cooperating teachers and university supervisors but also to peers, parents, and other school personnel such as principals. All of these assessments are used in evaluating the candidates. At the advanced level, along with observations by faculty, candidates apply coursework to the classroom setting, analyze P-12 student learning, and reflect on practice in the context of theories. In the educational leadership program, candidates also analyze data to make decisions in their own schools. Candidates are required to pass a comprehensive exam following the completion of the program.

Pedagogical content knowledge appears to be mastered by both initial and advanced candidates before beginning their student teaching. With the exception of the MAT program, both initial and advanced candidates also appear to have mastered the content knowledge in specific domains prior to their clinical experience. Because of the shortened time period, the MAT middle level education and secondary math and science candidates, who are nontraditional students and are changing careers, must renew their content knowledge on-the-job with their cooperating teachers. Variations occur based on the individual backgrounds of these candidates. This difference was apparent from the interviews with cooperating teachers. However, in all cases, interviews also indicated that candidates are ultimately prepared when they begin their first year of teaching. A previous candidate, now a program coordinator, said, "All of the standards were drilled in my head."

According to the handbooks and from interviews, cooperating teachers and university supervisors use multiple measures and assessments to evaluate candidate skills, knowledge and dispositions in relation to professional, state, and institutional standards. Specific attention is paid to the SPA assessments that target candidate impact on P-12 student learning with faculty explaining this impact and making suggestions for program improvement. University supervisors are responsible for evaluating long-range plans, units of instruction, formal lessons, and portfolios. Unit plan evaluations and formal lesson observation evaluations are used to measure candidate impact on student learning. Candidates use post assessments to determine student growth relative to unit objectives and pre-assessment data. Cooperating teachers and leadership mentors are responsible for formal evaluations and candidate professionalism. All of these are outlined in the handbooks and syllabi. Candidates are required to use student assessment data to guide instructional planning for each of their eight formally evaluated lessons. University supervisors evaluate the lesson plans, observe lessons, and assess candidates' use of informal methods during teaching to monitor student understanding and adjust instruction. After each lesson, candidates reflect on how to improve their lessons. University supervisors and cooperating teachers provide candidates with oral and written feedback. During the interviews, "data days" were mentioned where candidates, faculty, and supervisors review multiple sets of data and reflect on effective and ineffective instructional practices. Of special note is the initial program in special education where candidates complete curriculum-based measurement projects to evaluate the effect of classroom interventions on student performance. These projects were subsequently presented at the state special education conference. At the advanced level, multiple assessment strategies include portfolios, "paper and pencil" assessments, oral and written feedback on presentations, discussions, and projects. All of the Unit's programs at the initial and advanced levels have met the standard related to providing data showing that candidates have effects on student learning.

Guidelines/handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates and clinical faculty describe support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection. For initial candidates, clinical faculty provide support through observation, conferencing and email. They discuss assessments with the candidates that require candidates to reflect. All programs have capstone seminars taught by Unit faculty where groups reflect about their practice. Candidates in advanced programs complete field experiences that apply their coursework in classroom settings, analyze student learning, and reflect on their practice. Candidates in the leadership programs develop internship contracts with their mentor that address the needs of the district and the impact on P-12 student learning. All clinical practice assignments require analysis of data, use of technology and current research, and application of knowledge related to students, their families and communities. Field placements include students from diverse backgrounds.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is

not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

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

The unit expressed that their continuous improvement activities have included a strengthened emphasis on assessment of candidate impact on the learning of all P-12 students and an increase on the quality of diverse and thoughtful clinical placements.

Since the last NCATE visit, the unit convened a Task Force of school partners and the unit faculty. Based on a review of research and reflecting on feedback and suggestions, the task force made two major recommendations for teacher and school leader preparation programs: increase the quality of clinical experiences and develop more meaningful school partnerships. During fall 2011 half of all early childhood and elementary (two of the largest programs) practicum and student teaching placements were made in the Greenville school district. This school system is about 35 miles from Clemson and is very diverse in terms of socioeconomic status and cultural diversity. Candidates were concentrated in eight schools because of their high needs student populations and the high commitment of the leaders and teachers. Because of this concentration, unit faculty serving as University Supervisors spend more time in each school and are available to assist school leaders and teachers in promoting P12 student achievement. University Supervisors also provide professional development at the request of the school. Meetings and negotiations also occurred between local districts to establish placements in schools that data showed to be more diverse in terms of socioeconomic status, culture and linguistic diversity, with the goal of allowing candidates to experience a broader and more diverse spectrum of P-12 students. Furthering the objective of increasing the quality of diverse and thoughtful clinical placements, the new MOUs state that the unit's initial program faculty will work more closely with school partners to determine appropriate placements for candidates in addition to working more closely with school districts to facilitate these placements. At the advanced level Leadership 2.0/3.0 began in Spring 2012 and seeks to increase the leadership capacity of mid-career principals in low performing schools in South Carolina. This emerging program is a collaboration between the PEU and ten districts to meet the individual needs of schools and districts and to improve the design of our principal preparation program. Another collaborative project, the Successful Schools Principal Project involves PEU faculty working with schools to document the effects of school leadership on student achievement.

Realizing the need for more time and resources devoted to candidate placements, the unit has also created two new positions—Director of Partnerships and the Director of Moore Fellows to provide leadership for school and agency partnerships. The Director of Partnerships supervises the Office of Field Experiences and clinical experiences. With the new emphasis on clinical experience as a cornerstone of all programs, the unit initiated a change in policy within the initial teacher preparation programs that requires all faculty members who teach methods courses to supervise clinical experiences on a regular basis. With revisions, initial and advanced programs now meet the South Carolina requirements for field experience prior to clinical practice with initial programs exceeding the state required minimum of 100 hours of clinical experience prior to student teaching. At the advanced level, candidates in building and district leadership programs must complete two 100-hour internships. Overall, the unit is making progress in improving their placements; however, in interviews the faculty

are aware of the increasing diversity of the classroom and would like to continue to improve the candidates' ability to work in more inclusionary environments, identify needed community resources for struggling learners, and communicate in culturally responsive ways with parents, particularly at the secondary level.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

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

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Not all programs meet the state required minimum of 100 hours of clinical experience prior to student teaching. ITP ADV	All candidates in every program now meet the 100 field hours prior to student teaching.

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	

Advanced Preparation	

Standard 4

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings

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

The unit makes a concerted effort to infuse diversity into its teacher education programs through its curriculum and field experiences. In initial and advanced programs candidates are presented with opportunities to meet the individual needs of students with a wide range of diverse backgrounds. Candidates acquire the diversity proficiencies of the Conceptual Framework (CF) through reflections, field experiences, e-portfolios, and other assessments. Two of the six learner outcomes of the CF clearly articulate the expectation of candidate proficiencies related to diversity: Caring Beliefs and Caring Actions. Caring Beliefs speak to "respecting the rights and responsibilities of all and recognizing diverse points of view," while Caring Actions describe candidates' sensitivity "to developmental, social, and cultural differences." The unit presents a well-grounded framework for understanding diversity, which include linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities.

During field and clinical experiences the unit uses multiple assessment measures to evaluate initial and advanced candidates' performance on measures related to diversity. Data charts indicate candidates performed well on the unit diversity standards. During interviews, candidates and alumni confirmed they were well prepared to work with diverse students during their field and clinical experiences.

Initial and advanced candidates confirmed the use of peer review and collaboration in designing and implementing lesson plans that focused on meeting the needs of diverse students. Candidates stated they continuously write reflections on the success of their lesson plan implementation and on how well they were able to work with students with diverse needs, including linguistic, socioeconomic and ability differences. A more extensive reflective process was verified in candidate portfolios and interviews and demonstrated a constructive and insightful reflective process.

The unit demonstrates its commitment to diversity through its good-faith efforts in the recruitment of diverse faculty and candidates, the offering of many opportunities for diverse field experiences, and its support of diverse candidates. Candidates have opportunities to interact with full-time and part-time faculty of both genders and from at least two ethnic/racial groups. Evidence provided by the unit indicated the number of diverse faculty members has increased from 10.3% to 16.4% over the past eight years. A review of vitae and interviews with faculty and candidates indicated faculty have extensive experiences working with and relating to diverse students, including English language learners, racial/ethnic groups, and students with exceptionalities. Clemson University has developed an Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Policy and the unit has developed a Diversity Plan since the last accreditation visit. In 2008, the institution created and filled the position of University Chief Diversity Officer. In an interview with Mr. Wiles, he described many diversity initiatives

sponsored by the institution, such as the Gantt Intercultural Center, the Emerging Scholars program, the Best Practices in Achievement for Students of Color Conference, and the Minority Student Success Initiative.

The unit has taken many steps to achieve diversity among the candidates in its educational programs. One of its best known programs is the award-winning Call Me MISTER program that has increased the number of licensed teachers from diverse cultures and backgrounds. In the MISTER program African American males enroll in one of the education programs and take classes with other candidates in the program. Data provided by the unit indicate diverse candidates in the education programs mirror the ratio of diverse students enrolled across the university. Efforts to increase candidate diversity were evident in a wide variety of activities. Examples include The Houston Center for the Study of the Black Experience in Education, which conducts research and sponsors programs that address critical issues related to the experience of Blacks in education, the SAT Boot Camp, which is an academic outreach program designed to increase SAT scores for diverse students, and ClemsonLIFE, a residential program for college-age students with intellectual disabilities. Faculty also stated that candidates have the opportunity to work with diverse peers from other institutions through participation in professional development conferences required in several of the education programs. The unit's Multicultural Committee annually reviews the Diversity Plan and examines and addresses policies to ensure an environment that is supportive of all faculty, staff, and candidates. A multicultural website is also being developed to link campus events with faculty and students for the purpose of compiling/sharing information concerning diversity issues within the unit. In 2011 the unit's candidates were 75.7% white and 24.3 % non-white.

The unit ensures that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practices by infusing diversity components throughout the curriculum. Portfolio evidence indicated candidates are incorporating diversity in their field and clinical experiences. Candidates in many programs are required to write reflection pieces on their experiences with diverse students. According to candidates, unit faculty use best practices, demonstrating the importance of differentiation and how learning activities may be adjusted to ensure all students learn.

Candidates in all of the initial programs are systematically placed in field and clinical experiences that have large ratios of diverse P-12 students, including ethnic/racial differences, English language learners, and students with exceptionalities. The unit began a partnership with Greenville County School District for its early childhood and elementary programs two years ago. The schools in this district are considered very diverse for all measures of diversity (racial/ethnic, socioeconomic, English language learners, and students with exceptionalities). School district principals and teachers confirmed the collaborative partnership with the unit faculty. Together the school principal and unit faculty representative place candidates with master teachers who demonstrate the identified cooperating teacher criteria. In addition, unit faculty members provide professional development seminars and serve on school advisory committees. School personnel also confirmed the high level of proficiency candidates display when working with diverse students. While candidates in several of the initial placement programs are also systematically placed in diverse field and clinical experiences, most candidates in the Teaching and Learning M.Ed and Administration and Supervision M.Ed and Ed.S programs complete their field and clinical experiences in the schools where they currently teach. Thus many candidates in the advanced programs are not systematically required to have opportunities to work with diverse students, such as those with differences in socioeconomic levels, racial/ethnic groups, and abilities.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is

not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

Not applicable to this standard

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

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

The university and unit have expanded their diversity efforts to foster an environment that is welcoming and accepting. Clemson created and filled the position of University Chief Diversity Officer, who is responsible for coordinating/facilitating all major University-wide diversity and equity efforts relating to faculty, staff, and candidates. Under unit leadership of the past several years the unit has developed a strong school partnership with the Greenville County School District. The early childhood and elementary programs now place their candidates in several schools within the district and discussions have begun to place secondary candidates in the district. Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practices demonstrate an expectation for engaging initial candidates in settings to develop, understand and implement differentiated strategies in planning, teaching and assessing P-12 students. The unit also made several curriculum and program changes to increase diversity opportunities for candidates. These changes include adding an additional practicum for secondary students to allow them to work with diverse students, redesigned courses to introduce social justice and equity issues early in each program's course of study, and new courses that focus on linguistically and culturally diverse students.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

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

The Call Me MISTER program is a nationally recognized program that was developed to increase the number of African American males in the teaching profession. The program began at Clemson University and has expanded to thirteen universities in South Carolina and six other states. The PEU has a strong commitment to embedding diversity into the curriculum, field experiences, and clinical experiences of candidates. The unit is making efforts to increase enrollment of diverse candidates and hire additional diverse faculty through current initiatives. Candidates are sensitive to and prepared for the diversity of the students whom they encounter in their field experiences and clinical placements. Review of data and interviews with candidates and cooperating teachers indicated that candidates have developed knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with diverse populations of students.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	The unit and university have increased their good-faith efforts in the recruitment of more diverse faculty and the percentages of minority faculty have increased since the last NCATE visit. Unit faculty members have extensive and diverse teaching experiences and knowledge of diverse learners.
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.	The unit and university have increased their good-faith efforts in the recruitment and retention of diverse candidates. The efforts include the Call Me MISTER program, Best Practices in Achievement for Students of Color Conference, the Minority Student Success Initiative, and the SAT Boot Camp. The ratio of diverse candidates in the unit mirrors the diverse students of the university.

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not systematically ensure that all candidates in advanced programs work with diverse P-12 students. ADV	Many candidates in the advanced programs complete their field and clinical experiences in the schools where they currently teach. Thus many candidates in the advanced programs are not systematically tracked to ensure they have opportunities to work with diverse students, such as those with differences in socio-economic levels, racial/ethnic groups, and abilities.

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	
Advanced Preparation	

Standard 5

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

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

5.1 Overall Findings

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

All full-time tenure track faculty hold a doctorate in the areas in which they are assigned. Part-time faculty members hold a doctorate in the discipline in which they are assigned or have contemporary experience that qualifies them for their assignments. University supervisors have had at least two years experience teaching in public schools. In addition, supervisors of initial or advanced candidates have been or are currently certified in their fields of supervision. According to the evidence provided in the Institutional Report (IR), 76 percent of university supervisors have had 10 or more years of teaching experience. In addition, 62 percent of cooperating teachers and 50 percent of leadership mentors have had more than 10 years of teaching experience.

Evidence included in the IR and referenced in on-site interviews revealed unit faculty members know the content that they teach. Currently, the unit has 15 faculty members in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education disciplines. Two of these faculty members hold joint appointments with the Mathematics Department. Evidence gathered from the IR and interviews showed that faculty model best teaching practices in a variety of ways: using curriculum-based measurement (CBM) to evaluate student progress, using inquiry-based learning to teach math and science, and interpreting the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) test scaled scores for planning purposes. The IR and onsite interviews provided evidence demonstrating how faculty members model best practices for incorporating technology during instruction. For example, alumni reported learning how to use Google Earth, graphic calculators, SMART Boards, and various assistive technology devices during their teacher preparation programs.

Unit faculty members are engaged in leadership roles in professional organizations, ranging from committee memberships to officer positions. Faculty members also provide service to local schools and educational agencies through consultation and professional development (Center of Excellence for Inquiry in Mathematics and Science, the Latino Task Force). Faculty members are able to form connections with the school personnel who attend these professional development opportunities. These relationships result in administrators and educators welcoming faculty and teacher candidates into their schools and their classrooms. Candidates are also able to spend more time learning how to teach diverse learners. For example, candidates in the Middle Level MAT program work with at-risk students through the Greenville Early College program (GEC). Clinical faculty in early childhood and elementary education programs created the Greenville Partnership Initiative with eight Greenville elementary schools. Candidates spend a full year in one placement (practicum and then internship). Many students in these eight schools are from low socioeconomic backgrounds, are learning English as a second language, or have documented exceptionalities.

Unit faculty members prepare candidates to work with students who have disabilities using research-based practices. During interviews, alumni reported that they were required to co-plan and co-teach with their peers during their teacher preparation programs. These alumni are now teaching in schools where general education and special education teachers teach in inclusive settings. Unit faculty members also prepare candidates to work with students who are learning English as a second language (ESL). Elementary teacher education faculty members have revised the Bachelors of Arts in Elementary Education program to include two specialty areas. Elementary education teacher candidates have the opportunity to select the Language, Culture, and Diversity area which allows them to take courses that will count towards certification in teaching students who are learning English as a second language.

Faculty members demonstrate a high level of scholarly productivity as evidenced by journal articles, books, book chapters, presentations, grants, and other awards. Data from the IR indicate that this high level of productivity has been maintained over a number of years. Faculty members model scholarly

activity by including candidates in their research. During on-site interviews, a few teacher candidates and alumni shared that they had co-presented with faculty at professional conferences (South Carolina Ed Tech Conference, National Science Teachers Association Conference).

Procedures for faculty evaluation and guidelines for tenure and promotion are in place. A faculty committee makes initial decisions regarding promotion and tenure. The school director, dean, provost, and president review and make independent decisions about reappointment, promotion and/or tenure (TPR). The IR indicated that one key document used in the TPR process is the annual evaluation of faculty performance review (Form 3). Department chairs review the performance of each full-time faculty and document their findings using a six-point scale of excellent, very good, good, fair, and unsatisfactory. Department chairs then meet with each faculty member to review the completed document. The college dean also reviews Form 3. The faculty member, the department chair, and the college dean sign this document. The IR and IR addendum indicate that data retrieved from Form 3 are added to the evidence used to make decisions regarding a faculty member's TPR.

According to the IR, part-time adjuncts and graduate teaching assistants are reviewed each semester using evaluations and other feedback. Part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants explained the review process during the onsite interview. Each semester, all candidates complete a survey evaluating instructor performance through the Blackboard course management system. This survey consists of open and close-ended items. Part-time faculty share survey results with department chairs who then write a letter to the part-time faculty. This letter includes constructive feedback regarding the instructor's teaching performance. Examples of letters from chairs to part-time faculty members were found among the exhibits. Part-time faculty reported that their department chairs observed their classes from time to time. Graduate teaching assistants who teach a course are mentored and supervised by a faculty member in their program area after having completed a semester of shadowing the full-time faculty member teaching the course. The faculty member provides formal and informal feedback to the teaching assistant regarding their teaching performance throughout the semester.

Information derived from evaluations, both of individual faculty members and of programs in which they teach, has allowed the unit to plan a comprehensive approach to professional development. For the past two years, each faculty member has been allotted a travel budget of $2,000 to support their attendance at professional conferences. During the on-site interviews, full-time, part-time, and clinical faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants, reported having access to university-sponsored professional development through the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI). Professional development opportunities mentioned included: how to incorporate technology during instruction (BlackBoard, Adobe Connect, Adobe Presenter), and best practices when teaching in higher education (motivating students, managing large class sizes).

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

N/A

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

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

The unit has made significant gains in Standard 5 since the last visit Examples include the following:

-- As evidenced in the IR and onsite interviews, there are increased professional development opportunities to support faculty and graduate assistant teaching and scholarship. The Center for Collaborative Research and Activities support faculty and graduate students' scholarship through grant writing workshops, editing services, and identifying funding sources. The OTEI offers assistance to faculty and graduate assistants who want to improve their teaching and technology skills.

-- The unit has created partnerships with local school districts in order to provide additional opportunities for teacher candidates to implement best practices in authentic settings. It is clear from evidence found in the IR and during the on-site interviews that there has been a concerted effort to provide initial candidates with additional opportunities to work with P-12 students who have diverse learning needs (Greenville Partnership, Greenville Early College). In addition, faculty members are able to model best practices in teaching (co-teaching, including technology during instruction) at the new partnership sites.

5.2.b.i Strengths.

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

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
N/A	

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
N/A	

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 6

Standard 6: Unit Governance And Resources

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

6.1 Overall Findings

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

Evidence from exhibits and interviews with the college dean, school director, program coordinators, department chairs and faculty demonstrates the unit has the governance system and resources to prepare candidates to meet professional, state and institutional standards. The Professional Education Unit (PEU), chaired by the director of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education, serves as the governing body for all teaching faculty and administrators that represent two departments within the unit: Teacher Education and Leadership, Counselor Education and Human Organizational Development. Standing committees provide collaborative leadership and authority in monitoring accreditation and professional standards as well as all curriculum decisions across the unit.

Interviews with the Academic Advising Center (AAC) and Graduate coordinator confirmed that initial and advance level candidates in the unit have access to student services such as advising and counseling. At the initial undergraduate level, candidates are advised in the AAC upon admission to the institution until the end of their sophomore year. Candidates receive faculty advisors at the beginning of their junior year or after the completion of 45 credit hours. At the advanced level and the MAT initial program level, candidates receive an advisor upon being admitted into the graduate school. The academic calendars, catalogs, publications and grading policies located in the exhibits were accurate and current. Interviews with the Academic Advising Center and Graduate coordinator revealed that graduate recruiting resources are available to the coordinator while undergraduate recruiting resources are shared between AAC and the unit.

The unit is one of five units that receive their budget allocation from the dean of Health, Education and Human Development. The unit's budget appears to be similar to other units at the institution having clinical components, and permits faculty teaching, research and service. Interviews confirmed that a strategic collaborative decision-making process focused on the distribution of unit funds includes the

director, department chairs and financial analyst of the unit.

Financial resources for curriculum, instruction, faculty, clinical work and scholarship maintain high-quality work within the unit and its school partners. Each tenure-track faculty member is supported with a $2,000 travel budget. Targeted research and travel stipends are available for untenured faculty members. The unit has been successful in increasing grant support among its resources as well. The Center for Research and Collaborative Activities (CRCA) supports and contributes to faculty initiatives. Interviews with the dean, present and past school director, department chairs and budget leaders confirmed that CRCA resources have increased steadily and provided support for building capacity and programs within the unit.

Unit workload and policies for full-time and part-time faculty performance are found in the Clemson University Faculty Manual. Interviews confirmed that specific expectations regarding teaching, research and service comprise the performance areas in which faculty members focus their professional efforts. Interviews with department chairs confirmed unit workload policies for full-time faculty, and the policy for part time faculty. Courses that are taught by part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of each semester. Department chairs review the results of course evaluations with part-time faculty ensuring program quality and implementation. Evidence indicates part-time faculty assignments are reasonable and appropriate.

Interviews with the department chairs confirm a structure of governance that is very effective within the unit as well as attentive to curriculum changes, annual evaluation and promotion and tenure processes within the unit. Consistent communication is evident between unit administrators, department chairs, program coordinators and faculty members.

The unit has outstanding facilities on campus that prepare candidates to be successful and candidates report their ease of use. Facilities are well organized and modern. Current technology is available in the classrooms for candidates to use. The Tillman Media Center is a curricular laboratory and material center equipped with library resources that range from kindergarten to grade 12. Additional teacher preparation items are available to be checked out by the candidates.

Candidates in the initial and advanced programs are required to use technology in their formal lesson plans during practicum and student teaching and demonstrate proficiency. Part of the Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with partnership schools includes a requirement that participating classrooms be equipped with technology. For this reason, all of the cooperating teachers have classrooms with Smart Boards, i-Pads and other technology that facilitate student learning.

All candidates in the initial program are required to take a one-hour course that shows them how to use technology tools for specific tasks such as visualization, social media, and collaboration. In addition one-hour courses are also linked to methods courses in the core content areas at both the elementary and secondary level with the exception of secondary English, who take the course during their student teaching and secondary science, who take their course in the biological sciences. In the Literacy program, candidates use technology to motivate struggling adolescent readers who do not respond well to traditional printed texts. Assessment data indicate that candidates score at the proficient or distinguished level in their ability to use technology. Candidates must also develop an electronic portfolio for practicum and student teaching. Interviews with instructional technology faculty revealed that an internship contract is developed by advanced level candidates in the building and district level leadership program that includes a project that uses technology to improve P-12 students learning.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

Clear and consistent evidence shows the unit is moving towards target in unit leadership and authority, unit budget, personnel, unit facilities and unit resources including technology. The Associate Director for Research and Office of Graduate Programs was created to address candidate performance in research as well as recruiting and admission practices in the graduate school. Furthermore, expansion of the Executive Team now includes representation from all department units.

Evidence of the budgetary allocations permitting faculty teaching, research and service that extends beyond the unit to P-12 education can be found in the Moore Teacher Fellows program. This program provides candidates with immersion experiences that motivate them to become future leaders. Resources from the Eugene T. Moore endowment will provide access to significant resources needed to achieve that goal. All tenure-track faculty members within the unit are supported with a $2,000 travel budget. Targeted research and travel stipends are available for untenured faculty members.

Candidates at the initial and advanced program levels are required to use technology in their formal lesson plans during practicum and student teaching and demonstrate proficiency. Candidates must also develop an electronic portfolio for practicum and student teaching. Part of the MOU with partnership schools includes a requirement that participating classrooms be equipped with technology. For this reason, all of the cooperating teachers have classrooms with Smart Boards, I Pads and other technology that facilitates student learning.

Interviews with partnership school personnel confirmed that candidates are able to use technology tools for specific tasks such as visualization, social media, and collaboration within the school. Assessment data indicate that candidates score at the Proficient or Distinguished level in their ability to use technology.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

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

6.2.b.i Strengths.

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

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that

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

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Course evaluations are not consistently applied across all programs.	Course evaluations are now consistently applied across all programs.

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Moving Toward Target
Advanced Preparation	Moving Toward Target

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

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

Exhibit List
Meeting Attendees

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).

SC State Addendum

See **Attachment** panel below.