

# Comprehensive Program Review—M.Ed. in Secondary Math Education

## A. Mission

### A.1 Department Mission and Relation to the University and System Missions

As a member of the University System of Georgia, Augusta State University (ASU) is the primary public institution of higher learning in the state's second largest city. The university is well known for its dedication to expanding educational opportunities for people of all ages and backgrounds, with a special emphasis on service to Georgians in the Central Savannah River Area. The mission of the Department of Teacher Development at August State University is to prepare educators with the knowledge and skills required to bring students of diverse backgrounds to high levels of academic achievement, to serve the community of educators in the CSRA through collaborative initiatives, to contribute to the knowledge base of the education profession with scholarship that focuses on best practices in the classroom and teacher leadership.

The M.Ed. at Augusta State University is a thirty-six hour degree and utilizes a professional development school network of thirty-seven public schools in the Central Savannah River Area. Utilizing a selected group of "master" teachers, pre-service educators experience over nine hundred hours of face-to-face work with public school students in the certification area. These master teachers work closely with the faculty at ASU to provide the most realistic of preparation processes and serve as advisors to our undergraduate and graduate programs. Many of these master teachers have received their undergraduate and graduate degrees from ASU. Superintendents and principals indicate that as a result, first year ASU students' function in the classroom like much more experienced teachers. As a result, almost all ASU students, who desire employment, have found positions in the public schools of the CSRA.

The overarching theme of the College of Education's graduate program at Augusta State University is *Understanding for Teaching and Teaching for Understanding*. The theme reflects the following propositions: 1) that understanding - meaningful knowing - is pivotal to effective teaching, 2) that understanding for teaching is a distinctive type of such meaningful knowing that must be cultivated if teachers are to succeed at helping students learn, and 3) that teaching for understanding is represented in distinctive, deliberately planned approaches to instruction and assessment. The ten INTASC principles are used as the basis for College of Education's Conceptual Framework (CFP) (see Appendix A) for determining theme, course and curriculum objectives and performance assessment indicators. These ten principles were derived from the five core principles of NBPTS standards (see appendix B). The Teacher Development Department refined the five NBPTS standards by turning these standards into twelve questions labeled Teaching for Understanding (see Appendix C). In most instances, the revised courses in the masters degree will reflect both sets of criteria. In courses dealing with specific subject matter, the National Standards and Georgia Quality Core Curriculum Standards in that content area are used as the framework for considering the skills and understandings to be addressed with young adolescents. Performance assessments in all graduate education courses are grounded in these principles and standards.

The graduate Secondary Math preparation program is based on the INTASC standards (CFPs) in Department of Teacher Development and Teaching for Understanding (NBPTS) questions. All faculty teaching EDTD graduate courses have keyed their course objectives and assessment tasks to the INTASC standards (CFPs) and NBPTS standards (TfU). Graduate papers, essays, and thematic units are evaluated based on these standards using a rubric scale of 1-4.

## **A.2 Needs of Students**

The purposes and goals of Augusta State University dictate all course offerings. For example, one of its purposes is to provide quality graduate education programs that meet the needs of the citizens of the CSRA. Graduate programs in the College of Education are custom-designed and targeted for the needs of the citizens of the CSRA. The current programs began in 1995 at Augusta State University. During that time, the College of Education was in the process of NCATE accreditation. At the same time the university was preparing to move to the semester system. These changes coincided with conversations being held between faculty, local school personnel and pre-service teachers about shortcomings in the Secondary Math pre-service and graduate teacher preparation. Concerns emerged in several areas such as the need for more content/pedagogy courses in the areas of mathematics, science, and social studies, more relevant research and theory in the Secondary Math and advanced instructional practices directed toward the middle level.

The conversations with PDS partners brought out the need for more coherence in the Augusta State University's graduate teacher preparation programs' sequencing of courses. The changes were approved in May of 2003. Under the old program, the core was focused on Advanced Educational Psychology and Designs and Methodologies of Educational Research rather than teaching for understanding and the knowledge, dispositions and performances required to meet NCATE and INTASC standards. This lack of continuity interfered with teaching for understanding research. The current research and theory requirements were realigned to address knowledge, dispositions and performances required for accreditation. The new program tries to correct this problem by requiring courses to be taken in a more orderly fashion in order to address NCTM standards and NCATE standards of the specific subjects. The revised courses try to provide a balance between theory and classroom application. The outcome should be a graduate program focused on best practice and research for the classroom. Since the revised program was just implemented in May of 2003, the M.Ed. program does not have performance data collected but the process for data collection has been established. The new program has set up a performance matrix for assessing Conceptual Framework Principles (CFPs) and Teaching for Understanding (TfU) standards but does not have a database available over several semesters nor a graduate student who has completed the entire degree under the new program revisions. The new course sequence has begun this Summer with EDTD 6012 and EDTD 6010 this Fall (see Appendix D for Program of Studies). A masters portfolio is being developed as part of the requirements for the revised masters degree. The products from the various courses will be incorporated by the graduate students into their masters portfolio. This portfolio can be utilized for applying to be nationally board certified on the middle level as well as recognition by school district and state committees. It is organized around the twelve questions that are integrated into the courses (see Appendix C)

The Secondary Math graduate program prepares experienced teachers to refine their knowledge, dispositions and performances to teach primarily in grades 7-12. This corresponds to the certification offered by the state of Georgia (7-12). Augusta State University graduates approximately one masters candidate each year in Secondary Math Education. All candidates are required to complete a minimum of 36 hours. (see Appendix D for program of studies).

## **A.3 Demand for Graduates**

Satisfaction of the immediate demands for increased numbers of graduate candidates in our service area center on (1) improving our local PDS network, (2) providing graduate courses for Georgia TAPP students seeking initial certification, and (3) addressing the mandates of the recently passed No Child Left Behind Act.

### *Improving our Local PDS Network*

In part, the overall improvement in and demand for graduate programs is strongly correlated to collaboration with school personnel through our Professional Development School (PDS) initiative. The following narrative attempts to provide a strong argument and rationale for the preparation of mentoring master teachers who are able to gain a greater understanding of their ever expanding leadership role in the teaching profession through matriculation and graduation in our M.Ed. Secondary Math program.

The PDS initiative is an emergent collaborative of five county school districts and Augusta State University. The five school districts, Burke, Columbia, McDuffie, Jefferson, and Richmond Counties (see Appendix G) represent considerable diversity in size, socio-economic characteristics, social and cultural variety, and student achievement. They are each a part of the cohort of 37 Professional Development Schools (PDS). The purposes of the Professional Development School initiative are to 1) create a sustainable network of schools through which the schools, as full collaborating partners with the university, prepare new teachers; 2) support teaching practices that promote and assist all students achieving to high standards; 3) sustain teaching excellence through experienced teachers' and university faculty members' continued professional development. The Professional Development School initiative seeks to cultivate a network of energetic learning communities, provide articulation across the academic and lab components of the educator preparation curriculum, and foster a shared commitment to educational excellence across institutional boundaries.

As a result of the conversations among PDS collaborators, new field components were implemented for undergraduate programs. Changes included consolidating the lab time, shifting the responsibility of supervision from university faculty to teachers in the PDS, and narrowing lab sites to the Secondary Math PDS schools. These changes created a closer working relationship between the university and PDS schools. The new field component was a dramatic departure from the traditional lab experience at Augusta State University. Under the old system, students juggled course work and lab responsibilities throughout the duration of the course. Now the time is divided between course work and lab time. Students now spend eight weeks in course work with no lab time followed by five weeks, six hours a day five days a week, in the field with no class meetings. The two weeks after the field experience are spent in class tying the two experiences together. Other changes include the supervision and coordination of the lab experience. The roles of lab teachers and University faculty have changed. The classroom teacher has more responsibility for supervision and feedback. Coordination of the experience is now shared between the University faculty and a building level coordinator chosen by the PDS. These two coordinate the experience and facilitate communication among the participants. The shift in coordination and supervision to a coaching and mentoring model has had a direct impact on supervision and leadership in our graduate programs. PDS personnel also helped to develop, pilot, and evaluate lab task and evaluation instruments. Conversations have led to more realistic lab task with a building of responsibilities across lab experiences. Evaluation materials have been developed to assist students to gain an awareness of areas of strength to build on and areas of weakness for improvement. Lab teachers, university faculty, and lab students evaluate these tasks and evaluation instruments, as well as the participants involved, for needed improvements. The design and development of instruments has strengthened the understanding of the relationship among research, evaluation and the impact on teaching and learning in the classroom.

The changes in field placements, tasks, and structure have led to a more cohesive and robust experience for the pre-service teachers. Lab students are able to observe reflect upon instructional progress across five weeks for one group of Secondary Math students instead of two hours a week in several different locations. This arrangement enables students to acquire

more in depth knowledge of the Secondary Math students, lab teacher and the class routine. Lab students are able to plan for and teach the actual curriculum of the lab class instead of imposing a possibly irrelevant lesson on students. They spend their time actively engaged with young adolescents instead of driving to and from the university and lab site. The pre-service teachers are able to make connection between the course work at the university and the “real” world at the lab site; a desirable outcome for all involved. The PDS partners in this collaboration hold themselves accountable, and are accountable to the public for maintaining high standards. The result is modeling teaching for understanding and better articulation in undergraduate and graduate programs. The relationship of the master teacher to undergraduate student and university coordinator has aided the development of our M.Ed. programs, increased communication between university coordinators and has resulted in several middle level teachers enrolling in the masters program.

There are differing roles played by teachers and administrators in the Professional Development Schools. Increased collaboration has resulted in a more meaningful program for pre-service students and expanded the role of school personnel in undergraduate and graduate programs. Roles such as lab teacher, master teacher, and building coordinator help facilitate the placing, mentoring, and evaluation of university pre-service teachers. Each of the participants evaluates each role during each semester. The data gathered is used to make constant improvements to the education of each member in the learning community as well as improve our undergraduate and graduate programs.

Each semester students are paired with lab teachers or master teachers in the PDS. These teachers act as mentors to the students, guiding, coaching and instructing each student while providing critical feedback and evaluation. The lab and master teachers set goals with the students and provide activities and feedback related to achieving the goals within the instructional setting. At the end of each field experience, the university student evaluates the lab or master teacher. These evaluations are aggregated across the PDS sites and evaluated for areas that need improvement. The data is shared with building coordinators and administrators to be disseminated to the rest of the faculty at the PDS sites.

Coordination of the lab experience is now shared between the university coordinator and a building level coordinator chosen by the PDS. These two coordinate the experience and facilitate communication among the participants. Each PDS has internally selected a building coordinator (for the most part a master teacher) who serves as the chief communication link between the PDS and the university. The pre-service teachers, lab teachers and building administrator at the end of each lab experience, evaluate each building coordinator and university coordinator.

The performance of master teachers, building coordinators, and university coordinators, in their roles working with each other and apprentice students, are assessed each semester using parallel assessment instruments. As appropriate, items on these instruments are keyed to the NBPTS guiding principles. All participants complete these assessment instruments each semester. These data figure into annual evaluation of university faculty. The data on master teachers and building coordinators are shared through the university coordinators with the building coordinators and master teachers for any appropriate performance improvements. These changing roles among master teachers, university supervisors have helped to shape and guide the revisions in the M.Ed. programs.

In order to insure quality and continual improvement, all aspects of the PDS are evaluated and revised continually. At the PDS schools, individual teachers, coordinators, and administrators are evaluated as well as a self-evaluation of the entire school. Both the students and teachers from the PDS evaluate the university faculty. All participants evaluate the overall

teacher preparation programs. Assessments are conducted multiple times during each year to provide feedback to identify areas in need of improvement.

The PDS is evaluated each semester by a comprehensive survey of all participants' (program students, PDS teachers, administrators, building coordinators) perceptions of its effectiveness. Having compiled each succeeding semester of survey data, participants are consistently positive in their assessments of the effectiveness of PDS in improving educator preparation and in their assessment that PDS benefits teachers professionally and the schools themselves.

All 37 Building Coordinators and University Coordinators (see Appendix H for listings) meet together twice each semester at the university. These meetings set the professional development agenda for the academic year; review perceptual survey data and the annual evaluation report; plan for changes in the educator preparation programs; review and confirm placements of educator preparation students. During these day-long meetings, some portion of the schedule is set aside for grade alike meetings. This strategy accommodates distinctions across the elementary, middle grades, and secondary PDSs. Often times these meetings generate appropriately tailored implementation strategies for an idea to which all the PDSs have committed (e.g., master teacher selection/review; field experience rotations). These meetings also accommodate the identification, by the grade alike groups, of issues or concerns they would like addressed through the PDS.

Just as the purposes and standards for developing the PDS have been grounded in the NCATE PDS Standards, so has the PDS evaluation framework. A self-evaluation using the NCATE Draft Standards is used by each PDS to organize their documentation of activities, strategies and practices. Once compiled these data served as the basis for our overall self-evaluation. The procedure has allowed us to gauge progress in the initiative against a relatively constant set of benchmarks. It has helped ASU to reconceptualize our undergraduate and graduate programs.

Collecting assessment data does not in and of itself make an institution accountable. The NCATE standards state that PDS partners need to collaboratively develop assessments, collect information, and use results to systematically examine their practices. The ongoing development of the PDS at Augusta State University has been built on the use of assessment data. Looking at the multiple evaluations each semester and across time has allowed the PDS to refine the learning community continuously over the past five years. These changes began with the complete redesign of the capstone experience of student teaching. Further changes built on assessment data included changing the types and sequence of course work, redesigning the field experiences leading up to student teaching, the creation and refinement of evaluation tools, revising our graduate programs, and the redefining of roles that enable the PDS to function smoothly. Finally, the result has been to build a better model of teaching for understanding between public schools and ASU in the undergraduate and graduate programs.

#### *Providing graduate courses for Georgia TAPP students*

In addition to our PDS network's demand for preparing a new generation of teacher leaders, our graduate programs are now strategically positioned to prepare teachers seeking alternative certification through Georgia TAPP. Georgia TAPP is an acronym for The Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program. Georgia TAPP is an alternative preparation route toward educator certification. It is utilized by the State of Georgia to help reduce Georgia's teacher shortage. It enables individuals with a bachelor's degree or higher (who meet eligibility requirements for the program) to teach in Georgia's schools. Beginning in Summer 2004 our graduate enrollment will significantly increase because we are allowing Secondary Math and Secondary Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (TAPP) students to earn graduate credit for

the courses requisite for their certification. These specific graduate content/pedagogy courses have been approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. The earned graduate credit will increase the likelihood of these TAPP students completing our M.Ed. in Secondary Math program.

Another factor that will significantly impact the demand for increased teacher is the recently passed No Child Left Behind Act. Passed by an overwhelming majority in Congress in 2001 and signed into law by President Bush on January 8, 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act represents the most sweeping change to the Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA) since it was enacted in 1965. Building upon a foundation of accountability for improving student achievement, increased flexibility and local control, expanded parental options, and data-driven, research-informed instruction, No Child Left Behind aims to achieve a lofty goal that no society has ever attempted: a quality education for all of our students by the 2013-2014 school year. To meet the 100% proficiency goal, each state must define Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), a set of performance goals that establishes the minimum levels of improvement, based on student performance on state standardized tests, that schools, local education agencies, and the State as a whole must achieve within time frames specified in law.

#### *Addressing the mandates of No Child Left Behind*

Under No Child Left Behind, teachers will have the training and resources they need to teach effectively; parents will have unprecedented options and resources for helping their children; schools will have the information they need to strengthen their weaknesses and put into practice methods and strategies backed by sound, scientific research; and systems will have greater flexibility in the use of federal education funds. No Child Left Behind is a law that operates on one basic assumption: that every child--regardless of income, gender, race, ethnicity, or disability--can learn, and that every child deserves to learn. It is the belief that no child should be left behind, and that all of our efforts toward reforming our schools must be focused on ensuring that student achievement and learning improve.

Even though our undergraduate initial certification program in Secondary Math education (B.S. Ed.) does an outstanding job preparing beginning teachers, the training and resources needed to teach effectively under No Child Left Behind will increase the demand for graduate programs deliberately designed to increase achievement for all students. Our recently developed M.Ed. in Secondary Math program is committed to excellence in the preparation of teachers' participation in relevant research and other scholarly activities leading to the advancement of knowledge and good practice in the total learning and schooling process of children, and a service mission which provides leadership in the development and dissemination of relevant knowledge to address the wide-range of challenges faced by students, parents, and teachers.

## **B. Teaching, Learning, Research and Scholarship, and Service**

### **B.1 Students**

#### **B.1.a M.Ed. in Secondary Math Majors and Graduates**

According to the Augusta State University Office of Institutional Research, the average M.Ed. in Secondary Math major is 32 years old, earned an undergraduate GPA of 3.0, and scored 465 and 425 (math and verbal) on the GRE.

### B.1.b Enrollments and Certificates Awarded

Table 1.1 summarizes graduation totals by academic year

	2001	2002	2003
M.Ed. in Math	0	2	0
Percent of ASU Masters Total		1.8	

Table 1.2 summarizes enrollments for and credit hours generated by M.Ed. in Secondary Math majors for academic years 2000-2001 through 2002-2004.

	2001	2002	2003
Enrollment	6	11	4
Credit Hours	86	156	56

### B.1.c Student Needs and Learning Outcomes

The overarching theme of the College of Education's graduate program at Augusta State University is *Understanding for Teaching and Teaching for Understanding*. The theme reflects the following propositions: 1) that understanding - meaningful knowing - is pivotal to effective teaching, 2) that understanding for teaching is a distinctive type of such meaningful knowing that must be cultivated if teachers are to succeed at helping students learn, and 3) that teaching for understanding is represented in distinctive, deliberately planned approaches to instruction and assessment. The ten INTASC principles are used as the basis for College of Education's Conceptual Framework (CFP) (see Appendix A) for determining course and curriculum objectives and performance assessment indicators. These ten principles were derived from the five core principles of NBPTS standards (see appendix B). The Teacher Development Department refined the five NBPTS standards by turning these standards into twelve questions labeled Teaching for Understanding (see Appendix C). In most instances, the revised courses in the masters degree will reflect both sets of criteria. In courses dealing with specific subject matter, the National Standards and Georgia Quality Core Curriculum Standards in that content area are used as the framework for considering the skills and understandings to be addressed with young adolescents and form the basis for masters portfolio.

The following guiding questions for discussion and essays form the conceptual and analytical basis in the graduate courses for TEACHING FOR UNDERSTANDING and will serve as the organizing questions for the masters portfolio\*:

1. What does it look like, what does it entail? What are its major defining tenets? Use a subject area in which you teach to inform and ground your response. **NBPTS 1,2**
2. What theories of learning and teaching are compatible with it or foundational to it? **NBPTS 1,4**
3. How are standards-based curriculum and instruction reflective/suggestive of it; how do they support it? **NBPTS 1,2,3**
4. What approaches to curriculum design support or promote it? **NBPTS 1,2**
5. Why isn't activity based instruction adequate to the task of teaching for understanding? **NBPTS 2,3**
6. How is instructional time affected when teaching for understanding? **NBPTS 1,2**
7. How can it be best assessed? With what theories and practices of assessment is it compatible? **NBPTS 3**
8. What kind and quality of teacher knowledge does it require (subject matter, pedagogical, interpersonal, other)? **NBPTS 3**

9. Why is preparing for instruction more appropriate to teaching for understanding than is planning for instruction? What would change for you as a teacher, when preparing rather than planning? **NBPTS 4,5**

10. What does research on teaching tell us about the effectiveness of teaching for understanding and valid/reliable methods of assessing learning for understanding? **NBPTS 1,2,4**

11. Create a research design through which you could test and assess how well you are teaching for understanding. **NBPTS 1,2,4**

12. What metaphor best captures your sense of what teaching for understanding is? **NBPTS 1,2,3,4,5**

\*it always refers to Teaching for Understanding.

Throughout the course work beginning with EDTD 6010 Teaching for Understanding, culminating with EDTD 6909 Teacher Development Capstone Seminar, students will be able to synthesize their master's level program within the framework of Teaching for Understanding questions. Students will be able to write cogently and coherently about the following elements of their programs (learning theory, research design and findings, curriculum, instruction, content, assessment), relating them to the tenets of Teaching for Understanding. Students will be able to demonstrate through a masters portfolio how specific written essays, units and course assignments are integrated over the master's degree program in order to illustrate their degree of understanding and implementing principles of Teaching for Understanding. A four point rating scale will be employed as follows: 4 = exemplary level - level of excellence/mastery, 3 = Proficient level - level of competence, 2 = in progress level - approaching competence, 1 = unsatisfactory level - not competent at this time.

Once students are admitted to one of the graduate degree programs, they are expected to attend each semester. If students fail to enroll for a period of two consecutive semesters, they must reapply for admission. Upon readmission, the student will be subject to all admission requirements in effect at that time.

Students are fully admitted to all masters of education programs in the College of Education upon meeting the following minimum admission criteria:

1. An undergraduate degree from an accredited college or university in the proposed field of study or a closely related field.
2. A valid teaching certificate or license.
3. A minimum of two years of full-time teaching experience or new teacher under contract.
4. A grade point average of at least 2.75 (4.0 scale) on all previous course work. In the Secondary Math, middle school, and secondary education programs, a grade point average of at least 3.0 (4.0 scale) on all previous course work is required.
5. A minimum score of 425 on the Verbal and 465 on the Quantitative or 495 on the Analytical sub-tests of the Graduate Record Examination or a score of at least 44 on the Millers Analogies Test.

Students who do not meet one or more of the requirements for regular admission to the masters of education degree may be admitted on a provisional basis while these deficiencies are being addressed. Provisional admission allows the student to enroll in only nine semester hours of graduate work. The student must earn a grade of "B" or better in each of these courses and meet the other requirements for full admission. Students who fail to earn a "B" or better in the initial nine hours of course work or are unable to meet the other deficiencies will not be allowed to enroll in the graduate program. Students who are admitted provisionally and fail to meet the appropriate requirements will be dropped from the graduate program and must meet all

requirements for regular admission in order to be readmitted. In order to be admitted provisionally, the student must:

1. Hold a valid teaching certificate (for Secondary Math, Mathematics, Social Sciences, and History the teaching certificate must be in the proposed field of study).
2. A minimum of two years of full-time teaching experience or new teacher under contract.
3. Possess a grade point average of at least 2.5 (4.0 scale) on all previous course work.
4. Have earned a minimum score of 400 on the Verbal and 435 on the Quantitative or 465 on the Analytical sub-tests of the Graduate Record Examination or a score of at least 35 on the Millers/Analogies Test.

Candidates must be admitted to M.Ed. in Secondary Math Education in order to enroll in these courses. The Grade Point Average for admission to Teacher Education is calculated using all course work in the education preparation program attempted by the candidate. Once the graduate student has the completed twenty-one semester hours of successful graduate work, they are eligible to seek admission to candidacy in the masters degree. In concert with the advisor, the application form includes a proposed plan of study to be completed, the anticipated semester scheduled completion and the Faculty Committee for reviewing the masters portfolio (see Appendix F).

In order to graduate from the old M. Ed. program, the student had to successfully complete a written comprehensive examination. Under the revised program, Secondary Math majors, take the Capstone course and submit a masters portfolio to meet the exit requirements for the degree. Several changes in the overall graduate program design were collaboratively made overtime. Changes to the courses were made to better address the knowledge, dispositions and performance standards required by NCTM. As part of the graduation requirement under the revised M.Ed., students are to submit a masters portfolio to in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation (see Appendix C for the twelve questions to be addressed.).

Since the master's program was just implemented in May of 2003, we have will have preliminary data from the courses offered this Fall. It will be impossible to show a master's degree student who has completed this program.

#### **B.1.d** *Success of Graduates*

Praxis II results and reports from school districts are used to measure success in meeting student needs. 100% of our graduates take and successfully pass the PRAXIS II examination in their area of specialty. School districts report high levels of satisfaction with the graduates employed by them.

## **B.2 Faculty and Staff**

### **B.2.a Faculty and Qualifications**

The Department of Teacher Development at Augusta State University is composed of well-qualified professionals representing diverse fields of expertise, interests, and accomplishments. Teacher Development is supported by academicians with a vast array of skills necessary to 1) fulfill the mission of the institution, 2) provide students with experiential opportunities necessary for cultivating effective teachers, and 3) advance the professions within which they are members. Teacher Development employs professionals from accredited institutions who are qualified in their field of expertise and exhibit a propensity for community service as well as professional growth and development. Standards set forth by the University System of Georgia ensure equitable hiring practices and enable the COE to employ a systematic approach to advertising, interviewing, and hiring only those individuals who provide solid

evidence relative to available faculty positions. Characteristics of potential faculty include 1) terminal degrees within specific content areas, 2) certification credentials as warranted, and 3) evidence of scholarship, professionalism, and dedication. One of the most important criteria for hiring is the requirement that individuals must have at least three years of teaching experience within a public school system. Twenty-nine faculty members comprise the COE (10 in Clinical and Professional Studies, 9 in Kinesiology and Health Science, and 9 in Teacher Development). The vast majority of members (73%) hold terminal degrees with 90% of full-time faculty residing at the doctoral level. Each member represents the highest level of quality within their chosen field as exemplified by their ability to 1) effectively guide the student learning process, 2) offer support to communal entities, and 3) advance their profession through professional research and development. The level of quality among faculty within the COE is enriched through professional development, continuing education and credentialing, and scholarship.

The department of Teacher Development currently employs 9 full-time faculty members who share teaching responsibilities in the M.Ed. in Secondary Math. The composition of the current full-time Teacher Development faculty is provided in table 2.1 below:

Table 2.1 Full-Time Teacher Development Faculty, Fall 2003

<b>Name</b>	<b>Highest Degree</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Tenured</b>
Dianna Crislip	M.Ed.	Assistant Professor	No
Gordon Eisenman	Ed.D.	Associate Professor	Yes
Charles Jenks	Ed.D.	Associate Professor	Yes
Ronnie Harrison	M.Ed.	Assistant Professor	No
Emam Hoosain	Ph.D.	Assistant Professor	Yes
Beth Pendergraft	Ed.S.	Assistant Professor	No
Barry Thompson	Ph.D.	Associate Professor	Yes
Mark Warner	Ed.D.	Associate Professor	Yes
Judi Wilson	Ed.D.	Assistant Professor	No

The department also employs two part-time instructors, Fred Splittgerber, Ph.D. and Cindy Beatty, Ed.S. All faculty members teaching in the M.Ed. in Secondary Math program meet regional SACS accreditation requirements as well as the national standards provided by the National Middle School Association.

All full-time faculty are evaluated annually via the Faculty Role Model. The Faculty Role Model defines the criteria against which the performance of each faculty member is measured. The criteria within the three role categories (teaching, service, professional development and achievement) are consistent with the purpose and goals of the institution as defined in the university mission statement and strategic plan. In conjunction with the chair, faculty develop goals for the year based on the criteria. Faculty provide the department chair with a copy of their goals each year and, at the end of the year, a year-end report on the fulfillment of the goals. Part-time faculty are evaluated by the chairs after the first semester of teaching with subsequent evaluations at periodic intervals. In addition to the annual evaluations, untenured faculty are reviewed after completing two-and-a-half years of full-time service. Policies establishing the basis of the review and reporting and follow-up are provided in the *Faculty Manual*. All tenured faculty go through a post-tenure review every five years. Both the pre-tenure and post-tenure review processes provide for feedback and follow-up actions if deemed necessary. The flexibility of the Faculty Role Model provides opportunities for the chair and faculty member to address any identified problem areas in the annual evaluation of faculty via the allocation of weights to the three areas (teaching, service, professional development and achievement) and negotiated goals for the next year.

### **B.2.b Student/Faculty Ratios and Average Class Sizes**

Average class sizes in our graduate programs range from 10-30 students largely dependent upon whether or not the course is shared by other graduate programs in the College of Education. For example, on the one hand courses devoted to either Best Practices in Mathematics (EDTD 6241) or Research in Mathematics (EDTD 6141) are usually only chosen by Mathematics concentration majors. On the other hand, courses such as Instructional Technology Management (EDTD 6011) and Quantitative research (EDUC 6021) are shared by students earning graduate degrees offered throughout the College of Education.

### **B.3 Facilities**

#### **B.3.a Classroom Facilities and Instructional Technology**

At the time of this report, the department of Teacher Development is currently sharing the facilities in Butler Hall with the Department of Clinical and Professional Studies. The facilities include one conference/seminar room, a computer lab with 22 stations equipped with Pentium IV Dell computers, 9 classrooms, a lecture style auditorium, and an internet café including 6 computer stations and several tables for quiet study. Each classroom is equipped with an overhead projector, screen, and chalkboards. Computer presentation carts can be scheduled on a regular basis, set up and delivered by University Media Services. The department of Teacher Development is scheduled to move to the newly constructed University Hall where the condition of classroom equipment is state of the art. These new facilities include a Wolfvision VZ-8 overhead projector, projection of the Pentium 4 Gateway screen on demand, laptop network connections, as well as video and dvd service.

Table 3.1 New Classroom Resources

<b>Building</b>	<b>Room</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Description</b>
University Hall	131	49	Computer lab 24 hour
University Hall	162	24	Computer Lab GSAMs
University Hall	170	120	Lecture Room
University Hall	216	30	Classroom
University Hall	219	30	Classroom
University Hall	220	45	Classroom
University Hall	221	60	Classroom
University Hall	223	30	Teaching Computer
University Hall	224	60	Classroom
University Hall	234	28	Writing Lab
University Hall	239	30	Writing Classroom
University Hall	241	45	Larger Tablets
University Hall	242	48	Classroom
University Hall	243	48	Classroom
University Hall	245	30	Writing Classroom
University Hall	246	46	Chairs at Tables
University Hall	247	60	Tiered not fixed
University Hall	248	60	Tiered not fixed
University Hall	249	30	Classroom
University Hall	314	30	Classroom

University Hall	326	60	Classroom
University Hall	327	46	Chairs at Tables
University Hall	328	45	Large tablet arm chairs
University Hall	329	60	Classroom
University Hall	330	45	Classroom
University Hall	347	45	Large Tablet Arm Chairs
University Hall	348	48	Classroom
University Hall	349	48	Classroom
University Hall	350	48	Classroom
University Hall	352	45	Classroom
University Hall	353	46	Chairs at tables
University Hall	354	60	Tiered not fixed
University Hall	355	30	Chairs at tables
University Hall	356	46	Chairs at tables
University Hall	357	30	TD Teaching Lab-large tables
University Hall	381	30	Classroom

Our classrooms and classroom equipment conform to the standards and guidelines set forth by accrediting agencies that strongly support teachers creating new learning environments that are student centered, provide multi-sensory stimulation, incorporate multimedia presentations, encourage collaborative work through inquiry based information exchange, and promote critical thinking and informed decision making as applied to an authentic, real world context. M.Ed. students who are currently teaching in field need to experience the benefits of a physical environment that lends itself to gaining a greater understanding of designing educational settings that enable their current and prospective students to achieve to high academic standards by engendering multiple intelligences in combination with constructivist learning practices.

### **B.3.b Computer Labs**

University Hall has a 24 hour computer lab, a GSAMS computer lab, and a teaching computer lab. Graduate students are able to use their user id and password to log on to any networked computer on campus. Upon admission to ASU, each student receives an email address and web space used to establish and maintain an electronic portfolio designed to capture exemplars of assessments completed for course requirements during each student's course of study. The 24 hour computer lab enables students to work on projects at their own convenience. Georgia's Statewide Academic & Medical System (GSAMS) is one of the world's largest two-way interactive H.320 video networks, providing citizens throughout the state access to resources without the restrictions of time or distance. Approximately 400 sites ranging from elementary schools to rural hospitals have held more than 120,000 conferences since GSAMS' inception in 1992. Our teaching computer lab is specifically engineered to allow our Graduate students enrolled in EDTD 6011 to earn course credit for InTech training. EDTD 6011 focuses on advancing a learner's systematic, progressive migration to a student centered, technology empowered classroom. The central theme is integrating technology into the curriculum. All Georgia Technology Standards for Educators adopted from ISTE NETS Standards are embedded within the overall framework of the course and its various requirements.

### **B.3.c Faculty Offices and Departmental Equipment**

University Hall has more than adequate office space allotted to faculty. There are fifteen offices equipped with file cabinets, telephones, and desks appropriate for desktop computer use. Currently each faculty member has been provided with a Gateway Desktop computer with a Pentium 3 chip or better, a Diamondtron 17 inch monitor and a Hewlett Packard Deskjet Printer.

The University Hall Floor Plan for Teacher Development also includes a conference room, a faculty workroom, an AV storage facility, a reception area, and a conference room.

#### **B.3.d Resources**

Our current equipment and resources appear adequate to support our mission in the immediate future. We currently try to update our faculty and staff workstations every three years, as the department usually has the money in the budget for three to four computers per academic year.

#### **B.3.e Non-Instructional Technical Support**

Instructional Technology Services (ITS) provides outstanding technical support. Office workstations are repaired immediately upon report. Faculty and student help desks may be accessed by telephone and technicians are extremely knowledgeable and helpful. ITS staff have the capability of accessing and controlling an individual's computer and diagnosing the difficulty immediately. Students may call the helpdesk from school or home when accessing the ASU PIPELINE. Instruction on a variety of software programs are available to faculty and staff so that skills may be updated as software changes. A Faculty Development Institute provides grants for faculty to upgrade their technology skills. The grants typically include funding for software or hardware to enable the faculty member can implement a technology improvement plan.

Additional non-instructional technical support is provided by the Training Triad. The Training Triad is a collaborative effort among the trainers from Computer Services, Media Services, and Reese Library. It was formed to increase communication among the trainers, help reduce redundancies, share resources, and promote common interests. One recent effort on the part of the Training Triad has led to the establishment of the Faculty and Staff Training and Development Center located in Room 305 of Reese Library. This center is split into two areas, a training classroom designed for small-group training with state-of-the-art equipment, and a development area designed for trainer collaboration and one-on-one training with faculty or staff. The development area, when completed, will include capabilities for video and graphic editing, and campus general software. Costs for the equipment, software, and renovations to the room have been shared among the Triad members.

A significant leader in Triad activities is Computer Service's Instructional Services section, whose sole mission is assisting faculty with pedagogically sound infusion of technology into the curriculum. Furthermore, Media Services has an on-line instructional request form that faculty or students may use to request an instructional class. The instruction is coordinated by the Instructional Specialist. Media Services offers classes in scanning and Web design, introduction to Powerpoint, videotape editing, and Media Services orientation.

#### **B.3.f Library**

The Reese Library provides excellent support to the department, students and faculty. Staff are knowledgeable, helpful, and courteous. Materials placed on reserve by faculty are easily accessible to students. Students may request help with research, internet access, use of the databases, how to find materials in the stacks or any other information-gathering question, and will receive immediate assistance. A current subscription to Educational Resources Information Center (**ERIC**) documents on microfiche allows students and staff to conduct research in as much depth as desired. Current and archived serials are available in the stacks or on GALILEO, the online research service. Faculty are asked for input on materials on which to spend end of the year funds, if available. Media Services, a function of the Library, provides audio-visual equipment, a video library, and technical assistance to students and faculty. The Reese Library has provided the College of Education with books and serials totaling the following amounts:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Books</b>	<b>Serials</b>
2001/02	\$1192	\$36300
2002/03	500	45241
2003/04	7760	37395

### **B.3.g. Infrastructure**

The mission of the Department of Teacher Development and the M.Ed. in Secondary Math program is enhanced by a number of support units at Augusta State University in addition to the Reese Library, Media Services and Instructional Technology Services mentioned above. The College of Education Curriculum Center provides reference and classroom educational materials to be checked out by students and faculty. The University Bookstore is extremely helpful and cooperative in ordering texts for students, as well as desk copies and software for faculty. Curriculum packets, prepared by faculty, are copied and packaged for distribution to students. The University Copy Center also prepares materials when large numbers of copies are necessary. The Department of Public Safety is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to ensure that faculty and students have safe access to buildings, classrooms, offices, and their personal vehicles. The Office of the Dean of the College of Education oversees graduate admissions and processes applications for graduate school. The Director of Teacher Education and the Certification Officer coordinate the Teacher Alternative Preparation Program which has recently increased the demand for graduate courses since the Georgia Professional Standards Commission accepts some graduate course credit to meet Clear Renewable Certification requirements.

## **B.4 Curriculum**

### **B.4.a Coherence**

All curricular offerings are clearly and accurately described in published materials. The *Augusta State University Catalog* contains a brief description of all courses offered for graduate credit. Each semester, a listing is published of course offerings, times, credits, instructors, and location for each course. The graduate curricular offerings at Augusta State University are directly related to the goals of the institution and to the degree program. In addition, the curriculum is specialized for the particular degree program being sought by the student.

While the published catalog remains an excellent guide to all programs, some departments have supplemented their published materials to inform students of graduate curricula. For example, Teacher Development publishes an online Graduate Programs brochure as well as student advising sheets. An informational handbook for graduate students is currently in the final stages of preparation and scheduled for publication in Spring 2004.

### **B.4.b Currency**

The purposes and goals of Augusta State University dictate all course offerings. For example, one of its purposes is to provide quality graduate education programs that meet the needs of the citizens of the CSRA. Graduate programs in the College of Education are custom-designed and targeted for the needs of the citizens of the CSRA. The current programs began in 1995 at Augusta State University. During that time, the College of Education was in the process of NCATE accreditation. At the same time the university was preparing to move to the semester system. These changes coincided with conversations being held between faculty, local school personnel and pre-service teachers about shortcomings in the Secondary Math pre-service and graduate teacher preparation. Concerns emerged in several areas such as the need for more content/pedagogy courses in the areas of mathematics, science, and social studies, more

relevant research and theory in the Secondary Math and advanced instructional practices directed toward the middle level.

The conversations with PDS partners brought out the need for more coherence in the Augusta State University's graduate teacher preparation programs' sequencing of courses. The changes were approved in May of 2003. Under the old program, the core was focused on Advanced Educational Psychology and Designs and Methodologies of Educational Research rather than teaching for understanding and the knowledge, dispositions and performances required to meet NCATE and INTASC standards. This lack of continuity interfered with teaching for understanding research. The current research and theory requirements were realigned to address knowledge, dispositions and performances required for accreditation. The new program tries to correct this problem by requiring courses to be taken in a more orderly fashion in order to address NCTM standards and NCATE standards of the specific subjects. The revised courses try to provide a balance between theory and classroom application. The outcome should be a graduate program focused on best practice and research for the classroom. Since the revised program was just implemented in May of 2003, the M.Ed. program does not have performance data collected but the process for data collection has been established. The new program has set up a performance matrix for assessing Conceptual Framework Principles (CFPs) and Teaching for Understanding (TfU) standards but does not have a database available over several semesters nor a graduate student who has completed the entire degree under the new program revisions. The new course sequence has begun this Summer with EDTD 6012 and EDTD 6010 this Fall (see Appendix D for Program of Studies). A masters portfolio is being developed as part of the requirements for the revised masters degree. The products from the various courses will be incorporated by the graduate students into their masters portfolio. This portfolio can be utilized for applying to be nationally board certified on the middle level as well as recognition by school district and state committees. It is organized around the twelve questions that are integrated into the courses (see Appendix C)

The Secondary Math graduate program prepares experienced teachers to refine their knowledge, dispositions and performances to teach primarily in grades 6-8. This corresponds to the certification offered by the state of Georgia (4-8). Currently, the program is offered in language arts, social studies and mathematics. At this point in time, the science option is not available because graduate science content courses are not offered by ASU science faculty. Augusta State University graduates approximately two masters candidates each year in Secondary Math Education. All candidates are required to complete a minimum of 36 hours. (see Appendix D for program of studies).

#### **B.4.c Course Sequencing, Frequency, and Enrollment Patterns**

Ideally, our M.Ed. in Secondary Math is designed for a cohort of students to be able to complete a 36 hour course of study in 18 months. For example, beginning in Summer 2004 a graduate student cohort begins its program of study by enrolling in 9 hours to complete core courses in Teaching for Understanding (EDTD 6010), Quantitative Research (EDUC 6021) and Qualitative Research (EDTD 6012). In Fall 2004, the graduate student cohort enrolls in 6 hours of course work in Secondary Concentration including choices from the following list of courses: Mathematics (EDTD 6141), Mathematics (EDTD 6241), Research in Math Education (Math 6570), Writing Across Content (EDTD 6224), Tests and Measurements (EDUC 6040), Inquiry Models of Teaching (EDTD 6362) Social Interactive Teaching (EDTD 6363), Integrated Curriculum (EDTD 6364), and Authentic Assessment (EDTD 6381), Technology I (EDTD 6011—a PSC approved INTECH course), Technology II (EDTD 6416), Qualitative Research II (EDTD 6412), Classroom Management (EDTD 6491), Multicultural Education (EDTD 6432), Current Issues (EDTD 6401), and Teaching for Understanding in Action (EDTD 6410). During

Spring 2005, the graduate student cohort enrolls in 6 -9 hours of course work in Content Emphasis including Math 6110, Math 6211, and Math 6460, In the following Summer 2005, the graduate student cohort enrolls in 9-12 hours of electives from the math department to supplement and add depth to the student's undergraduate program. In the fall of 2005 3 hours are devoted to completing the Capstone course (EDTD 6909).

See Appendix for Advising Checklist for M.Ed. in Secondary Math

## **B.5 Other Learning Activities**

### **B.5.a Advising**

The Dean's office in the College of Education is responsible for developing, implementing, and maintaining a system of academic advising of graduate students. Students are assigned an advisor upon acceptance to the M.Ed.D. in Secondary Math program, and faculty advisors are provided with information on their advisees. Throughout their education at Augusta State University, students are encouraged to meet regularly with their advisors, who assist them in monitoring their academic progress. The BANNER system provides advisors with access to up-to-date student records and allows them to print current academic summary sheets at any time, and a special graduate student tracking data base, WADM 119, has been created.

Graduate students are evaluated throughout their tenure in each program in a variety of ways. After meeting specified requirements for a program, students petitioning for admission are evaluated for candidacy. Once a student is admitted, a graduate committee (major professor, etc.) at the department level guides a student through a program. When students petition for permission to undertake a thesis or to enroll in certain internship experiences, their major professor considers many factors to aid with the decision for the preferred option. Letter grades are issued in all classroom-based courses; these are typically based on many types of evaluations of course performance, including participation, tests, papers, and presentations. Students must pass a comprehensive oral or written examination.

### **B.5.b Tutoring**

The environment at Augusta State University supports and encourages scholarly interaction between faculty and students. This interaction occurs in the classroom, during advising, clinical experiences, internships, recitals, other formal gatherings, and informal campus contacts. All faculty are required to post office hours on their office doors and to include this information in their course syllabi so that students can know when to make an appointment. Faculty meet with students on an appointment or walk-in basis, depending on the circumstances. Faculty work very closely with students on assignments and on their research projects. Media Services provides workstations that promote collaborative projects, especially curriculum development between faculty and students. Many faculty and students collaborate on research, making presentations at professional meetings.

### **B.5.c Student Organizations and Clubs**

All M.Ed. in Secondary Math candidates are strongly encouraged to become members of the National Council for the Teachers of Mathematics(NCTM). The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics is a public voice of mathematics education, providing vision, leadership, and professional development to support teachers in ensuring mathematics learning of the highest quality for all students.

In accordance with the mission, NCTM is dedicated to the following goals and the accompanying strategies for achieving them:

## **Goals**

### **Goal 1: To promote excellence in school mathematics curriculum, instruction, and assessment**

- Develop, disseminate, monitor, and update standards for curricula, instruction, and assessment in mathematics
- Promote, in all initiatives and activities, equity of opportunity in mathematics education
- Develop and disseminate information about models of exemplary curricula, instruction, and assessment in mathematics education
- Provide information and assistance to states and provinces, as well as local school districts, regarding excellence in school mathematics programs

### **Goal 2: To stimulate students' interest, achievement, and confidence in learning mathematics**

- Develop products and materials that can be used directly with students to enhance their mathematical growth
- Encourage and support students' participation in extracurricular activities related to mathematics
- Help teachers capitalize on student diversity to enrich their students' mathematics experiences both within and outside the classroom

### **Goal 3: To promote high-quality mathematics teaching and ongoing professional development throughout the preparation and careers of teachers of mathematics**

- Promote ongoing learning as a core component of teaching, seeking support for the time and resources necessary for effective professional development
- Provide a broad array of professional meetings, conferences, and seminars that promote the professional growth and knowledge of teachers of mathematics
- Provide a varied array of professional publications and other resources that address the needs and interests of teachers of mathematics and promote the implementation of the Council's Standards
- Ensure that all publications and programs of the Council reflect the diversity of the entire Council
- Promote, through standards, positions, and advocacy, excellence in the preparation and postbaccalaureate education of teachers of mathematics

- Identify and disseminate models of effective professional development for teachers of mathematics and encourage adequate support for the broad implementation of these models
- Provide programs and information for administrators, guidance counselors, and other school personnel to build their understanding and support for teachers of mathematics
- Form partnerships with Affiliates and others to help provide high-quality professional development experiences for teachers of mathematics

**Goal 4: To strengthen leadership in, and service to, mathematics education**

- Provide varied means of communication among NCTM, its members, and others in the mathematics education community
- Advocate for the involvement of representatives of all segments of the mathematics education community--including mathematics program leaders--in the development, implementation, and evaluation of curricula, instruction, and assessment at all levels, pre-K–college
- Ensure that all committees and task forces of the Council reflect the diversity of the entire Council
- Recruit potential leaders, and provide and promote leadership development opportunities for these and other leaders in mathematics education

**Goal 5: To encourage research in mathematics education and the translation of research findings into practice**

- Encourage and support programs of research and policy studies in teaching and learning mathematics, professional development, curriculum, and assessment
- Promote needed research, including the development and dissemination of a research database relating to current issues in mathematics education
- Support the translation of research into classroom practice through the dissemination of the implications of mathematics education research and collaboration between classroom teachers and the research community

**Goal 6: To provide resources and useful professional support for members and Affiliates as they engage in activities on behalf of mathematics education**

- Form partnerships with Affiliates to strengthen the field's capacity to provide high-quality services to all mathematics teachers and to address important issues at local, state or provincial, and national levels
- Maintain online capabilities, including a Web site that is current and relevant, to allow easy access to a variety of resources and information about mathematics education

- Develop and disseminate position statements on important issues facing members of the Council

**Goal 7: To develop partnerships and collaborations that help to influence the forces for change affecting mathematics education and that build support for our mission**

- Involve communities, families, and caregivers in the mathematics education of students and in building and maintaining support for quality mathematics programs
- Build alliances and develop joint initiatives with other organizations dedicated to, or concerned with, mathematics and mathematics education
- Help educators, educational groups and organizations, government leaders, and the public understand the importance of high-quality mathematics education for all students and the need for ongoing improvement in mathematics education
- Provide programs and resources for school and district-level administrators to broaden their understanding of the importance of a quality mathematics education for all students
- Promote the establishment and maintenance of appropriate levels of funding for mathematics education research and development and for curriculum, assessment, and professional development at all levels
- Participate in discussions and activities related to educational issues and policies that affect mathematics education, including federal programs, inclusion, school-to-career initiatives, site-based management, and reform efforts in other disciplines

**B.6 Research and Scholarship**

**B.6.a Faculty Productivity**

Although Augusta State University is not funded for research, a large number of the faculty desire to contribute to the production of knowledge and, thus, engage in research. Many feel an obligation to participate in the betterment of the local area and consult, conduct workshops, speak at local meetings, interview with local television networks (News Channel 6, 12, and 26) as well as the Augusta Chronicle. The combination of substantive collaboration and program quality have contributed to the recognition the department's programs have received within the University System of Georgia, regionally and nationally. The scholarly productivity of department faculty in both publications and presentations has contributed substantially to this recognition as well. Acceptance rates for faculty submissions to national professional conferences exceeded 95%; publication acceptances were similarly high at approximately 90%. (See Appendix D7 for a list of faculty publications and presentations).

**B.6.b Level of Support**

Faculty members in the Department of Teacher Development are strongly encouraged to make significant and meaningful contributions to the teaching profession by conducting presentations at local, regional, national, and internationally recognized conferences and

contributing to our profession’s corpus of research by submitting their scholarship to refereed journals. This commitment to our profession is supported in the following ways: (1) Discretionary Departmental Funds; (2) Grants; and (3) University Faculty Research and Development Funds.

Since this service to the educational community at large is such a vital part of part of our ongoing pledge to professional development, the department dedicates approximately 50% of its overall travel allowance ( \$10,000) to support active participation and attendance at conferences and workshops. The Department of Teacher Development has utilized a portion of its Partner School Grant money to host an annual Professional Development School conference on the ASU campus. This conference is designed to enable graduate students who are master teachers to work in collaboration with initial certification candidate apprentices to showcase best practices in their respective middle schools. These best practices are identified as those which clearly demonstrate an impact on the learning of students in their respective classrooms.

Additionally, over the past several years faculty have participated in a number of initiatives funded by grants secured by the department chair. These include the Advanced Academy for Future Teachers, Partner Schools- Teacher Leadership Project, and the Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program. Each of these initiatives compliments the central collaboration of the PDS Network including active participation involving graduate students who are occupied in the research components of these initiatives. In addition to these projects all department faculty participated in the initial implementation of the Induction of Beginning Teachers program in conjunction with graduate students who earn credit for mentoring beginning teachers in their respective schools. Additionally the reading/language arts faculty represented the department and ASU in the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium.

Each year university faculty members are invited to submit proposals to the committee of Faculty Research and Development. As part of the proposal, a budget is included that indicates the department’s willingness to commit \$200 of its own resources to help finance the project. In the past several years, faculty members in this department have been awarded substantial funding for their efforts to make significant contributions to the teaching profession. As an example, the table below illustrates the funding received by certain faculty members for their research projects during the 2003-2004 academic year

Table 6.1

<b>Faculty Member</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Dr. Gordon Eisenman	\$600
Dr. Emam Hoosain	\$618
Dr. Barry Thompson	\$789.60
Dr. Judi Wilson	\$500

**B.6.c Student Involvement**

The environment in the Department of Teacher Development supports and encourages scholarly interaction between faculty and graduate students. This interaction occurs in the classroom, during advising, clinical experiences, other formal gatherings, and informal campus contacts. All faculty are required to post office hours on their office doors and to include this information in their course syllabi so that students can know when to make an appointment. Faculty meet with students on an appointment or walk-in basis, depending on the circumstances. Faculty work very closely with students on assignments and on their research projects. Media Services provides workstations that promote collaborative projects, especially curriculum development between faculty and students. Many faculty and students collaborate on research, making presentations at professional meetings.

Additionally, the Department of Teacher Development has utilized a portion of its Partner School Grant money to host an annual Professional Development School conference on the ASU campus. This conference is designed to enable graduate students who are master teachers to work in collaboration with initial certification candidate apprentices to showcase best practices in their respective middle schools. These best practices are identified as those which clearly demonstrate an impact on the learning of students in their respective classrooms. (see Appendix for 2003-2004 Conference Bulletin).

## **B.7 Service**

### **B.7.a Contributions to the Mission**

As have been our practice in the preceding six years, faculty and staff in the department have continued to diligently cultivate the Professional Development School Network through extensive collaboration with teachers, administrators, and students in the P-12 context. The PDS Network includes 37 active schools and represents the academic, socio-economic, ethnic, demographic diversity of the CSRA. Our school system partners contribute substantially to the transformed educator preparation programs we collaboratively enact. Field experiences are fully integrated into the curriculum and the expertise and wisdom of practicing teachers is fully woven into the fabric of the programs. Departmental faculty (each faculty member serves as university coordinators to 3 or 4 PDSs) contribute to the work of the PDSs through their regular presence in the schools, serving on school- wide committees, and through varied professional development activities. The PDS Network operates within the framework of the NCATE PDS Standards. Our graduate programs play a considerable role in enabling the transformation of educational programs in the CSRA dedicated to increasing student performance on the standards found in Georgia's Quality Core Curriculum. Beginning in fall 2002 a formal cycling of each PDS through Inquiry and Review and Renewal was launched. The following tables demonstrate the framework used for Review and Renewal as well as Inquiry.

**Table 7.1 Review and Renewal**

**AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERISTY- CSRA P-16  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL NETWORK  
Framework for the Review and Renewal Process**

**Introduction**

The purposes of the Professional Development School Network (PDSN) are to:

- 1) create a sustainable network of schools through which the schools as full collaborating partners with the university, prepare new teachers;
- 2) support teaching practices that promote and assist all students in achieving high standards; and
- 3) sustain teaching excellence through experienced teachers' and university faculty members' continued professional development.

The PSDN works to cultivate a network of energetic learning communities, coherence across the academic and lab components of the educator preparation curriculum, and a shared commitment to educational excellence across institutional boundaries. Since its inception in 1998, the PSDN has used the NCATE (Draft) PDS standards as a framework for its development and as a template for its self- evaluation. During the fall of 2001, the first semester of the PDSN's fourth year of operation, a formal four- year cycle of participation was adopted by its members. Just as all members are committed to teaching excellence, high academic achievement for all students, high-quality collaborative educator preparation, and inquiring communities of learning, they are committed to on-going review and renewal of their work in relation to the NCATE PDS standards. The four- year cycle requires that each PDS formalize the review and renewal every four years. During the formal Review and Renewal year, each PDS will systematically review its participation in the network in relation to the NCATE PDS standards. Each PDS should use its Review and Renewal to reflect on its accomplishments, challenges, progress, and processes in order to inform its decisions and its future direction as a PDS.

Each PDS should strive to maintain a catalogue of indicators related to each standard each year so that the formal R & R in the fourth year is informed by the cumulative evidence of work, challenges, and achievements. During the formal Review and Renewal year, each PDS should review its record comprehensively, as well as categorically in relation to each standard. The review should include all members of the PDS community, master teachers, lab teachers, building coordinator, university coordinator and administrators of course, as well as parents, staff, and students when appropriate. Review and Renewal should address, at least, the following questions:

1. What do our indicators tell us about how well we are doing in relation to each NCATE PDS Standard? What evidence are we using to make these determinations?
2. What changes have taken place in our school that have positively influenced our PDS efforts? What changes have posed challenges to our progress? How are we addressing these?
3. What evidence of benefits of being a PDS do we have? Do they warrant a decision to continue in the Network?
4. What are we distinctively contributing to the PDS Network? How is the network supporting or assisting us as a member?
5. What are our priorities for the next four-year cycle? To which of the standards are they linked? How will we go about addressing them (outline of an action plan)?

**Review and Renewal Timeline:**

**September Building Coordinator Meeting: Preliminary Compilation of Indicators by Standards.**

**November Building Coordinator Meeting: Preliminary Responses to Question 2.**

**January Building Coordinator Meeting: Preliminary Responses to Questions 3 & 4.**

**April Building Coordinator Meeting: Preliminary Responses to Question 5.**

**Table 7.b2 Inquiry Framework**

**Augusta State University- CSRA P-16  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL NETWORK  
Framework for INQUIRY**

**Introduction**

The purposes of the Professional Development School Network (PDSN) are to:

- 1) create a sustainable network of schools through which the schools as full collaborating partners with the university, prepare new teachers;
- 2) support teaching practices that promote and assist all students in achieving high standards; and
- 3) sustain teaching excellence through experienced teachers' and university faculty members' continued professional development.

The PDSN works to cultivate a network of energetic learning communities, coherence across the academic and lab components of the educator preparation curriculum, and a shared commitment to educational excellence across institutional boundaries. Since its inception in 1998, the PDSN has used the NCATE (Draft) PDS Standards, as a framework for its development and as a template for its self-evaluation. During the fall of 2001, the first semester of the PDSN's fourth year of operation, a formal four-year cycle of participation was adopted by its members. The third year of the cycle has been designated as the formal inquiry year, when each PDS systematically examines an issue of significance to its on-going improvement and professional vitality. Just as with the other defining elements of PDS, inquiry is an on-going characteristic of the dynamic learning community. Through the formal inquiry year each PDS realizes the power of systematic investigations into practice to promote continuous improvement in P-12 student achievement, certification candidate preparation, and P-16 faculty development.

NCATE defines inquiry in a PDS as partners engaging collaboratively in examining and assessing their practices and the outcomes achieved by students and faculty alike. By studying phenomena directly related to the teaching/learning process, PDS partners and certification candidates monitor their own work in order to improve their performance. Participants raise specific and significant questions, investigate them systematically, use their findings to inform practice, and share their findings with others. PDS inquiry should support improvement at the individual, the classroom, and the institutional level. Through such inquiry PDS partners hold themselves responsible and accountable for maintaining high standards for P-12 students, certification candidates, and faculty. PDS partners engage in inquiry:

- To identify and meet P-12 students' learning need;
- To effect certification candidate professional competencies; and
- To determine their own professional development agenda.

Inquiry in the PDS partnership should extend beyond the principal, master teachers and university partners.

It should include P-12 students, all educators in the PDS, ASU educator preparation students, parents, and the community. The PDS university coordinator should provide substantial assistance and support to the inquiry effort. Because the work is inquiry-based and focused on improving teaching and learning for candidates, professionals, and students, PDS partnerships should generate new knowledge that is relevant to both the university and schools. Through the process of asking and answering questions, partners examine the ways and extent to which the PDS partnership increases and improves learning for all participants. Inquiry in each PDS will result in continual refinement of practices and increased professionalism.

### **The Inquiry Year**

The following is a suggested framework for the third year of the PDS cycle focused on inquiry. Schools undertaking an inquiry should:

- Gather input from all stakeholders into questions to be considered for inquiry and determine collaboratively the question(s) to be addressed. **Report on this at September PDS building coordinators meeting.**
- Design the methods of inquiry to be used and the timelines for the inquiry. **Report on this at the November PDS building coordinators meeting.**
- Gather relevant research and professional writings that would inform the inquiry.
- Gather data relevant to the inquiry questions.
- **Report on progress and challenges of the inquiry at the January PDS building coordinators meeting.**
- **Report on progress, challenges, results, insights, and next steps at April PDS building coordinators meeting. Develop appropriate medium and strategy for dismissing findings, insights, and follow-up plans.**

### **B.7.b Departmental Projects**

In addition to the primary work of the department, faculty have participated in a number of initiatives funded by grants secured by the department chair. These include the Advanced Academy for Future Teachers, Partner Schools- Teacher Leadership Project, and the Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program. Each of these initiatives compliments the central collaboration of the PDS Network. In addition to these projects all department faculty participated in the initial implementation of the Induction of Beginning Teachers program. Additionally the reading/language arts faculty represented the department and ASU in the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium.

### **C. Summary**

The overarching theme of the College of Education's graduate program at Augusta State University is *Understanding for Teaching and Teaching for Understanding*. The theme reflects the following propositions: 1) that understanding - meaningful knowing - is pivotal to effective teaching, 2) that understanding for teaching is a distinctive type of such meaningful knowing that must be cultivated if teachers are to succeed at helping students learn, and 3) that teaching for understanding is represented in distinctive, deliberately planned approaches to instruction and assessment.

The conversations with PDS partners brought out the need for more coherence in the Augusta State University's graduate teacher preparation programs' sequencing of courses. The changes were approved in May of 2003. Under the old program, the core was focused on Advanced Educational Psychology and Designs and Methodologies of Educational Research rather than teaching for understanding and the knowledge, dispositions and performances required to meet NCATE and INTASC standards. This lack of continuity interfered with teaching for understanding research. The current research and theory requirements were realigned to address knowledge, dispositions and performances required for accreditation. The new program tries to correct this problem by requiring courses to be taken in a more orderly fashion in order to address NCTM standards and NCATE standards of the specific subjects. The revised courses try to provide a balance between theory and classroom application. The outcome should be a graduate program focused on best practice and research for the classroom.

Since the revised program was just implemented in May of 2003, the M.Ed. program does not have performance data collected but the process for data collection has been established. The new program has set up a performance matrix for assessing Conceptual Framework Principles (CFPs) and Teaching for Understanding (TfU) standards but does not have a database available over several semesters nor a graduate student who has completed the entire degree under the new program revisions. The new course sequence has begun this Summer with EDTD 6012 and EDTD 6010 this Fall (see Appendix D for Program of Studies). A masters portfolio is being developed as part of the requirements for the revised masters degree. The products from the various courses will be incorporated by the graduate students into their masters portfolio. This portfolio can be utilized for applying to be nationally board certified on the middle level as well as recognition by school district and state committees. It is organized around the twelve questions that are integrated into the courses (see Appendix C).

Satisfaction of the immediate demands for increased numbers of graduate candidates in our service area center on (1) improving our local PDS network, (2) providing graduate courses for Georgia TAPP students seeking initial certification, and (3) addressing the mandates of the recently passed No Child Left Behind Act. The Professional Development School initiative seeks to cultivate a network of energetic learning communities, provide articulation across the academic and lab components of the educator preparation curriculum, and foster a shared commitment to educational excellence across institutional boundaries. The overall success of the PDS Network is highly dependent upon the sustained collegial interactions enhanced through the passion, excitement, and vitality generated by our scholarly involvement with our graduate students. Educational reform will predictably fail without the empowerment of new teacher leaders who gain their strength, confidence, resolve and support in the process of earning a graduate degree that is highly articulated with school improvement.

Similarly, our graduate programs are now strategically positioned to prepare teachers seeking alternative certification through Georgia TAPP. Georgia TAPP is an acronym for The Georgia Teacher Alternative Preparation Program. Georgia TAPP is an alternative preparation route toward educator certification. It is utilized by the State of Georgia to help reduce Georgia's teacher shortage. It enables individuals with a bachelor's degree or higher (who meet eligibility requirements for the program) to teach in Georgia's schools. Beginning in Summer 2004 our graduate enrollment with significantly increase because we are allowing Secondary Math and Secondary Teacher Alternative Preparation Program (TAPP) students to earn graduate credit for the courses requisite for their certification. These specific graduate content/pedagogy courses have been approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. The earned graduate credit will increase the likelihood of these TAPP students completing our M.Ed. in Secondary Math program. These students will be integrated into courses in which our traditional graduate students are enrolled and will thus stand to benefit from dialogues among and collaboration with more experienced teachers.

Our graduate programs seek to instantiate the promise of No Child Left Behind. Under No Child Left Behind, teachers will have the training and resources they need to teach effectively; parents will have unprecedented options and resources for helping their children; schools will have the information they need to strengthen their weaknesses and put into practice methods and strategies backed by sound, scientific research; and systems will have greater flexibility in the use of federal education funds. No Child Left Behind is a law that operates on one basic assumption: that every child--regardless of income, gender, race, ethnicity, or disability--can learn, and that every child deserves to learn. It is the belief that no child should be left behind, and that all of our efforts toward reforming our schools must be focused on ensuring that student achievement and learning improve.

### **C.1 Quality of the Program**

Our program quality is best measured by the overall successes our graduates experience with young adolescents achieving to higher standards in our local service area. Criteria that measure this kind of effectiveness naturally include increased test scores on norm referenced tests. However, as educators who understand the notion that human beings have multiple intelligences, it is often difficult to evaluate student performance solely on the basis of a score on a test. There are other not so obvious indices that enable teachers to measure and evaluate student achievement. Therefore our graduate students seek to develop and sustain learning environments in which children are encouraged to think critically, find and solve problems, make decisions, set and establish goals, work cooperatively and collaboratively, and generally learn to actively participate as responsible members of a democratic society. Our graduate programs provide our students with the luxury of opportunity to discover best practices and research their effectiveness in their everyday classrooms. Teachers are able to pose such relevant research questions as: Does Problem and Inquiry Based Learning motivate students to aspire to higher academic standards? If the promise of technology is worth keeping, what are the implicit and explicit costs for students, faculty, and school systems? What are the effects of engendering Culturally Responsive Classroom Management?

To further instantiate this ideal, conversations with PDS partners brought out the need for more coherence in the Augusta State University's graduate teacher preparation programs' sequencing of courses. The changes were approved in May of 2003. Under the old program, the core was focused on Advanced Educational Psychology and Designs and Methodologies of Educational Research rather than teaching for understanding and the knowledge, dispositions and performances required to meet NCATE and INTASC standards. This lack of continuity interfered with teaching for understanding research. The current research and theory requirements were realigned to address knowledge, dispositions and performances required for accreditation. The new program tries to correct this problem by requiring courses to be taken in a more orderly fashion in order to address NCTM standards and NCATE standards of the specific subjects. The revised courses try to provide a balance between theory and classroom application. The outcome should be a graduate program focused on best practice and research for the classroom. Since the revised program was just implemented in May of 2003, the M.Ed. program does not have performance data collected but the process for data collection has been established. The new program has set up a performance matrix for assessing Conceptual Framework Principles (CFPs) and Teaching for Understanding (TfU) standards but does not have a database available over several semesters nor a graduate student who has completed the entire degree under the new program revisions. The new course sequence has begun this Summer with EDTD 6012 and EDTD 6010 this Fall (see Appendix D for Program of Studies). A masters portfolio is being developed as part of the requirements for the revised masters degree. The products from the various courses will be incorporated by the graduate students into their masters portfolio. This portfolio can be utilized for applying to be nationally board certified on the middle level as well as recognition by school district and state committees. It is organized around the twelve questions that are integrated into the courses (see Appendix C)

### **C.2 Productivity of the Program**

Until recently, the number of students enrolled in our M.Ed. in Secondary Math program did not entirely support the faculty members who taught these graduate courses. In point of fact, several faculty members volunteered to teach extra courses to serve the needs of our students enrolled in our graduate programs during the spring and fall semesters. However, as noted in section A.3, satisfaction of the immediate demands for increased numbers of graduate candidates in our service area center on (1) improving our local PDS network, (2) providing graduate

courses for Georgia TAPP students seeking initial certification, and (3) addressing the mandates of the recently passed No Child Left Behind Act. Our potential for productivity in terms of numbers of students can easily be projected as we consider enrollment for Summer 2004 which represents the initial year that Georgia TAPP students will be able to earn graduate credit to satisfy their initial certification requirements. Our certification officer, Ms. Heather Eakin has assured this department that Georgia TAPP is not just a temporary bandage for the current teacher shortage. The TAPP program is a viable means for postbac students to gain certification, and with our ongoing cooperation, earn credits toward an M.Ed. This summer, over 100 TAPP students will enroll in approximately 900 hours of course work. This number coupled with our traditional cohort of M.Ed. students is likely to substantially increase our summer enrollment and eventuate in increased enrollment for fall and spring semesters.

### **C.3 Viability of the Program**

Augusta State University offers only a few courses in non-traditional formats. Graduate programs in the College of Education endeavor to meet the demands of those students who desire to advance their education in the midst of raising children while working full-time. Given this scenario, all of our students are full-time teachers who prefer to enroll in courses during the summer when they have adequate time to devote a larger portion of their attention to their studies. Often times these summer courses are offered as one-week intensive workshops; enrollment is limited to graduate students who are currently employed as teachers and who are able to synthesize sizable amounts of information in short periods of time. These courses always focus on advances in instructional practices, so in-class time is spent engaging in strategies. Out-of-class time focuses on the scholarly grounding of the course content and demonstrated practices. Once the week-long class meetings have ended, students have additional time to reflect on, analyze, and synthesize information and insight as they create final products for evaluation and grades. Faculty meet individually with students during this post-workshop period.

## **D. Appendix**

### **D.1 Educational Purposes and Goals (from 2000 SACS Self-Study)**

An 18-member Teacher Education Council, made up of individuals from programs within and outside the College of Education, was established to advise the Dean of Education on such matters as policies, evaluation, compliance with professional standards for program approval and accreditation, and changes in curriculum and programs. The council meets at least once a month. Members of the council also serve on council committees, including the Curriculum Committee, which considers all changes to admission, retention, exit, and program requirements for teacher education and other school personnel programs; and the Exceptions Committee, which considers all student appeals of admission, retention, and exit requirements for these programs.

The institution has a clearly defined process for establishing, reviewing and evaluating curriculum. The process for the graduate curriculum and programs is the same as for the undergraduate curriculum and programs. Curriculum issues are first addressed within the department as a part of ongoing evaluative processes. Although anyone may propose curricular changes, major responsibility resides with the department chair. Each of the colleges has a curriculum committee to deal with matters pertinent to its curriculum. All proposed changes to a college's curriculum must be submitted to its curriculum committee. (In the College of Education, curricular matters in teacher education and other school personnel preparation programs must first be reviewed by the Teacher Education Council.) Any department or college possibly affected by the curriculum change must be consulted before the change is sent to the Academic Policies Committee. The Academic Policies Committee reviews curriculum changes

from the colleges and forwards these to the University Council with the committee's recommendation.

Graduate degrees in the College of Education are designed to build on previous course work and clinical and field experiences. Each program of study has specialized objectives designed to extend and enrich the knowledge base, understanding, and pedagogical repertoire of the student. Each program provides students the opportunity for using critical thinking and analytical abilities so that as graduates they can question and create new curricular programs, contribute to the professional knowledge base by relating classroom practices to research, extend best practice, and offer collaborative assistance to colleagues.

All graduate programs incorporate research and methodology components into their curricula. Curricular content is attuned to current practice via several mechanisms, including involvement with professional associations and accreditation by external agencies, when available. Graduate students in the College of Education are required to comprehend methodology and engage in research. For example, the M. Ed. requires a capstone, original research project.

**APPENDIX D.2**  
**PROGRAM CURRICULA**

APPENDIX D.3  
LIBRARY SUPPORT, HOLDINGS, &  
SUBSCRIPTIONS

APPENDIX D.4  
LISTS OF FACULTY PUBLICATIONS &  
CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

APPENDIX D.5  
FACULTY VITAE

APPENDIX D.6  
DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORTS