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SECTION I: Relevance of Academic Programs in SOE to the GC&SU Mission

The mission of the John H. Lounsbury School of Education meets both of the major goals of GC&SU: residential learning community steeped in the liberal arts at the undergraduate level and provider of high quality graduate programs meeting the needs of Middle Georgia.

Our selective, undergraduate field-based cohort programs in the undergraduate, MAT and MEd in Special Education embody the key components of the public liberal arts mission. Students are in small groups with mentor leaders who nurture their development with an emphasis on preparing ethical, intellectual teachers who are leaders, problem-solvers and advocates for P-12 students, public education and the teaching profession. The quality of education programming at the undergraduate level has been recognized by national societies in the disciplines. This year, SOE was granted recognition by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (undergraduate programs), the Council for Exceptional Children (undergraduate programs), the National Middle School Association (undergraduate and graduate programs). The Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) accreditation was not granted. We will be working to revise the proposal and make needed changes prior to submission tentatively scheduled for summer 2005. (In SOLAS, Music education was accredited by the National Association of Music Educators. In Allied Health, Kinesiology was accredited by the National Association of Sport and Physical Education (NAPSE). In documenting the performance of our initial preparation programs, the School of Education has adopted the Livetext program to provide a structure for students’ standards-based e-portfolios, the aggregation of assessment data and the documentation of student performance.

At the graduate level, programs are intended to meet the needs of the region with an emphasis on the preparation of educational leaders in the classroom, the school and the district. After some years of ambiguity, the role of graduate professional education is being clarified and faculty are enthusiastically re-thinking SOE graduate programs. Two initiatives are underway:

1) Inter-departmental faculty examination of a common core for graduate programs in SOE based upon school improvement. This initiative has been discussed and will be developed over the summer for presentation and input from SOE faculty next fall. If SOE faculty endorse this initiative, the next step will be a focused group of practitioner advisors from area districts, the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) and from the School of Liberal Arts & Sciences and the School of Business. That group will refine a central core of courses designed to reach all Masters level students who already have initial certification. The core school improvement focus includes: educational research, data analysis and decision-making, leadership, school and community, ethics and advocacy, advanced learning and development theories, and a culminating seminar and action research project.
Such a design provides options for serving graduate students in cohorts made up of school teams, district teams or individuals; lends itself to district outreach for on-site graduate courses; invites collaboration with school and district leadership in furnishing coursework and learning experiences; builds upon the selective and appropriate use of GLISI models for leadership development.

In addition, this model provides opportunities for graduate students from different fields to work together and practice the collaboration we expect in the profession. Finally, this model ensures our ability to staff a common core of courses and to provide a number of additional strands of specialization: early childhood, middle grades, secondary, special education, leadership, school media, and reading.

(2) Faculty and student exploration of the great thinkers who have influenced educational theory and practice with an emphasis on having students read primary text, explore the influence of key scholars and their contribution to current practice, educational controversies and current issues. This experimental initiative is loosely modeled on the Great Books approach used at Lynchburg College and is tentatively called Great Architects of Educational Change. A graduate assistant will be working with faculty this year to identify and provide a web site for support of faculty and students with electronic resources, texts, bibliographies of the great thinkers, annotations of text, and ideas for infusing them in the curriculum. After some exploration this year (some faculty in each of the three departments have volunteered to try this approach), this initiative will either be refined and adopted as a formal part of our graduate programs, be maintained by interested faculty only, or be discarded. Should this initiative be adopted as a school policy, SOE graduate students would be required to infuse the great architects as a part of their discussion of their own educational philosophy and research, and as well as their analysis of current issues, theories and practices.

**SECTION II: MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SOE IN 2003-2004**

This has been a year of intense work, significant challenges and major changes. As a new dean facing SACS and NCATE accreditations, some natural priorities (re-examination and updating of strategic plan for the school, major graduate program revision, etc.) had to be delayed until the accreditation exigencies were met. Yet, SOE did accomplish some important initiatives that will support a full-blown strategic planning process after the NCATE visit. These initiatives include examining the role of professional education in a public liberal arts institution: beginning the process of regular data collection, aggregation, analysis and
In addition, as a new Dean with a relatively new assistant dean, a major goal which I think has been successfully accomplished is the **continuation of a culture of collaboration and mutual respect within SOE, a positive and productive SOE Administrative Council and a shared understanding of our values and mission.**

Any list of the major accomplishments must begin with the major emphasis on accreditation as most of our energies were directed there. Other accomplishments are listed in categories below. The most significant accomplishments are in bold.

---

**Accreditation**

SOE faculty and staff continued their preparation for the NCATE review and on site visit in Fall 2004, prepared and submitted materials for the SACS review and on site visit, and submitted program review materials to national specialty organizations for accreditation. Given the convergence of SACS and NCATE, considerable time and energy has been directed to issues of accreditation, evaluation and assessment. Faculty in a number of programs worked to submit materials for initial accreditation by the specialty professional organizations recognized by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

**Accreditations earned include:**

- National Association for the Education of Young Children (Initial Programs)
- National Middle School Association (Initial and Advanced Programs)
- Council for Exceptional Children (Initial Programs)
- SOE completed initial program reports for PSC/NCATE and collected data for aggregation and analysis for the on-site visit.

Note: Kinesiology received NASPE certification, Music Education received NAME accreditation. Both programs are part of teacher education but are not housed in SOE.
Assessment

- Established an expectation for SOE faculty and staff to engage in continuous assessment for program evaluation and revision, and evidence-based decision-making. SOE held a spring retreat to support faculty use of assessment data in evaluation and planning.
- Conducted a validity study on the self-report measures we use as part of our program assessment. (See Appendix B for the summary.)
- Explored the assessment of dispositions and had a faculty session with Dr. Holly Thornton focused on defining, assessing and developing teacher dispositions.
- Created a Data-Users Group comprised of faculty, staff and administrators.
- Evaluated TK-20, Taskstream, and Livetext as e-portfolio, assessment and database tools.
- Initiated Livetext as our e-portfolio tool and database tool and held an initial orientation for faculty, gathered key assessment tools for conversion to the Livetext format over the summer and determined that all junior cohort members would be required to purchase Livetext and use it in their classes.

Partnerships

- Entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Georgia Children’s Museum for development of off-campus site at the museum’s Education Annex, collaboration on museum projects, opportunities for partnerships to seek external funding, to do research, to provide professional development, to increase interactions with Bibb County schools.
- Revised framework for partner school relationships and signed three professional partner school renewal contracts with the Baldwin Child and Family Development Center, Gray Elementary School and Clifton Ridge Middle School.
- Collaborated with Oconee RESA to offer the 3rd Annual Induction Conference to provide resources for new teachers, their mentors and administrators.
- Continued collaboration on funding for the Center for Film Enhanced Education (CFEE), a partnership with Film Clips, Inc. and the SOE to develop curriculum based upon motion picture clips.
- First successful collaboration with the Professional Association of Georgia Educators to offer a summer camp for high school students interested in becoming teachers.
• Entered into an informal agreement with Baldwin County to provide classroom space for weekend leadership program classes
• Completion and dedication of the Architects of Change mural---a collaborative project with the Art Department and SOE
• Completion of the first “exhibit” in the SOE Creative Expressions Gallery---a partnership among SOE, our host and partner schools and Central State Hospital to identify, frame and mat and display P-12 student art in our hallways. We also hung the quilts created by last year’s cohorts.
• Participation in (Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI)
• Renewal of GA TAPP program with Oconee RESA

Programmatic Revisions

• Completed development of the Reading Masters program
• Implemented the MEd exit examination
• Completed transition to cohort model in the Masters and Ed.S. Level Education Leadership programs,
• Began transition to cohort model programs in graduate level Special Education (Ed Focus),
• Alignment of MAT programs with standards
• Initiated the development of an EdS program in Special Education

Policies & Procedures

• Began revision of governance procedures with more faculty ownership of decision-making, analysis of assessment data, committee functions, new faculty mentoring and the tenure and promotion process
• Clarified roles, timeline and responsibilities for curriculum actions---some additional work is needed to have a fully functional system
• Planned for a change in graduate admission procedures with SOE assuming responsibility for processing (other than tuition and financial matters)
• Revised the job description of the graduate coordinator with more emphasis on leadership and outreach; devolved admissions decisions and initial contacts to the chairs and program coordinators
• Added the position of technology coordinator and included that person as a member of the SOE Administrative Council
• Clarified job description and expectations of P-12 Community Liaisons
• Initiated review/revision of the tenure and promotion process and procedures, support and orientation within SOE
Enrollment Management, Recruitment & Retention

- Identified enrollment goals and admissions criteria for initial certification programs and identified specific audiences, programs or school systems. Until the university’s strategic plan is complete, SOE has taken the position that the integrity of the initial certification undergraduate program requires a cohort size of no more than 20. There is little room for growth for early childhood and middle grades in Milledgeville without additional faculty and space. There is room for some growth in the BS programs in Macon, in the MAT, MEd and EdS programs. A key goal for undergraduate programs on campus is increased diversity. We must consider this in any goals and plans.

- Established priorities for growth at the graduate level. Leadership programs, Special Education, and the graduate programs are key targeted areas for recruitment. Staffing and completing the program approval process for the Reading Master’s is another goal for 2005.

- Established plan for moving graduate admissions to SOE (other than financial transactions) with increased responsibility for Sam Bassinger and the graduate faculty.

- Eliminating conditional admission to graduate programs

Facilities and Resources

- Renovations to four classrooms
- New (and accurate) signage meeting ADA requirements
- Updated faculty computers
- Beginning of a strategic plan for technology

SECTION III: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals were established on May 2, 2003 for the 2003-2004 academic year. The goals were grouped in six categories.

I. Graduate Program
   a. Increase enrollment in low enrolling programs and increase quality in all programs. Consider offering programs in partner schools. Work with A&S to make programs strong enough to draw students to us.
b. Include decision points (medial assessments) to counsel out those who are not suitable for graduate work and to monitor progress of all students toward meeting NBPTS standards.

c. Work on meaningful and cohesive programs that are not unreasonable in length. Consider a modified cohort approach with a sequence of courses designed to meet NBPTS guidelines.

d. Work on issues in the graduate student survey report that indicate problems.

Assessment: The discussion of graduate enrollment, curriculum, student feedback and future directions for SOE has been ongoing. SOE has established three major options for bringing congruence and relevance to graduate education programs: first, attention to national standards in graduate education; second, use of school improvement as a core across programs; and third, the exploration of great thinkers who have shaped education, Great Architects of Change, as another unifying element that supports our Georgia College & State University mission. In addition, changes have been made in the process of graduate admissions and the monitoring of graduate student progress. Finally, faculty who have not been responsive in their role as graduate instructors have worked with their chairs to design improvement plans.

II. Partner Schools
a. Be sure that everything we do has P-12 input.

b. Redefine contracts for partner schools.

c. Involve liaisons in the revision.

d. Establish a process for renewing contracts which would include evaluation of goals and progress toward goals by all stakeholders.

e. Ask for faculty approval prior to contracts being signed.

f. Identify and develop at least one (1) clinical faculty member for each PDS.

g. Research the possibility of a high school PDS, specifically in Bibb County.

Assessment: Our Partner School Survey indicated that we were excellent or good in a number of areas. 90% ranked us excellent or good in our collaboration in the preparation and development of teachers. However, only 45% ranked us as excellent or good in providing professional development opportunities for their faculty. Responses on our impact on P-12 learning, conducting joint research and mentoring new faculty are also not at the level we would want. (See the Table of good and excellent responses at the top of the next page.) We have taken steps to increase our partnership and to improve our communication with partner schools. However, it must be understood that faculty, other than our full-time liaison, Revel Pogue, are given no release time to achieve these additional goals.

Liaisons worked with Carol Bader to clarify the role of partner schools, to change designations from Professional Development, Partner and Dispersion Schools to
two categories:  Professional Partner Schools and Host Schools. The obligations of SOE and the partner schools were delineated. Three Professional Partner Schools have or will be signing new agreements this year.

We are asking that in the future, faculty have input into the decision about being Professional Partner Schools. We have at least one faculty liaison for each Professional Partner School. We are still working to develop Professional Partner School relationships in Bibb and Hancock Counties.

III. Faculty & Staff Professional Development

a. Salary study to compare SOE salaried with the market in P-12 and higher education.

b. Recommend that secretaries be encouraged to seek National Professional Certification and that salary increases be given when this distinction is earned.

c. Professional Development Committee to set up an expectation and practice of sharing professional development activities with the faculty and staff.

d. Professional Development Committee to set up a website to publicize professional development opportunities and monetary awards.

e. Administration will establish a firm rotation of courses so that faculty know at least two semesters in advance what their teaching schedule will be. This will allow time for adequate preparation.

Assessment:

The salary study was completed and has been shared. We are working to update and refine the study. We continue to lose some faculty and to be turned down by candidates who cannot take the $15,000 to $20,000 cut necessary to come to GC&SU.
We have not been as successful in sharing professional development regularly or publicizing opportunities in professional development on the website. This will be addressed this year with our intranet redesign. Chairs have made an effort to inform faculty of course assignments in a timely manner when possible.

IV. PRAXIS
a. “Clean up” PRAXIS scores so that our aggregate scores truly represent program completers. Publicize those scores as a recruitment tool.
b. Work with A&S to conduct at least one workshop per year that focuses on the content areas of PRAXIS II. This should be organized by MAT and Middle Grades faculty.
c. The new secondary education club should focus on preparation for PRAXIS II. Students should take PRAXIS II at the end of the BS degree. Consider making the taking of PRAXIS II an entry requirement for the MAT.
d. Fund faculty members who wish to take the PRAXIS II.
e. EDEX 2210 requires that students take or obtain an exemption for the PRAXIS I. EDEX 2210 is required for admission to teacher education.

Assessment:
PRAXIS scores are still a problem. In Music Education, a number of majors do not take the PRAXIS II which counts as a failure or don’t take the examination seriously because they do not care about certification. Some preliminary discussions with Pattie Tolbert and Beth Rushing have taken place.

Secondary PRAXIS scores have improved significantly. MAT students are now required to take PRAXIS II in their fall semester.

V. Induction
a. Continue to collaborate with Mike Walker, Oconee RESA, on a model of support and ongoing professional development for beginning teachers, their mentor teachers and principals. Extend that collaborative effort to the Heart of Georgia and Middle Georgia RESAs.
b. Develop a focus group of key stakeholders to discuss the issue of induction and develop an action plan to get administrators to “buy in” to the process.
c. Link the work of the Induction Committee to the work with our partner schools.
   i. Mentor leaders set up list servs with graduated cohorts.
   ii. On line survey
   iii. Seek funding
   iv. Provide an Induction Conference in November/early December
   v. Consider “problem-solving” lectures for other times during the year depending upon identified needs

Assessment:
The Induction Conference was very successful with a group of over 70 new teachers, mentors and administrators. Cindy Stephens from PSC came to speak on teacher retention and was impressed enough to provide some funding for next year’s conference. List servs and on-line surveys were done. We have not provided lectures during other times of the year, but we will consider this again next year.

VI. Grants
   a. Define the purpose and culture in which the pursuit and implementation of grant funded projects are carried out.
   b. Establish a framework of processes and supporting resources such as workshops, collaborative and peer review of project proposals.
   c. Set aside faculty resources for grant opportunity development.
   d. Create an information infrastructure to support the production and management of grant supported projects.

Assessment:
We have not been able to pursue external funding to the degree we would like. The goals established are worthy, but there has been little time, energy or resources to devote to this area during this year. We continue to believe in these goals and we have established some formal partnerships (Georgia Children’s Museum, PAGE and Baldwin County) that will help in obtaining grants. We have also had some informal connections with Hancock and Bibb Counties. These counties have large numbers of high need students and schools and are eligible for partnership grants from the federal government. These preliminary contacts and agreements will be important in future grant writing.

KEY DEPARTMENT (PROGRAM) GOALS:

ECMG

1. Completed paperwork on Reading Masters degree, need further review and plan to submit after NCATE.
2. MEd exit exams were piloted. Revision and implementation planned for 04-05.
3. Developed a targeted recruitment plan for graduate programs focusing on specific audiences, programs and school systems.
4. Reviewed field and class hours associated with undergraduate cohort programs to ensure meeting program goals and accurate catalog descriptions.

5. Continued preparation for NCATE and SACS. Prepared, submitted application, and awarded accreditation for undergraduate and advanced programs by the National Middle School Association. Prepared, submitted and awarded accreditation for undergraduate early childhood programs by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). The submission of graduate programs was not successful. We will revise and resubmit next year.

6. Reexamined the role of liaison to the public schools and expanded the role to serve all departments with reporting line to the Assistant Dean.

7. Worked to develop a better system for scheduling cohort program courses within and beyond the department.

8. Developed a consistent rotation for MEd program to provide better information for A&S in offering content courses.

9. Decided not to explore an MAT in early childhood and middle grades given the current lack of staffing.

EDFS

1. Increased efficiency in department tasks including reporting for NCATE and SACS.


3. Efforts to encourage faculty to use multiple forms of assessment were not very successful and this goal will be continued for the 04-05 year.

EDEX

1. Transitioned from tradition to cohort model in L5 and L6 programs.

2. Applied and was granted undergraduate recognition by the Council for Exceptional Children. Will reapply next year at the graduate level.

3. The Ed Focus program in special education began and will replace the traditional programs. Request to deactivate those programs has left the School of Education.

4. Initiated the development of an Ed.S. program.

CHANGES AS A RESULT OF ASSESSMENT

Formal assessments (graduate surveys, discussions and feedback from graduate students shared in staff meetings and SOE Administrative Council meetings), led to a series of meetings with Paul Jones and Sarah Scott. The goal was to bring a more coherent and efficient approach to graduate admissions. Several decisions were made.
including revision of the messages to graduate students on-line to accurately reflect the status of their application and exploration of an on-line registration option for graduate students who are not required to pay an application fee. This process is being handled by Lis Wolfgang and should be operational soon. Finally, the decision was made to have Sam Bassinger in SOE enter the data and keep the files for SOE graduate student admissions. Sam will be trained by Lakeisha Hardwick and take over the process after fall 04 registration. Sam will enter and track the process, provide feedback and do follow up through the admissions process. All financials including deposits and payments will still be handled by Lakeisha Hardwick.

All departments examined major directions in program design, schedule of cohorts, recruitment and retention. As a result of the analysis, several directions were reinforced: move toward cohort programs at the graduate level; continued emphasis on aligning programs with the objectives of the professional societies, the SOE conceptual framework and the SBAITC and SBAATC. These goals were well underway in most departments. Significant work is still needed in Educational Leadership.

Examination of future directions, current resources, conceptual framework, program and university goals led to capping of some programs including educational leadership, special education, early childhood education and middle grades education. Capping cohort size at 18-20 resulted from the universities target class size, and feedback (formal and informal) from teacher candidates and faculty.

Refining plans and increasing emphasis on monitoring student progress and performance in programs was a result of examination of assessment data, discovery of inconsistencies and some slippage in carrying out policies, and the PSC/NCATE and SACS self-study and reporting requirements. The work to insure quality monitoring in the initial programs was significantly implemented. Concerns at the graduate level continue and this will be a major emphasis during 04-05.

It was also clear that we have major needs in moving toward an efficient process of unit assessment as required by NCATE. Aligning assessments in all initial and advanced programs (in SOE as well as other educator preparation programs in Liberal Arts & Sciences and Allied Health). The decision to go to a standards-based e-portfolio and to revise and combine various databases to meet operational and reporting needs was the result of assessment of our current data and assessment needs.

Examination of data from PT3 grant indicated, although successfully expanding student and faculty use of technology, the use of technology in the field placements was not significantly improved. The decision was made to request a further year in PT3 to concentrate on this particular goal. Examination of feedback from students indicated that the structure/content of the Teaching with Technology course was not meeting student needs. As a result, the course was restructured and the content was revised significantly. The revised course, now three one hour courses, will be offered for the first time this fall.
Because self-report is a major component of the SOE assessment plan. Sharie Smoot provided a validation study on the validity of this approach and found that the correlations between self-report and instructor evaluation were sufficiently high enough to continue the self-report surveys.

Examination of the records of students who were having difficulty successfully completing graduate programs led to a recommendation that provisional admission to graduate programs be ended. This recommendation was approved by SOE and the provisional acceptance has been discontinued.

**ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT GOALS**

PRE-EDUCATION MAJORS – Freshmen 175-200 each year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL PROGRAMS</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>GC&amp;SU GOAL 04-05</th>
<th>TRANSFER GOAL 04-05</th>
<th>TOTAL GOALS 04-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood BS</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades BS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED MED/BS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05 GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood MED</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades MED</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education MED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technology/Library Media</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership L5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership L6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction EDS</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is the IPPA data, but we know that it is not accurate.

**Support of the University’s Strategic Goals:**

Goal 1: Engage the university in creating a learning environment to accomplish our liberal arts mission.

All departments have made contributions to this goal including:
All SOE programs are built upon a strong liberal arts foundation as cited in our conceptual framework.

- Wider applications of the cohort model to insure a single faculty member takes responsibility for advising, mentoring and guiding students.
- Incorporation of service learning or equivalent work as criteria to be considered for admission into the cohort program.
- Systematic examination of teaching, curriculum, and field work based upon student feedback.
- Training about and with diverse learners is mandatory.
- Participation in the Sweden program is growing and there is interest in a program in Belize in the future.
- Students are required to show their ability to analyze, critique and apply theory in their work in courses and in the field.
- Students are regularly evaluated on their leadership and communication performances.

Goal 2: Develop attitudes among administration/faculty/students/staff that foster trust and respect.

All departments have made contributions to this goal including:

- The use of mentor leaders in most programs (all initial programs (BS, MAT and Med in Special Education and Educational Leadership).
- Opportunities for faculty/student participation in professional organizations, professional presentations, service projects and governance.
- Program faculty work with the graduate coordinator to make graduate admission decisions.

Goal 3: Promote intellectual excellence in faculty and students.

All departments have made contributions to this goal including:

- Financial support for faculty and student participation in conference presentations, research and professional organizations.
- Required demonstration of exit standards in all programs.
- Alignment of programs with standards set by the disciplinary professional societies.
- Critical, interdisciplinary approach to educational theory drawing on current knowledge base in psychology, sociology, socio-linguistics, history, philosophy and disciplinary theories in mathematics, English, social studies, the sciences, business and foreign language.
Goal 4: Enhanced student-centeredness

All departments have made contributions to this goal including:

- Emphasis on individual performance and progress monitored by the mentor leader in each cohort that may include individual development plans when indicated.
- Regular and systematic examination of student course evaluation data, student surveys and student assessment data to provide appropriate and rigorous program design.
- Rites and traditions include Honors Day and Senior Showcase, “Pizza with the Dean,” Creative Expressions Gallery, the annual Induction Conference and the Student Research Conference.
- Efforts to find out and consider student preferences in field placement assignments.

Goal 5: Link resources to the mission of the university

- The move to use the P-12, Community University Liaison to serve all schools and departments in supporting P-12 and Community education initiatives.
- PT3 and other grants have funded activities designed to support the mission.
- Continued partnerships with SOLAS, Business and Allied Health to provide excellent teacher preparation.
- Partnerships that draw upon resources such as Continuing Education to provide space for Kids University; space and volunteer student support for Academic Outreach; participation in Service Learning initiatives and the experiential transcript.
SECTION III: SUPPORT OF INSTRUCTION

Class Size Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Aver #</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Aver #</td>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>Aver #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC/MG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDIS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (ECMG)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFS</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDIT</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (EDFS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEX</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (EDXL)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student-Faculty Ratios
ECMG  19:1
EDEX  17:1
EDFS  14:1

TOTAL SOE   18:1

Percentage of Classes taught Part-time Faculty
ECMG    12%*
EDEX    16%
EDFS    9%

- This is not an alarming number, but it masks a problem in EDRD where 42% of courses are taught by adjuncts. This is due to several factors: Carol Bader, Linda Irwin-DeVitis and Charlie Martin (reading faculty) are all administrators, and it will be even more problematic next year when Les Crawford reduces his load to 51%. We do have permission to search in Early Childhood for a literacy faculty next
year, but we have a Reading Masters program on hold for lack of faculty. This could be an area for growth with sufficient staffing.

SECTION IV: FACILITIES

The SOE is faced with a number of critical needs in terms of facilities. Given the high quality nature of our initial educator preparation programs, our position as a partner in the College of Arts and Sciences, and our coherence with the mission and vision of GC&SU, we request that a more adequate facility be developed for the John H. Lounsbury School of Education. In many ways, JHL is “across the street” and physically isolated from the rest of campus. While we are making do with the quality and quantity of space, efforts to remake Kilpatrick/Peabody into a modern education facility are hampered by the age and architecture of the buildings.

In this annual report on our resources, it seems most appropriate to separate our undergraduate, special education M.Ed initial certification program, and MAT mission (Georgia College) and the graduate (State University) mission.

UNDERGRADUATE, SPECIAL EDUCATION MED, MAT

Quality of Facilities:
Kilpatrick and Peabody are older facilities with a number of problems including the lack of classroom space, office space, rodent and mold problems, majority of rooms lack LCD projectors, CD and DVD players, monitors and white boards. Our auditorium lacks these capabilities as well. When these instructional supports are available, they are often “rigged” in ways that make their use difficult for the average faculty member who may need to change connections to accomplish a particular instructional goal.

Our students are expected to learn and use instructional technology effectively. This expectation must be met to maintain our accreditation and to provide an adequate preparation for our students. We are using end of year monies as we can, but without an infusion of funding, we will never reach an acceptable level.

In addition to the technological needs, the building itself has problems. Faculty offices (including the campus ADA coordinator for academics) who are housed in Peabody are not wheelchair accessible. This year the ceiling in one faculty office collapsed due to the weight of rodent droppings.
Space is a real issue in SOE. We currently have no office space for part-time faculty or graduate assistants. If we are successful in filling the empty and new lines allocated, we will have to ask full-time faculty to share offices. Carol Bader has provided help in using space effectively. However, we had to convert the student lounge to a faculty office this year and even with the building of two small offices in the hall area across from Kids University in Peabody, we will lack sufficient office space next year.

Currently, several undergraduate Macon cohorts are meeting at Clifton Ridge Middle School. This arrangement provides ample space and is appropriate for the middle grades cohort. Such partnerships with schools are appropriate, but temporary. Susan Eilers, Clifton Ridge principal, will provide space as long as it is available, but Clifton Ridge enrollment is increasing and there is talk of redistricting. SOE needs at least one state of the art smart classroom, additional instructional space with dedicated storage for manipulatives in early childhood, mathematics and science education.

This year we are experiencing increases in demand for initial preparation programs in early childhood, middle grades and the MAT. While the expansion of undergraduate programs may be limited, we would like to expand the MAT to meet the increasing demand. We are also concerned that if the number of students who indicate their interest in early childhood as freshmen actually apply to the program, we will be turning away qualified students (and hurting GC&SU retention and graduation rates) if we do not add an additional cohort. Increasing the number of cohorts will require additional classroom space.

**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

Quality
Many of our advanced graduate programs meet off-campus or on weekends. The requirement that campus students pay all fees has been problematic with advanced graduate students who do not use facilities or participate in campus activities. Given current policies, we have requested classroom space for leadership programs from Baldwin County Public Schools. We are hoping that appropriate classrooms with suitable technological equipment will be available for use next fall. While this is inconvenient for faculty, it will be welcomed by SOE students.

Macon State provides facilities in Macon. The new building provides better office space for GC&SU, but faculty offices are still in different buildings and finding GC&SU is difficult unless one has specific directions. (Perhaps this will improve with signage.)
The Georgia Children’s Museum Annex has the possibility of providing a downtown presence for GC&SU programs. The MOU establishing a partnership was signed this year. Funding for the annex completion is being sought. This partnership offers distinctive advantages for GC&SU in marketing, research, curriculum, outreach and service.

Quantity
Given the graduate mission, the direction of graduate education will be to provide off-campus courses, develop resources in the Macon area, and work with districts to provide on-site coursework when feasible. There are special challenges when programs are off-site. It will be important for SOE to explore appropriate space and to negotiate access. Offering classes at multiple sites requires additional administrative support to insure appropriate and well-equipped classroom and office space for faculty and adjuncts. Such consideration needs to be a part of the strategic planning for our graduate mission.

SECTION V: DIVERSITY OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS

Diversity is an area of concern for SOE. While our gender diversity is good and we are moderately diverse in our regional backgrounds, there is a real problem with faculty and undergraduates in terms of race/ethnicity.

**Faculty Diversity in SOE 2003-2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECMG*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEX-EL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SOE</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
<td>27(73%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>36 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ECMG has hired Mercy Chigubu, an African educator, who will begin next fall. We extended an offer to another minority candidate, but the salary and rank were not sufficient to attract him.

The searches this year were successful in attracting minority candidates into our assistant professor of early childhood pool, but we were only successful in hiring one. The Practitioner in Residence position has not yet been filled, but the candidates in that pool were not as diverse.
Student Diversity in SOE 2003-2004

INITIAL CANDIDATES (314 Degree Seeking Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Black, non Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood BS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education BS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education MEd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9.5%) (9.5%) (6%) (1.2%) (88%) (.3%)

ADVANCED CANDIDATES (175 Degree-Seeking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Black, non Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood MEd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood EdS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades MEd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades EdS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education MEd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction EdS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed Leadership MEd</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Leadership EdS</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22%) (1%) (77%)

INSTRUCTIONAL LOAD ISSUES

Issues: The toll of accreditation related work was onerous this year. SOE faculty and administrators are all exhausted from a year in which reports and significant development and revision were required. SOE faculty worked to prepare the following reports:

- Professional Associations
  - Council for Exceptional Children
  - Educational Leadership Constituent Council
  - National Association for the Education of Young Children
  - National Middle School Association

- State Reports
  - PSC Annual Report
  - BOR Principles Report

- Regional and National
  - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
  - National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Institutional Report

Given the work-intensive mentor-leader/field-based cohort model (which is highly effective) and the faculty commitment to students and P-12 partners, the actual load for SOE faculty is very high. Although we have made internal adjustments and have begun to add exceptional practitioners to non-tenure track positions when appropriate, the work load continues to be exceptionally demanding. This is problematic when faculty with doctorates are working as hard (or harder) than public school teachers and are earning substantially less ($17,000 average). The work load and the pay have resulted in the loss of two excellent faculty members in the last two years: Larry Bacnik and Kevin Crabb. In addition, we have been turned down by several candidates for positions (including Practitioner in Residence and a minority candidate for assistant professor) because of our salary limits. While all faculty who have left mentioned their belief in our programs and admiration for their colleagues, the combination of above average work load and below market salaries combine to make maintaining an excellent faculty difficult. Supplementing faculty salaries, and/or professional travel and research...
opportunities through external funds is one option we are considering. Unfortunately, finding the time to write the grants is also difficult. Untenured faculty who must balance teaching, learning the mentor leader role, developing a research agenda and establishing a service record are particularly vulnerable to the workload. Staffing currently does not permit us to either exclude them from service obligations or lighten their teaching load. Finally, although over half of our students are graduate students and graduate classes are often as large or larger than the undergraduate classes, no distinction is made for those who are involved in graduate teaching.

PERFORMANCE

Enrollment - 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>SeniorsAc</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEX</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit Hour Production

According to IPPA data (and it is not accurate in terms of the Special Education/Educational Leadership Department or the inclusion of EDIS in the Educational Foundations Department), SOE has the following credit hour production patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%School</th>
<th>%College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRD</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDIS</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECMG TOTAL</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFS/EDIT TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While our percentage of the college may seem slightly low, it must be remembered that over half of our enrollment is graduate and we do not (with the exception of one course) teach our students until they are admitted to the cohort as juniors.

Exit Examination Scores

The major exit examination for our students is the PRAXIS II. It is required of all students who are seeking initial certification (BS, MAT and some MEds). Our pass rates are excellent in most areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMS</th>
<th>01-02 Total Tested</th>
<th>01-02 Passed</th>
<th>01-02 Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Last cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty/staff accomplishments

SOE faculty have been quite busy in addition to the major work for our accreditation efforts.

Publications
3 books --- including a co-authored book by four members of our faculty on their work as mentor leaders *Becoming a Mentor Leader*
4 journal articles
5 book chapters
1 school curriculum design
1 book review

Presentations
3 international conference presentations
11 national conference presentations
1 regional conference presentation
7 state conference presentations
8 local conference presentations
Professional Service
- Review Boards: 6
- Professional Society Officer: 2
- Professional Committee Chair: 3
- Program Reviewers: 3
- Conference Planning: 3
- Editor – Professional Book Series: 1

Grants
5 grants for a total of $296,000

Honors
Bader, Carol. Nominated by National Association for Developmental Education as a Fellow in the American Council of Developmental Education Associations.


Kleine, Karynne --GC&SU Excellence in Teaching, 2003

Schwartz, Stacy L. (2004). Awarded the D. Keith Osborn Outstanding Graduate Student Award, Department of Elementary Education, The University of Georgia.

*Student Accomplishments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with HOPE Scholarship for 4 years</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE Promise Teacher Scholarship</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Presentations at regional state or national conferences</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices held in student organizations on campus and at the state level</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students awarded scholarships in addition to HOPE</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accomplishments of recent graduates include:

Lianna Nix, (Alumna Cohort Class of 2001 & current host teacher) was selected middle School Teacher of the Year for Jasper County.

Ketura Collins was nominated and selected as "Teacher of The Year" at Bonaire Elementary in Houston County spring 2003. She completed her undergraduate degree in 1999 and her masters in December 2002. Both degrees were from GC&SU.

Misty Garcia was nominated and selected as "Teacher of the Year" at Todd Grant Elementary in Darien, Georgia. She was a graduate of the 2001 Middle Grade cohort, so Misty was awarded this honor during her second year of teaching.

Research Projects – All graduate students in Educational Leadership (Ed.S.) and Curriculum & Instruction (Ed.S.) participate in research studies.

Departmental Accomplishments

The accomplishments noted earlier in many of the categories are a fuller account of the departmental accomplishments in various areas. In summary, Early Childhood has tightened its procedures for individual assessment, mentoring and program continuation. In addition, the group has aggregated program data on student performance and used that data to make program decisions. Major work on the graduate program has begun and should be concluded early next fall. The program was successful in obtaining accreditation of initial programs by the National Association for the Education of Young Children. It will resubmit graduate programs for approval after revisions have been made. The program has also decided on enrollment targets and caps, included interviews as part of the admission decision, and continues to work on the role of mentor leader as a key part of the field-based, cohort program.
Middle Grades has successfully obtained accreditation of both initial and advanced programs by the National Middle School Association. Middle grades faculty have been a major part of efforts to mount the Induction Conference and compile the NCATE report. There has been a real effort to insure a common understanding and increased cooperation between the Macon and Milledgeville cohorts. There continues to be excellent cooperation with A&S faculty and team teaching during the summer.

Secondary Education has increased its enrollment in key areas, worked to ensure a closer relationship with the Arts & Sciences faculty for content preparation. MAT students are amazingly active in presenting and doing research while doing coursework and fieldwork. In addition, the MAT faculty have worked to improve their assessment of teaching. Foundations serves primarily a service role, but they have been important in our move toward the Great Architects of Change concept, and to helping us with unit assessment and research needs.

Instructional Technology has streamlined programs (eliminating several options) to better serve the needs of students with available resources. In addition, the faculty have helped with decision making on LIVETEXT (e-portfolios and databases) and with our overall technology plan. IT has also revised the required course in technology to better meet student needs.

Special education has implemented the graduate cohort program with success. They continue to refine procedures, to encourage students to be actively involved and to take leadership roles. Special education sought and was successful in being accredited by the Council on Exceptional Children for its initial programs.

Educational Leadership has had a rough year. While the number of students has increased and the pass rate on licensure examinations has also increased, the program has had a number of issues. The ratings on the BOR Principles Report, while accurate, are not yet satisfactory. The concepts and teaching done by the department are quite good, but the paperwork and the infrastructure to capitalize on the conceptual design are problematic. Work will continue this year. Perhaps I can say that the realization of the problems and the commitment to engage in serious and sustained work are the major accomplishments of this year.

Support of Quality Enhancement Plan

Support of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

The six learning initiatives in the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan are listed below along with ways the department is supporting each initiative. The QEP focuses primarily on undergraduate education as do our efforts to support the QEP.
1. Enhance student orientation programs for transfer students.

Smart Start at Macon State is an attempt to help students who are matriculating in office campus programs. Many of these students are transfer students. Because orientation to teacher education begins for ALL students when they are accepted into the cohort, there are no special programs for transfer undergraduate students.

2. Enhance student leadership opportunities

The departments sponsor student professional organizations associated with the Professional Association of Georgia Educators, National Middle School Association, the Secondary Education Club, and the Student Council for Exceptional Children. Our students hold offices in the local chapters and in the state organization. See the table under student accomplishments.

3. Enhance academic challenges within the curriculum to reflect the liberal arts mission.

Our pre-education requirements in the CORE as well as coursework at the junior and senior levels is firmly grounded in rigorous content, thinking, and communication skills normally associated with a liberal arts preparation. The evaluation and assessment of content knowledge, communication ability, critical thinking skills and a broad and open perspective are integrated into all of our courses, consistent with our conceptual framework and key for the success of students in the major. We are assessing the relationship of the liberal arts mission to our graduate programs. Great Architects of Change, an emphasis on seminal thinkers who have impacted education, is being piloted. In addition, programs are increasing the rigor and relevance of graduate programs with an emphasis on the same values and skills within a professional program.

4. Enhance recruitment of students and faculty to increase diversity.

Enrollment in the graduate programs is acceptable in terms of diversity. We have real concerns about undergraduate and MAT enrollment. The analysis of our applications indicates a disproportionate number of minority students are not able to meet entry criteria for teacher education. This finding, and other considerations, have prompted discussion of a more flexible admissions policy. We have not finalized anything, and we must also be cognizant of our analysis findings that show a high correlation between PRAXIS II performance and the entry requirements. In summary, we are aware that we cannot merely admit students in a more flexible way without providing the necessary support needed to facilitate their success.

5. Enhance student involvement in the campus community and beyond.
The field-based cohort programs emphasize involvement in local school systems working directly with children and with classroom teachers to improve the learning of P-12 children. Our students are becoming more involved in early service learning experiences through the efforts of Marianne Williams and Rebecca McMullen. Revel Pogue, our school liaison has also arranged for our students to participate in community and school events. We hope to work more closely with Academic Outreach and other established programs to involve our underclassmen prior to their formal entry into teacher education.

Our graduate programs in Educational Leadership are already centered around school improvement with emphasis on the community’s role in education. SOE’s move to a school improvement focus with selected graduate programs will also involve students and faculty directly in efforts to improve P-12 teaching and learning. We also believe that our criteria for admission to the cohort, that emphasizes the experiential transcript and work with P-12 children, will encourage student involvement in the community.

6. Enhance preparation of students for post-graduate opportunities

We are looking at our graduate assistantships more systematically as internships for those interested in pursuing post-graduate opportunities. In addition, we are thinking about ways to involve our graduate and undergraduate students in more meaningful ways. The revised M.Ed. programs in Early Childhood and in Middle Grades have focused more on meeting professional standards.

Finally, we mentor promising students at both the initial and advanced program levels. We have specifically encouraged promising students to pursue advanced study and provided information and guidance for them.

SECTION V: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2004-2005

Goals and Objectives

SOE – These school wide goals have not been formally adopted although they have been discussed in faculty meetings and endorsed by the SOE Administrative Council.

1. The major goal for 2004-2005 is a successful NCATE review.
2. Implementing the e-portfolio and data-basing with LIVETEXT.
3. Developing a strategic plan for SOE consistent with the GC&SU plan.
4. Revision of graduate programs and increased enrollment in the Med programs in Early Childhood, Middle Grades, Secondary, Special Education, Instructional Technology and Library Media and Educational Leadership. A group has been formed to explore a common core based upon School Improvement to serve as the basis for ALL graduate programs, to provide a sense of shared ownership of graduate programs, to encourage collaboration.
with other GC&SU schools and with P-12 practitioners. A second initiative for graduate study is exploring the role of the great thinkers and primary text in shaping a liberal arts focus for graduate study in professional education. The graduate coordinator and another faculty member will be visiting Lynchburg College to observe the program there and share information with the faculty.

5. Re-evaluation of the Reading Endorsement program and identification of strategies for implementation of a Reading Masters program.


7. Establishing strong ties with Macon (Bibb and Houston Counties) and Oconee RESA for graduate education, collaboration on external funding and partnerships for school improvement.

8. Refining policies and procedures for undergraduate admissions including the evaluation and role of the interview, prior experience in working with children and/or adolescents, and commitment to the profession.

9. Continued exploration of the concept of candidate dispositions and refining plans to assess this dimension of candidate performance.

10. Continued work on establishing a culture of self-governance, shared decision-making and more pro-active committees.

11. Continued work on “closing the loop” and establishing a decision-making process that is evidence-based.

12. Establishing an alumni network including those who attended Peabody School (if appropriate).

13. Refining our policies and procedures to encourage service learning, GEM participation, study abroad and other important aspects of the GC&SU learning community.

14. Establishing an advisory committee for Educational Leadership programs and considering structures for more input into all programs at the planning and assessment level.

15. Improving student and faculty diversity through early mentoring and outreach to P-12 students who want to pursue teaching, continued efforts to attract minority candidates for faculty positions, and active recruitment of qualified minority adjunct faculty.

16. Provide documentation and evidence for addressing equity, salary compression and inadequate chair compensation in SOE.

17. Begin planning for future needs in terms of physical facilities.

**Budgetary Needs**

The budget has already been submitted for this year. I will prioritize needs:

1. funding (permanent) for school liaison position $55k (recurring)
2. salary equity and market adjustments $250k (recurring)
3. Training and development for LIVETEXT $15k
4. Additional faculty in reading, secondary and leadership $200k
5. Instructional technology (Smart classrooms for our use) $75K
6. A new (or totally remodeled) facility to provide classrooms, offices and technological support to prepare educators for schools—and while I am asking, it would be nice to join the other schools on the main quad.
SECTION VI:

SOE
DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL REPORTS
2003-2004

Early Childhood & Middle Grades

Foundations, Secondary & Instructional Technology

Special Education & Educational Leadership
Departmental Annual Report  
Early Childhood and Middle Grades Education

Major Accomplishments for Academic Year

Departmental Goals and Objectives

Itemization of the department’s goals in the past year, with discussion of which goals were met and in what ways

1. Complete the development of the Reading Masters Degree program.

   Dr. Ed Wolpert continued development of the reading masters program through the fall semester. At that time we decided to delay submitting paperwork to Board of Regents until after our accreditation visit in fall 2004. This would allow us additional time to complete work on the program and would prevent having to gather evidence for a new program in the short amount of time until the NCATE site visit.

2. Implement the M.Ed. exit exam.

   We continued to pilot-test a version of the exit exams in early childhood and middle grades and drafted a scoring rubric. Plans are to further revise the procedure following the NCATE site visit.

3. Develop targeted recruitment plan for graduate programs that focuses on specific audiences, programs, or schools systems.

   We made a great deal of progress in this area. With a focus of school improvement, we worked with four counties to develop on-site cohort programs at the graduate level that would focus on specific school improvement needs of those districts. In fall, we failed to have a sufficient number of students to begin a program in early childhood in Jasper County; but learned about process and paperwork involved in graduate admissions and recruitment. In fall we began negotiations with Twiggs County to offer a reading endorsement program for approximately 50 teachers and administrators. This program began in the spring and will graduate 46 teachers at the end of summer term. During the spring we also worked with Jones County to develop an early childhood cohort. We’ve met with approximately 30 teachers and will review applications in July to determine if we have sufficient numbers (a minimum of 15 students) to begin a program in the fall. Putnam County has also expressed interest in a program for early childhood focusing on school improvement. We’ve had an initial meeting with 15 teachers and these teachers are also pursuing graduate admissions. We may be able to combine these two groups to form a cohort.
4. Review field and class hours associated with the undergraduate cohort program to
insure they are appropriate to meet program goals and are accurate with catalog
descriptions.

Courses have been revised to reflect actual class and field times.

5. Complete preparation for NCATE and SACS program reviews.

Reports for NCATE and SACS were completed. In the process, the middle grades
program received endorsement from the National Middle School Association for
both the initial and advanced preparation programs, and the early childhood
program received endorsement from the National Association for the Education of
Young Children for the initial preparation program.

6. Reexamine role of Public School Liaisons and Partner School Network in the
cohort program. This includes renewing and/or modifying partner school
agreements.

This responsibility was moved from the department to the Deans office. The
liaisons’ work is now supervised by the Assistant Dean.

7. In conjunction with Goal 6, revise our induction plan.

Again, this is a project that is school-wide rather than department specific. Dr.
Nancy Mizelle, a department member, is chair of the induction committee. The
induction plan was modified by the committee to focus on supporting all new
teachers in our region rather than just our graduates.

8. Develop a better system for coordinating courses for cohort program within the
department and between our department and those departments in the School of
Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Major accomplishments may be sited in this area. This year we developed and
shared a regular rotation of courses at set times. This enables us to project needs
for School of Liberal Arts and Sciences courses four years ahead.

9. Develop a set rotation of content courses for our M.Ed. programs, to be offered by
the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

A two-year rotation of courses at the graduate level is set and will soon be posted
on our website. This will greatly enhance students in their program planning and
will facilitate faculty assignments. A regular rotation of graduate MAED courses
is also in place as are science courses in life and physical science.

10. Explore the creation of an MAT in early childhood and middle grades.
We decided not to pursue this goal at this time due to our work with area districts on school improved focused graduate programs and a lack of staffing to cover courses required in an MAT program.

Discussion of changes as a result of assessment

1. Capping Cohort Enrollment

It was clear from an increased number of problems with student performance that the size of the undergraduate cohorts had grown too large to adequately supervise and continue to provide quality educator preparation. Originally, the cohorts were designed to serve approximately 18 to 20 students. Recently size of cohorts in early childhood approached 30. In addition to issues related to size, students who were “provisionally” admitted into the programs demonstrate a much higher rate of problems than did students who entered the program having met all admissions requirements. As a result, we decided to cap the size of the cohort at 20 and require that applicants meet all admissions requirements prior to acceptance. We also plan to develop an interview component that assess dispositions necessary to be successful in the program.

2. Monitoring student performance in programs

Clear and consistent review of student progress at checkpoints in the program and associated procedures for remediation or removal from the program were developed. This was largely in response to program review in preparation for NCATE/PSC review. We identified key assessment points, methods for collecting data, and methods for aggregating that data. Later, work with these assessment points informed decisions about a database system to collect and aggregate the information on student performance. The school selected LiveText and training in use of the software began in late spring.

3. Decreases in class sizes

Feedback from faculty and students in opinion surveys indicated that classes originally designed to be co-taught among three instructors had evolved to large classes taught by one instructor at a time. Students were also concerned about lack of communication among faculty and that there be consistent expectations related to student performance. As a result of this data, instructor revised courses, classes were divided into smaller sections according to topics, and instructors worked to coordinate assignments and assessment.

4. Revision of graduate programs

Largely as the result of program review in preparation for NCATE/PSC accreditation visits and because of criteria established by specialty organizations (e.g., NMSA), faculty revised graduate programs in early childhood and middle
grades education. We also found that little data is collected to monitor these programs and little is done in terms of student performance data aggregation. We have begun work to address the problem of data collection. This is will be a major goal in the next year.

5. Improve opportunities for use of technology in field placements

Data from our external PT3 evaluator, Dr. LeAnne Dickey, indicate that there is still little being done in this area. This past year, we altered our plan to concentrate on few locations that might serve as a model; but little was accomplished. This year we’ve worked with the schools technology coordinator, Dr. JJ Hayden, to revised coursework from one three-hour educational technology course, taken late in the program, to a series of three, one-hour classes spread across the two years. We hope that this will better prepare candidates to use technology in their placements. Additionally, we will request a one-year extension of our federal technology grant to focus specifically on developing strategies for encouraging uses of technology in placements.

Identify enrollment management goals per program

The first set of goals are connected to points discussed above in the section entitled “Capping Cohort Enrollment.”

1. Cap enrollment in all undergraduate cohorts
   a. Maximum enrollment in cohorts 20
   b. Entering students must meet all minimum admissions requirements
   c. Develop measures of disposition critical to success in the program
   d. Recruit for diversity

2. Specifically recruit in Macon for middle grades and minority candidates

3. Develop school improvement focused graduate cohorts

4. Continue to use the Reading Endorsement Program as recruiting tool for new graduate students

Support of University Strategic Goals

Ways in which the department supports the Universities Strategic Goals are listed below.

Goal 1: Engage the university in creating a learning environment to accomplish our liberal arts mission.

- Liberal arts mission is support in our conceptual framework
- Broad-based content preparation in core and within the program
• Emphasis on communication and collaboration among faculty, candidates, and host teachers
• Training about and experience with diverse learners
• Distinctive experience of the cohort and field-based program

Goal 2: Develop attitudes among administration/faculty/students/staff that foster trust and respect

• Unique mentor leader/student relationship
• Shared decision-making as exemplified by the Mentor Leader group

Goal 3: Promote intellectual excellence in faculty and student

• Financial support of faculty and student participation in professional organizations, research, and presentations
• Adherence to admissions standards and increased qualification of applicants
• Rigorous, field-based requirements connected to strong basis in theory

Goal 4: Enhanced student centeredness

• Role of mentor leader working with cohort as advisor and teacher
• Emphasis on students as architects of change throughout their preparation
• Regular seminars and close supervision in field both provide opportunities to interact with mentor leaders
• Rites and traditions such as Honors Day and Senior Showcase
• Early intervention as a result of frequent progress evaluation checkpoints

Goal 5: Link resources to the mission of the university

• PT3 and other grants (e.g., Reading Endorsement Grant and Teacher Quality Grant) have funded activities designed to support mission of the department.
• Work with technology coordinator to upgrade classroom facilities
• New positions funded to support increased needs in reading and early childhood

Support of Instruction

Average Class size 2001-2003

Table 1: Average Class Sizes 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secs Avg</td>
<td>secs Avg</td>
<td>secs Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>4 22</td>
<td>1 12</td>
<td>5 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>3 13</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>4 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both numbers of sections and class sizes have increased over the past three years although the increase is relatively small.

Student/faculty ratio

Table 2: Student/Faculty Ration 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>13:1</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEC/MG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14:1</td>
<td>14:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRD</td>
<td>19:1</td>
<td>8:1</td>
<td>15:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>17:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As would be expected, the rise in class size is reflected in the student/faculty ratio.

Percentage of classes taught by part-time faculty

Table 3: Percentage of Credit Hours Generated by Part-time Faculty 2001-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The large number of part-time faculty used in reading continues to be problematic. We have a new position assigned for Fall 05 that we plan to fill with a person trained in reading. However, this is a difficult to find commodity and limited salary is assigned for the position. All faculty members with doctorates in reading are engaged in activities other than teaching. Dr. Crawford is reducing his assigned time to 51%, and Drs. DeVitis, Bader, and Martin are administrators.

Facilities

Over the past year, facilities have been upgraded. However, if we remain in Kilpatrick, classrooms must have adequate technology (e.g., lcd projectors and adequate computers). If we move to requiring students to own laptops, then we will need to significantly upgrade power into the classrooms and ensure fast, reliable wireless connections.

Another need is additional office space. We have no empty offices and plan to hire new faculty.

Diversity of students and faculty

The following table summarizes IPPA data on student enrollment at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the Early Childhood and Middle Grades programs. (Note that IPPA data includes freshmen and sophomores designated as early childhood and middle grades majors.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Percent Enrollment 2001-2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Table 4: Percent Enrollment 2001-2003](table.png)
Currently the faculty in Early Childhood and Middle Grades Education consists of four males and nine females. We were able to fill one position in the spring with a minority hire. In the fall we could be searching for as many as four positions and will be placing special emphasis on minority recruitment.

**Instructional load issues**

Frankly, faculty members were exhausted at the end of spring semester. They have SACS, NCATE, PSC, and Regents Principles. They are required to partner with schools, develop school improvement agendas, and serve as liaisons. On top of this they teach a full load, are active in research, and most contribute to the community. I’m not sure what the answer is, but revisiting workload in the context all these requirements is a start. It has been four years since we’ve systematically reviewed this issue.

I believe we are seeing this workload issue taking its toll in the recent resignation of faculty to return to public schools. They see the workload more reasonable and the pay is significantly higher. Last week a teacher turned down a practitioner in residence position because accepting it would mean a $20,000 cut in pay. The candidate we are currently pursuing would ONLY be looking at a $12,000 reduction in her salary.

**Enrollment in major**

Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EC Juniors</th>
<th>EC Seniors</th>
<th>EC Total</th>
<th>MG Juniors</th>
<th>MG Seniors</th>
<th>MG Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment in undergraduate programs has consistently increased over the past three years. This year’s fall enrollment represents a 34% increase over fall 2001. Capping enrollment in the cohorts at 20 would put a ceiling of 160 students on the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credit hour production

Table 7: IPPA Data- Hour Production by Area Fall 2001-Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% School</th>
<th>% College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDIS</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>32.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDIS</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>31.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>EDEC</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDMG</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDRD</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDIS</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Upper division hour production increased 29.1% in Fall 2003 versus Fall 2002, and production in Fall 2002 had increased 12% over Fall 2002. Graduate production was up slightly over Fall 2002 (6.7%) but was still down slightly compared to Fall 2001 (-4.8%). Not represented in this data was a substantial increase in graduate production in Spring and Summer 2004 as a result of 46 new graduate students from Twiggs County Schools completing the 9 hour Reading Endorsement Program.

The Department’s contribution to the School’s production has increased 10% since Fall 2001 and its contribution to the College has increased 23% during the same period.

Exit exam scores and/or pass rates/Percentage of students passing licensure exams
Table 8 reports the most current data on PRAXIS II exams and is taken from the most recent Board of Regents Report. During 2003-4, 14 graduate students took and passed their respective exit examinations.

### Table 8: GC&SU Praxis II Longitudinal Comparative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>99-00 Total</th>
<th>99-00 Passed</th>
<th>99-00 Rate</th>
<th>00-01 Total</th>
<th>00-01 Passed</th>
<th>00-01 Rate</th>
<th>01-02 Total</th>
<th>01-02 Passed</th>
<th>01-02 Rate</th>
<th>Cum 99-02 Passed</th>
<th>99-02 Passed</th>
<th>99-02 Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>92%</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>91%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>98%</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
<td><strong>93%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student successes**

Our undergraduate student successes are best seen in our seniors and represented in scholarship, leadership in school and state organizations, and research presented at regional, state, and national conferences. The accomplishments of the 69 graduating seniors in early childhood and middle grades education are summarized in the following table.

### Table 9: Summary of Student Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Childhood (n=48)</th>
<th>Middle Grades (n=21)</th>
<th>Total (n=69)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with HOPE Scholarship for 4 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Presentations at regional state or national conferences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices held in student organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students awarded scholarships in addition to HOPE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students inducted in honor societies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accomplishments of recent graduates include:

Lianna Nix, (Alumna Cohort Class of 2001 & current host teacher) was selected middle School Teacher of the Year for Jasper County.
Ketura Collins was nominated and selected as "Teacher of The Year" at Bonaire Elementary in Houston County spring 2003. She completed her undergraduate degree in 1999 and her masters in December 2002. Both degrees were from GC&SU.

Misty Garcia was nominated and selected as "Teacher of the Year" at Todd Grant Elementary in Darien, Georgia. She was a graduate of the 2001 Middle Grade cohort, so Misty was awarded this honor during her second year of teaching.

Faculty/staff accomplishments

Publications


_____. Snipe, R. B.& Calfee, R. C (2003). Strategies for Writers, Levels A and B. Columbus, OH: Zaner-Bloser Publishing (This completes the series. Levels C-G were published 2002 authored by Crawford & Snipe)


Presentations


Kleine, Karynne; Mizelle, Nancy; and Hern, Leigh."Mentor Leaders: The Backbone to Professional Teacher Preparation at GC&SU."


Pogue, Revel; Campbell, Paige; Russell, Dee and students Cari Finley, Katie Fleming, Shawna D'Angelo, and Stacie. “Quilting experience: Stitching together pieces of our experience,” Georgia

Schwartz, Stacy L. (2003, December). Teachers Learning to Partner with Diverse Families. Interdisciplinary Qualitative Studies Advanced Seminar, Athens, GA.

Grants

Martin, Charlie and Grubb, Autumn. Received third year of funding ($240,000) for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (PT3). The GC&SU effort, the Prometheus Project, has four goals: 1) to improve the modeling of uses of technology in university courses, 2) to directly training teacher candidates to use technology in their teaching, 3) to enhance the opportunities of teacher candidates to use and see the uses of technology modeled in their field placements, and 4) to support new teachers' uses of technology as they begin their teaching careers. For the third year in a row, juniors in the early childhood, middle grades, and special education programs will be given laptop computers to use for three years. Federal funding for the Prometheus Project is approximately $240K. Total funds for this year, including matching funds from GC&SU and our partner school systems will exceed $500K.

Crawford, Les and Martin, Charles. Reading Endorsement Grant, ($5,000)

Kleine, Karynne. Becoming a Nationally Board Certified Teacher: Enhancing Credibility and Improving Learning. Faculty Research Award ($2000)

_______ Improving Teacher Quality Grant to develop an interdisciplinary course on using DNA technology for middle grades and secondary teachers for summer 2003 ~$40,000

_______ ELSI summer institute in Dartmouth summer 2003 ~$8,000

Schwartz, Stacy L. Learning to Work with Diverse Families: How a Study Group Affects Teachers' Practice Building Partnerships with Students' Families. Faculty Research Award. ($640)

Editorial Review Boards and Professional Service

_____. Editorial Board, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy (CRDEUL) at the University of Minnesota, 2000-present.

______. Monograph Committee Reviewer for the National Association for Developmental Education, 1997-present.


_____ . Reviewer, Teaching Exceptional Children.


Hunnicutt, Vicki. Chaired project for Air Force Association to display and fly a replica of the 1905 Wright Flyer at the Robins Air Show, Sept 6-7.

Klein, Trish. President, Georgia Council for the Social Studies.

_____ . Representative to the House of Delegates for the National Council for the Social Studies.
Participant, Curriculum Revision Team for Georgia’s Quality Core Curriculum


Martin, Charles. Editorial Board, The Middle School Journal

Mizelle, Nancy. Editorial Board, The Middle School Journal

Mumma, Brian. Board of Directors, Georgia Children's Museum. Macon, GA.

Warren, Lyndall. Board member for EEA (Environmental Education Alliance of GA).

Honors

Bader, Carol. Nominated by National Association for Developmental Education as a Fellow in the American Council of Developmental Education Associations.


Kleine, Karynne --GC&SU Excellence in Teaching, 2003

Schwartz, Stacy L. (2004). Awarded the D. Keith Osborn Outstanding Graduate Student Award, Department of Elementary Education, The University of Georgia.

Partnerships

Mumma, Brian. Conducting a teacher and middle school student technology collaboration project with Clifton Ridge Middle School, Jones County, GA and Roteberg Skola, Edsbyn, Sweden. Utilizing telecommunications and web-based cameras for community building and learning exchange between schools.
Support of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

The six learning initiatives in the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan are listed below along with ways the department is supporting each initiative. The QEP focuses primarily on undergraduate education as do our efforts to support the QEP.

7. Enhance student orientation programs for transfer students.

No specific activities are designed to support this initiative although the department participates in regular orientation sessions for transfer students and provides advising to make sure transfer students understand department admissions requirements.

8. Enhance student leadership opportunities

The department sponsors student professional organizations associated with the Professional Association of Georgia Educators and the National Middle School Association. Our students hold offices in the local chapters and in the state organization.

9. Enhance academic challenges within the curriculum to reflect the liberal arts mission.

Our pre-education requirements in the CORE as well as coursework at the junior and senior levels is firmly grounded in rigorous content, thinking, and communication skills normally associated with a liberal arts preparation.

10. Enhance recruitment of students and faculty to increase diversity.

Although no specific plans were in place for student recruitment this year, we plan to institute specific recruitment efforts as part of next year’s goals. That said, according to IPPA data, minority enrollment in the department was 8% at the undergraduate level and 14% at the graduate level. We also believe that our efforts to establish school improvement cohorts at the graduate level and continue reading endorsement cohorts will help with minority recruitment into graduate programs. This year we hired one minority faculty member in the one search we completed.

11. Enhance student involvement in the campus community and beyond.

The field-based cohort program emphasizes involvement in local school systems working directly with children and with classroom teachers to improve the
learning of P-12 children. Our move to a school improvement focus with selected graduate programs will also involve students and faculty directly in efforts to improve P-12 teaching and learning. We also believe that our criteria for admission to the cohort, that emphasizes the experiential transcript and work with P-12 children, will encourage student involvement in the community.

12. Enhance preparation of students for post-graduate opportunities

We do not have any special initiatives in place that focus on preparation of students for post-graduate opportunities. However, our emphasis on life-long learning certainly communicates the importance of post-graduate education.

Recommendations for Next Academic Year

Changes in departmental goals and objectives

1. Develop plan for graduate programs focusing on school improvement (including Reading Endorsement Program)
2. Revise early childhood graduate program to achieve NAEYC recognition.
3. Increase minority enrollment in undergraduate cohorts and at the graduate level
4. Develop database system to collect and track candidate performance data (LiveText).
5. Develop and implement data collection and aggregation procedures for graduate program.
6. Refine admissions process for undergraduate cohort program including measures for dispositions.
7. Complete preparations for NCATE/PSC site visits.
8. Revise technology preparation and enhance opportunities to use technology and see its use modeled in P-12 placements.
9. Pursue external funding to support department initiatives.

Budgetary needs of the department, linked to the performance indicators and the departmental goals

Salary Equity is an enormous issue in the department and the school. Over the past decade, university salaries in education have not kept pace with salaries in P-12 schools. This discrepancy has affected us in two ways. First, this year the school has lost two faculty members to P-12 schools. Second, we’ve had two P-12 teachers turn us down for positions because of the salary differences. One was facing a $20,000 cut in pay to accept a position at GC&SU. Dr. Bader has noted salary issues in detail in her well-researched report so I will not repeat that information here. I would like to use money from one faculty member’s load being reduced to 51% (approximately $40,000) to address salary issues.
Although we will search for one new position in reading, we will continue to have a large portion of our reading courses taught by part-time faculty. This problem is exacerbated by Dr. Crawford’s time being reduced to 51% and by the fact that our other reading faculty members hold administrative positions.

Related to facilities, we need additional office space for new faculty members being hired for the 2005 academic year. Currently, we have faculty spread over two floors. This arrangement does not contribute to the type of collaborative efforts necessary for the success of our programs. Second, classrooms need lcd projectors and updated computers. As we move to requiring students to purchase wireless laptops, classrooms will need to have adequate AC power connections and fast, reliable wireless access. Immediately we need funds to upgrade classroom computers and purchase lcd projectors. Within the next two years we will need to address the AC power issue.
Departmental Annual Report
Foundations and Secondary Education

Major Accomplishments for Academic Year

Departmental Goals and Objectives

- Itemization of the department’s goals in the past year, with discussion of which goals were met and in what ways

Major Objectives for 2003

1. Increase efficiency of my faculty in carrying out departmental tasks including NCATE writing assignments.
   This goal was met. Data was collected as efficiently as could be hoped for for accreditation purposes and all NCATE reports were written well and completed on time.

2. Improve the quality of all programs through increased faculty collaboration and improved means of adhering to standards with a special emphasis on how our programs meet national organization content standards. All departmental syllabi were re-written to reflect the standards met in each course. We then looked at what specific assignments, etc. might be best utilized to meet each of those standards.

3. Encourage faculty to improve their teaching practice through multiple forms of feedback and self-assessment.
   The goal was to encourage, and I did indeed do that. The department brainstormed a list of possible ways of obtaining feedback and then that list was distributed to everyone. I modeled the use of alternate forms of feedback by teaming with Maureen Horgan from the music department to do some peer review. I also learned to conduct mid-term assessments and carried out such an assessment for a professor in Nursing. However, the faculty in my department still have shown little desire to use multiple forms of classroom assessment. I will make this one of our goals again for next year.

- Discussion of changes as a result of assessment (Closing the loop)
  The number of changes made as a result of assessment are truly too numerous to mention. Nearly all changes were made to specific programs, and these changes are documented at length in our SACS and NCATE tables. Most significantly, all the major assessment documents we utilize were revised in order to bring them directly in line with our standards.

- Identify enrollment management goals per program
  - Goal for admitted freshmen per program – Given the number of slots available in our cohorts, we are probably above what our goal should be. There were 178 freshman pre-education majors in 2002, the majority of
whom have just applied to our cohorts. Our cohorts pretty much filled. In 03-04, 200 freshman took EDFS 2224, so I would expect we may have to turn students away in 05-06. On the plus side, when we can pick and choose, we get higher quality students in our cohorts, so 200 may be a good number.

- Goal for admitted transfer students per program – transfer students do not generally come into programs in my department as we serve no juniors or seniors.
- Goal for graduate students admitted per program (as applicable) – I would really like to see our M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs double in size over the next two years.

- Support of University Strategic Goals/Articulation of how the department/unit goals and objectives correspond with the University’s Strategic Goals

I believe that the EDFS department meets the majority of the goals quite well, but I am going to focus here on the one point in each section where I think we most shine.

IG “Create Distinctive Educational Experiences”
The MAT truly is a unique experience. The intensity of the field experiences, the focus on developing leaders, the sense of community developed, and the level of academic rigor make it one of the highest quality programs of it’s kind in the nation. We are now working on developing M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs that are similarly unique.

IIB “Promote Shared Governance”
While the university works toward this goal, we are working toward it in our department as well. Most major decisions are made by vote at departmental meetings.

IIID “Encourage Student Participation in Faculty Guided Research”
All students in the Milledgeville MAT cohort presented research at a conference. Furthermore, all our Ed.S. students submit articles for publication, and many of these are in fact published.

IVF “Enhance Student Orientation Programs”
Since the Freshman Seminar is housed in EDFS, we have been working on improving it each year and the student opinion forms seem to suggest that we are succeeding.

Support of Instruction

Resources

Average class size
EDFS:
2001: 22 sections with an average of 16-18 students per class
2002: 24 sections with an average of 19 students per class
2003: 41 sections with an average of 14 students per class
EDIT:
2001: 15 sections with an average of 16 students per class
2002: 18 sections with an average of 18 students per class
2003: 17 sections with an average of 14 students per class

I am pleased to see that class sizes are down this year. We have a number of very small classes of 1-4 students due to special internships for non-degree certification students and the like, and those skew the final average. But in general I was able to keep freshman classes between 25-27 and graduate courses between 16-20 in most cases.

At first I thought the number of sections offered must be incorrect. Could they really be up from 24 to 41? I double checked on PAWS, and those numbers are correct. We had a very large number of freshman taking our introduction to education class this year, so there were several extra sections of that. Then the MAT cohort was quite large and all their classes had to be split into two sections, so those added up.

EDIS is listed as being in Foundations and Secondary, but it is not. This is the third year we have had this problem. Hence the totals for this department on the intranet are totally incorrect. Also, EDIT courses are listed under two departments. I combined them for the purposes of this document.

**Student/faculty ratio**

The ratio of students to faculty in this department is
2003: 14:1

**Percentage of classes taught by part-time faculty**

**EDFS**
2002: 4%
2003: 5%

**EDIT**
2002: 11%
2003: 18%

2 out of the 41 EDFS classes offered this fall were taught by an adjunct. This adjunct was Kathryn Gray-White, a specialist in foundations of education finishing up her doctorate in that area at UGA. We had to bring her in at the last minute to teach 2 sections of EDFS 2224 when demand for that class rose so quickly.

3 of the 17 classes offered in EDIT was taught by part-time faculty (18%). Two of those classes were taught by Dr. Ron Trice who just retired from the department, and the other was taught by Deborah Touchton, a long-time adjunct who teaches for us virtually every semester.

Chances are good the number of part-time faculty we will need to use is going to rise steadily. As we move toward our goal of induction for all graduates of initial certification programs and as we strive to increase the number of teachers we produce, the faculty we have are not going to be able to cover our needs.
Facilities

Our facilities have been somewhat under par for the past few years, but a lot of work is being done this summer, and I suspect that come fall, they will be quite adequate.

Diversity of students and faculty

There is very little diversity amongst our students or faculty. In the job searches that I have conducted since I came here in 2001, only one non-White applicant had all the necessary qualifications. We did not end up hiring him, however, because he did not have a P-12 background. In terms of students, the Recruitment Committee has met this year and last year with individuals such as Paul Jones and Katrina McClain. They gave us several good ideas, none of which have helped a bit. For example, we developed a plan to target admitted minorities and “court” them. Paul showed us how to get their contact information from his data banks and so forth. Great plan, except of the hundreds of pre-education majors admitted, I think only one or two were racial minorities!

We have done a good job recruiting males, which was one of our goals. The ratio of men to women in education is problematic as nationwide, about 25% of all teachers are men., but the programs in EDFS attract quite a lot of men (38%).

Instructional load issues

Instructional load in the School of Education is always complicated, but each year we get closer to finding formulas that work. This year, the loads for my faculty were reasonable in most cases. The biggest concern I have is for un-tenured professors who have a hard time balancing teaching and research. I would love to see class loads reduced for untenured professors.

Performance

Enrollment in major

Undergraduate education majors take their initial “Foundations of Education” course in Foundations and Secondary Education, but all of the majors in this department are in the graduate school.

EDFS undergraduates served:
2001: 205
2002: 216
2003: 263

EDFS graduate students:
2001: 41
2002: 61
2003: 56 (+ 16 non-degree)

EDIT graduate students:
2001: 51
2002: 46
2003: 45 (+ 19 non-degree)

EDFS graduate students are divided into 39 in MAT, 12 M.Ed., and 5 Ed.S. Already our MAT cohorts for next year will probably number close to 50 and hopefully our other graduate programs will be up as well.

One problem, however, is that I cannot see where our non-degree certification students are included in these numbers. We currently serve a rather large non-degree population of 16 EDFS and 19 EDIT students. These students take M.Ed. level courses with us and require as much faculty time and energy as degree seeking students.

Credit hour production

Again, EDIS has been included when it should not have. When the numbers are corrected they are:
% of the school:
2002: 28.2%
2003: 27.0%
% of the college:
2002: 2.6%
2003: 2.5%

I am pleased that Foundations and Secondary is responsible for 27% of the credit hour production. Educational Leadership and Early Childhood programs throughout the nation both tend to be significantly larger than Foundations programs, so this percentage is reasonable in my estimation.

Yield rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IPPA data only provided numbers for undergraduates. Recruitment of undergraduates is really a school-wide activity and not the work of any one department. To me, the most significant number is the enrolled to admitted percentage. We cannot accept everyone who applies because many do not meet the admissions criteria, but ideally all students who were admitted would enroll. It is great to see that number up so significantly from last year.

First-to-second year retention rates
I saw no first to second year retention rate data available. I would, however, be very interested in seeing this data since the first and second year students fall under the supervision of Foundations. We are currently working on a retention plan that we believe will be quite effective, but we will need appropriate data in order to be certain that it is indeed working.

I have chosen to estimate this number by comparing the number of freshman in EDFS 2224 in 02-03 with the number of sophomores in EDEX 2210 in 03-04 since education majors are supposed to take the 2224 in their freshman year and the 2210 in their sophomore year. This yields a retention rate of 153:178 or 86%. My guess is that this number is actually slightly higher given that not every student follows the pattern perfectly. 90% is pretty accurate, I’ll bet.

**Graduation rates**

Secondary Ed. (SEED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MED</th>
<th>MAT</th>
<th>Ed.S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Na (but should be 4)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to 2001, the various EDFS graduate programs were listed under separate prefixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Ed.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sci Ed (NSED)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3, EDS 3</td>
<td>3, MED 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Science Ed (SSED)</td>
<td>1, MED 1</td>
<td>3, MED 5</td>
<td>2, MED 7</td>
<td>3, MED 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I cannot find information on our Ed.S. graduates listed on the chart although I attended some Ed.S. exit exams, so I know they must exist. Data is still not listed for 2002 either. I would also like to see non-degree certification students added to these numbers. While they may not receive a degree from GC&SU, they are still teachers we are preparing.

The M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs, like our other programs, have enjoyed steady enrollment over the years. I would like to see total enrollment move from an average of around 10-15 per year to closer to 30.

Instr Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit exam scores and/or pass rates/Percentage of students passing licensure exams

All M.Ed. and Ed.S students who took their exit exams, passed them. 96% of all MAT students passed the Praxis II licensure exam.

Student scholarly/creative activities

John Andrews
*Presenter, Interdisciplinary Research Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Ben Spell
*Presenter, Interdisciplinary Research Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Daryl Leslie
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Jason Kornegay
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Julie Wade
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Jeff Eller
*Presenter, Interdisciplinary Research Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship
Recipient, Graduate Research Scholarship

Stephanie Shelton
*Presenter, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference
*Presenter, Interdisciplinary Research Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship
Recipient, Regents Opportunity Scholarship
Recipient, Mary Burns Alumni Scholarship

Chad Mozley
*Presenter, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Julie Kight
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Laura Brown
*Presenter, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Allison Hays
*Participant, San Jose, Costa Rica Study Abroad Program
Recipient, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Michael Ward
*Presenter, Interdisciplinary Research Conference

Buffy Jenkins
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Meredith Pavolovsky
*Recipient, Graduate Assistantship with Academic Outreach
Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Amber Howard
*Presenter, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Chris Head
*Recipient, Saul Wolpert Scholarship

Courtney Dale
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop

Dana Queen
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop

Kathryn Wagner
*Presenter, Interdisciplinary Research Conference

Elizabeth Cooley
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Lisa Prevatt
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Jessica Sedor
*Published in The Corinthian
Presenter, Georgia Council of Teachers of English Conference
Recipient, Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship

Lindsey Levie
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop

Liz Cawrse
*Presenter, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning Workshop

Student awards/recognition

Graduate students
Outstanding Majors
EDIT……………………………………………………………. Juli Lakewood
EDFS…………………………………………………………..Marilyn Devereaux
Master of Arts in Teaching
Outstanding Students
Macon.........................................................Jeff Locks
Milledgeville..............................................Gloria Burkett

Outstanding Academic Student
Macon.........................................................Elizabeth Cooper
Milledgeville..............................................Stephanie Shelton
Saul Wolpert Scholarship............................James Head

Faculty/staff accomplishments

Brenda Trice

Kevin Crabb
• Presenter and session moderator, GCSU Student Interdisciplinary Research Conference
• Presenter at the Southern Center for International Studies Curriculum Workshop
• Completed the FDW program
• “We the People” Curriculum workshop

Marianne Edwards
• Presented program, “The Emerging Professional: Building a Professional Identity During the Freshmen and Sophomore Years” at GACTE/GATE conference, Sea Island, GA, March, 2003

Martha Jones
• Developed an agreement between GC&SU and the Children’s Museum

Heide Hlawaty
• Dunn, R., De Paula, R. M., Hlawaty, H., Honigsfeld, A. & Ulubobova, T. (in
progress). Stop educating teachers to teach hypothetical children: The case for individualizing instruction—and how to do it.


Jane Hinson
- Journal article in preparation for publication submission:
  With Smoot, S. Changing Teacher Behaviors by Self-Observation and Self-Recording

JJ Hayden
- Presented program, “In Pursuit of Funding: Grant Strategies and Resources” Workshop, JHL Induction Conference, GA, December, 2003

Sharie Smoot
- Dr. Smoot was published in R.I.F. News. She has submitted 6 articles for publication and one is currently in press.

Cynthia Alby
- “Becoming a Mentor Leader in a Professional Community” published in November
- Consultant to the Governor’s Teaching Fellows Program
- Attended the COBEC conference in Belize and conducted a study of Belizean elementary and secondary schools. I also wrote an article on this visit for Terranostra
- Nancy Mizelle and I presented the SBAATC document in a workshop on implementing NBPTS standards at the NBPTS State Conference

Departmental accomplishments

WE ALL WORKED ON ACCREDITATION REPORTS UNTIL WE THOUGHT OUR FINGERS WOULD DROP OFF.

Support of Quality Enhancement Plan

While I feel like the EDFS department certainly supports all aspects of the QEP, we are doing a particularly good job of this in certain areas. And while the QEP may particularly address undergraduates, there is no harm in pursuing it’s ideals at the graduate level when possible as well.
There are no undergraduate degrees housed in EDFS, but we do teach two courses to freshmen: Introduction to Education and Freshman Seminar. In these courses we strive especially to work on goals 5 and 6.5.1 as each year we seek to improve students’ opportunities for field experiences and also improve the quality of those early field experiences. Also, in our Freshman Seminars, we always invite multiple people to come talk about study abroad opportunities (goal 6.5.6) because we feel like the sooner they start planning, the more likely they will be able to actually go. The department also created a club called “Future High School Educators” to provide undergraduates who are planning to go into MAT type programs a chance to begin developing leadership capabilities and learn beyond the classroom (goals 2 and 5).

In the graduate programs, we are especially interested in the goal of “Enhancing Leadership Opportunities” (goal 2). In the MAT, for example, we require students to attend state conferences and provide a great deal of support in helping them present at those conferences.

**Recommendations for Next Academic Year**

**Changes in departmental goals and objectives**

1) Faculty will create an agenda for improving their own instruction through feedback that does not rely on student opinion. They will publicly post this agenda and meet with me in October and November to discuss progress in this area.
2) The M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs in secondary education will create comprehensive assessment programs that allow each of these two degree programs to demonstrate fully that its graduates meet the standards set by the national board.
3) The EDIT courses for initial certification (3202 and 5202) will be redesigned to meet the needs of the students in those classes.

**Budgetary needs of the department, linked to the performance indicators and the departmental goals**

Our budget meets our needs reasonably well as long as we are all careful about how much photocopying we do, long distance phone calls, etc. I would like to see my faculty travel more frequently to present at conferences, and perhaps that will be possible when the economy improves.
Major Accomplishments for Academic Year

Departmental Goals and Objectives for previous year:

1. Implement final transition from traditional to cohort model in the L5 Education Leadership program.
   **Expected Results:** Final transition for traditional model to cohort model in L5 program will be completed.
   **Actual Results:** The traditional program in Leadership was discontinued at the L5 level.

2. Implement final transition from traditional to cohort model in the L6 Education Leadership program.
   **Expected Results:** Final transition for traditional model to cohort model in L6 program will be completed.
   **Actual Results:** The traditional program in Leadership was discontinued at the L6 level.

3. Apply for accreditation from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) for all programs in special education
   **Expected Results:** Accreditation materials will be submitted to the Council for Exceptional Children for Interrelated special education at the undergraduate and graduate level.
   **Actual Results:** Accreditation was granted at the undergraduate level and deferred at the graduate level.

4. Begin transition from traditional to cohort model in the graduate programs in Special Education.
   **Expected Results:** The EdFocus program will be started while the traditional programs will be phased out.
   **Actual Results:** Two cohorts in the EdFocus program were started in spring semester 2004.

Changes as a result of assessment

As a result of assessment and goals from the previous year, a continuation of the major direction for both the graduate and undergraduate programs is proposed. In the Special Education program, the undergraduate area has received accreditation from Council for
Exceptional Children. However, the decision on the graduate program was deferred until one class of students has graduated. Therefore, the major undertaking of program revision will be to accumulate data required for this accreditation. In the program for Educational Leadership, the closing of the traditional program has resulted in a need to refocus faculty effort toward meeting the ELCC requirements for accreditation of both the L5 and L6 levels.

**Enrollment Management Goals per Program**

The department houses undergraduate programs in two areas: special education and education leadership. At this time, our programs are full and we, in fact, are forced to turn down students in the L5 area of Education Leadership.

Undergraduate Special Education-The program is capped at twenty students per cohort starting in fall semester. At this time the cohort for fall 2004 is full.

Graduate Special Education-The graduate program in special education (EdFocus) leading to initial certification in Interrelated is capped at 15 students. We currently have two cohorts of 12 and 14. The enrollment goal for the January 2005 cohort is 15 students.

Education Leadership-The original faculty recommendation for both the L5 and L6 program in Education Leadership was 20 students per cohort. At this time the faculty is studying the need to reduce this number based on workload, travel time, and work in the schools. The tentative numbers are 16 students per cohort in the L5 program and 14 students per cohort in the L6.

**Support of University Strategic Goals**

The departmental goals support the university strategic goals in several ways.

Goal 1B-Create and atmosphere of community, is clearly served in our cohort models at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The main thrust of a cohort model for delivery of instruction is to enhance interaction between and among students and faculty thereby leading to communal learning and sharing of ideas and experiences. Student anecdotal records indicate that the cohort models currently used in all our programs are valued by students and instructors for this reason.
Goal III-Promote Intellectual Excellence in Faculty and Students. The faculty currently conducts rigorous scrutiny of candidates for admission to all programs (IIIA) as well as encouraging the shared research with students in special education and leadership (IIID).

Goal IV-Enhance Student Centeredness. Academic advisement is done by cohort leaders at the graduate and undergraduate level that facilitates a climate of quality and value in the advisement process. This, in turn, directly contributes to faculty/student interactions.

Support of Instruction

Resources

Average Class Size

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDEX</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across two programs the department offered an average 46 class sections with the average class size being 16 students in special education programs and 18 in leadership programs. This number should be mitigated in the case of special education as no differentiation is made between graduate and undergraduate classes. As a five-year trend these numbers appear stable and take into account low enrollment special education graduate programs that are scheduled to be eliminated in Mental Retardation, Learning Disabilities, and Behavior Disorders. In addition, numbers reflect classes offered as part of the Core Curriculum (EDEX 2210 in Area F) as well as major area classes in the undergraduate special education cohort. In the special education major, the average class size is stable at 18 for the undergraduate cohort and 14 for the graduate cohort. The number for Education Leadership across the L5 and L6 programs in 18.

Student/Faculty Ratio

The average class sizes of 16 & 18 are indicative of student/faculty ratio well within the targets set by the university. The Departmental programs are in the process of being changed from a traditional format to a cohort format over the course of the next two years. Faculty have established consensus that class size in each graduate cohort in both Educational Leadership and Special Education be limited to twenty students each but this matter is to be studied by program faculty in the coming year.

Percentage of Classes Taught by part-time faculty

For the academic year 2003 the percentage of part-time faculty used across both major areas was 16%. This continues to drop from the previous five-year trend of over 50% and represents a switch from the traditional programs to cohort based programs in both areas. Faculty redirection within the School of Education as well as new positions.
allocated by the university have resulted in a significant reduction of part time faculty use in the five-year period. In undergraduate program part time faculty were rarely used. The number of part-time faculty in the graduate programs has been reduced significantly. The part-time faculty used in graduate programs in Education Leadership and Special Education are skilled practitioners who bring needed experience to our graduate students in both disciplines. In the Special Education graduate programs, the transition from traditional to cohort model will not reduce the number of part time faculty used greatly.

Facilities

Facilities concerns centers on the need for off-campus locations in which to teach out Education Leadership programs. Currently student come to the Milledgeville campus for Saturday classes but since we draw students state-wide a more convenient location would help recruitment. The graduate program in Special Education is housed at the campus of Macon State College and is adequate for our needs.

Diversity of Students and Faculty

Concerns within the university about a diverse student body are not representative of the student body in our programs. For the past year, the undergraduate program had 8.5% African American students while the graduate programs in special education and education leadership had 32% minority enrollment.

Performance

Enrollment by Major

Data reported by the Institutional Planning and Policy Analysis office do not reflect what is thought to exist on the department level. For example, the number of reported majors in special education at the junior year is 12 when, in fact, we have 19 current students in the junior year cohort. In addition, the number of freshman and sophomore students reported as 2225 is at variance with the actual number of majors advising in the department of 50. The number of undergraduate majors, as a five-year trend, is down slightly but this is thought to reflect the continued change in program model noted last year, increase in tuition, and the statewide mission that the university has adopted. The inconsistency of data reported between the department and the university is though to reflect the fact that students currently in our programs may have not officially changed their major at the time data were collected.

Credit Hour Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Percentage of University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDEL</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEX</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of credit hours, when reported as a total for the entire university, appears small. This must be mitigated, however, when viewed as a total percentage of the
graduate program specifically. In fact, as a five-year trend, the enrollment in the graduate programs has increased slightly and in any given semester accounts for almost 10% of the entire graduate credit hour production in the university. Credit hour production at the graduate level possibly will decrease due to several factors including an increase in tuition, poor facilities at the Macon State University site, and the requirement for part-time graduate students in Milledgeville to pay what is viewed by them to be unfair and arbitrary fees associated with graduate study. These factors have been cited frequently by students as reasons for delaying their education or enrolling at other institutions that do not share these requirements. In addition, it is projected that the move to a cohort based model and changes in state certification rules will result in a decrease of credit hours over the next five-year period. How much would be speculative as changes at the state level are beyond the control of the university.

Exit exam scores and/or pass rates

The programs in special education and education leadership both require an exit portfolio as the exit activity. The portfolio is developed as part of the senior capstone experience for the undergraduates and as a culminating course for graduates. For this reason the rate of passing is 100%.

Percentage of Students Passing licensure Exams

The undergraduate special education program has a 99% pass rate on the PRAXIS II licensure exam for the past four years (this reflects one student who did not pass the exam). For minority students, the passing rate is 100% for the past two years. Current data indicate that the program in Education Leadership has a passing rate of 84%. This is rate is low due to the nature of our program. As the transition to the cohort model for the L5 (the only program requiring the PRAXIS II) is completed, passing rates will increase due to an increase in student quality. The current rate of the last graduating cohort in Education Leadership was 96%.

Student Successes

Student success in terms of post graduate study and career placement is excellent. Of student seeking admittance to graduate school, the acceptance rate is 100%. Furthermore, each student graduating from the undergraduate program in 2003 has found employment in Georgia public schools.

Student Scholarly/Creative Activities and Student Awards/Recognitions

Holly Adkins
Phi Kappa hi
T.E. Lavane Alumni Scholarship
Weir and Wells Study Abroad Scholarship Recipient
President’s List-Fall 2002
Phi Delta Kappa Scholarship
Sweden International Studies Grant

**Dana Baxter**
Director, Best Buddies, 2003-2004

**Shea Buckley**
State President, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2003-2004

**Kasey Connell**
Governor, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003
Director, Best Buddies, 2002-2003
Co-Presenter, Georgia American Association on Mental Retardation Conference, Milledgeville, Georgia, 2002
Recipient, Hope Promise Scholarship, 2 years
Recipient, Hope Scholarship, 4 years

**Lindsay Garrett**
Historian, GC&SU Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003
Lead Presenter, Georgia Council for Exceptional Children Conference, Macon, Georgia, 2003

**Erin Howell**
Treasurer, GC&SU Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003
Co-Presenter, Georgia American Association on Mental Retardation Conference, Milledgeville, Georgia, 2002
Recipient, Hope Promise Scholarship, 2 years
Recipient, Hope Scholarship, 4 years
Recipient, GC&SU Alumni Scholarship, 2002-2003
Member, Alpha Lambda Delta Honor Society
Member, Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society

**Theresa Ignatius**
HOPE Promise Scholarship
Dean’s List Fall 2002

**Natalie Johnson**
Historian, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003

**Casey Singleton**
Secretary, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2003-2004
Activity Director, Best Buddies 2003-4
Christy Spangler
Hope Teacher Promise Scholarship

Ashlin Stephens
Historian, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2003-2004
Miss Georgia College & State University 2003

Julia Strange
Treasurer, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003

Lindsay Tyler
Hope Promise Teacher Scholarship
President’s List-Fall 2002

Ashley White
Historian, GC&SU Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003
Recipient, Hope Promise Scholarship, 2 years

Michelle Williams
Vice President, Georgia Student Council for Exceptional Children, 2002-2003

Faculty/Staff Accomplishments

The departmental faculty in both the Special Education and Education Leadership programs continued work in redesign and implementation of the graduate programs. During the coming year a substantial revision of the initial certification graduate programs in special education will be completed and implemented. This revision was a direct result of our NCATE/PSC accreditation self-studies. As a result of these revisions, the training model will provide our students a more consistent graduate education as well as better serve the school systems in which they teach Georgia College & State University is unique in Georgia in the manner in which graduate education in this field is designed and delivered. Regarding the undergraduate special education program, accreditation was received from the Council for Exceptional Children and was the result of substantial work by faculty in this program.

Recommendations for Next Academic Year

Departmental Goals and Objectives
1. Program Faculty in Education Leadership will revise entrance criteria for L5 and L6 programs to more adequately reflect dispositions and standards in the discipline.

2. Program faculty in Education Leadership will design and implement an assessment system which examines both program effectiveness and leader candidate impact on the student success while they are in the program and upon appointment to leadership positions in the field.

3. Program faculty in Education Leadership will design an Internship Handbook which defines the role and responsibilities for mentors and leader candidates during their field-based experiences.

4. Program faculty in Special Education will continue implementation and revision of the EdFocus program for initial certification in special education Interrelated.

5. Program faculty in special education will submit a proposal for the EdS degree in Special Education to the university for submission to the Board of Regents.

6. The EdFocus program will have a passing rate of 85% for program completers from the January 2004 cohort.

**Budgetary needs of the Department**

The total non-personal services budget for this department for FY 2003 was $13,904.00. In fact, the amount of funding allocated by the university has remained relatively unchanged for the past five-year period. The apparent increase in budget is the result of funds generated by Maymester courses offered by the department in the special education and education leadership programs. As a five-year trend, this amount has not changed significantly in any sub area despite the expectation of new programs and fiscal responsibility. We remain seriously under funded in areas of faculty allocation, equipment, telephone, supplies, and faculty travel. Of these categories, faculty allocation is, and will continue to present major problems for our mission. At the present time our programs in Education Leadership are full and waiting lists exist for our fall 2004 cohort at the L5 and L6 level. In past years, this low funding in the non-personal services area has been alleviated somewhat by revenue from Maymester classes taught in the Education Leadership and Special Education programs. As the department transitions from traditional to cohort models in all its graduate programs, the feasibility of teaching Maymester courses will be reduced. In addition, the academic appropriateness of departmental offerings in a condensed May term is questionable.
APPENDIX A

Summary of Self-Report Validation Study

By Sharie Smoot
Summary

- The participants were two graduating classes, 2002 and 2003 of students receiving their initial teacher certification.
- The 14 mentor leaders served as advisors for their group of students for both their junior and senior years in most cases. In the case of the two graduate level cohorts, the program was only for one year in secondary education. The mentor leaders also served as instructors for various (but not all) of the courses taken by their assigned students. Five of the mentor leaders were new to the school of education and this was their first cohort.
- The questionnaire had 13 questions related to the stated goals of the school of education in their conceptual framework as well as an overall readiness to begin teaching question. Both groups completed identical versions by circling the Likert scale elements. The forms were matched by student identifying numbers but were otherwise confidential.
- The data analysis used the Spearman Rho to correlate the sets of answers. The results were as expected in that for the most part; the students rated themselves higher than their mentor leader did. Most of the students (98%) rated themselves as Excellent or Good on their overall readiness to begin teaching and on most of the different teaching skills. (This was from all 304 initial teaching candidates surveyed at exit from the program, not just the students in the cohort programs.)
- The mentor leaders also used mostly Excellent or Good (89%) to rate their students (n = 210) as on their overall readiness as beginning teachers. The difference between these two sets of ratings was statistically significant using a Chi Square test collapsed to a two by three cell table. Ratings of poor and fair were collapsed into one cell ($\chi^2 (2) = 20.8, p < .001$). The proportion of their ratings of excellent ratings was much higher for the students than for the mentor leaders, which we expected to find.
- Then the percent of ratings of excellent were calculated for both the students and the mentor leaders for all of the 14 skills listed, actually 13 skills and one overall teaching readiness rating. When these numbers were correlated as a set, the value of the correlation was much higher ($r = .69 n = 14, p = .004$, one-tailed). This means that the agreement between students and mentor leaders of which of their teaching skills was considered excellent is very good.
- For example, the mentor leaders rated 54% of their students as excellent in their knowledge of educational ethics and laws. This was their highest aspect rated. They rated their students lowest in their ability to assess learning in the children (only 25% were rated excellent in this aspect of teaching).
- The data from this study supports the assertion that student self-ratings at exit from the program are valid in regard to comparison with those of their mentor leader (program advisor), although students tend to rate themselves more highly than their professors did.
• Both students and professors agreed on which specific aspects of the conceptual framework resulted in outcomes of perceived strengths and weaknesses in readiness to begin teaching.

• In regards to more accurate self-assessment of specific abilities, the mentor leaders could stress more self-evaluation or collect more data in regards to the lowest correlated skills or abilities as stated in the Conceptual Framework.
Student Self-Evaluation of Teaching Abilities at Graduation from GC&SU Teacher Education in the Initial Preparation Program

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the self-ratings that the exiting seniors gave themselves on the 13 teaching skills/abilities emphasized in our conceptual framework would be comparable to the ratings given by them to their mentor leaders. It was expected that the seniors would probably rate themselves somewhat higher than their professors would, but that there would be a positive correlation of these ratings.

Methods

Participants

There were a total of 108 students and eight professors participating in the 2002 study. There were 6 cohorts from the main campus at Milledgeville and 2 cohorts from the satellite campus at Macon State College. The Milledgeville cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 27), Health and Physical Education (n = 7), Middle Grades (n = 16), Music (n = 4), Special Education (n = 19), and Secondary Education (n = 15). The Macon cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 10) and Secondary Education (n = 8). The mentor leaders were all professors who served as advisors and course instructors in the major field. The cohorts were students who started their professional education coursework at the start of their junior year and took all their classes together for the two-year period culminating in their student teaching during the spring of their senior year.

There were a total of 127 students and 6 more professors participating in the 2003 study. There were 6 cohorts from the main campus at Milledgeville and 2 cohorts from the satellite campus at Macon State College. The Milledgeville cohorts were Early Childhood (n = 29), Health and Physical Education (n = 9), Middle Grades (n = 9), Special Education (n = 19), and Secondary Education (n = 19). The Macon cohorts were Middle Grades (n = 13) and Secondary Education (n = 7). For 22 of the students, we do not know what cohort they were in because they did not include the last five digits of their social security number, or we could not match the number written by the student with the number given by the mentor leader. Some of these students were nondegree certification in an alternative program and did not have a mentor leader to evaluate them. The mentor leaders were all professors who served as advisors and course instructors in the major field. The cohorts were students who started their professional education coursework at the start of their junior year and took all their classes together for the two-year period culminating in their student teaching during the spring of their senior year.
**Instrumentation**

One-page questionnaires were used. See Appendix. The professors were instructed to rate each student in their group (cohort) at the end of his/her student teaching. “How would you rate his/her present abilities as a beginning teacher?” The students were asked “How would you rate your skills as a beginning teacher right now?” The 13 teaching skills were described and the rating scale was excellent, good, fair, or poor. There was an additional question (which was actually question one) in which the person was asked to rate their ability to “begin teaching overall”. The last five digits of the students’ social security numbers were used to match the questionnaires for data analysis.

**Procedures**

The students were given the one page questionnaire during a session in which they all met with the SOE certification officer to complete their paperwork for applying for teacher certification during their last month at GC&SU. The mentor leaders were given a comparable version of the form at about the same time and asked to rate each of their graduating seniors using the same rating scale. The instructions on the forms stated that the participants were to base their ratings or self-ratings on their skills/abilities as a beginning teacher.

**Data Analysis**

This was a descriptive study and Spearman Rho correlations were used. Data were analyzed as a whole and then cohort-by-cohort for both graduates in 2002 and graduates in 2003.

**Results**

Most of the students (98%) rated themselves as Excellent or Good on their overall readiness to begin teaching and on most of the different teaching skills. (This was from all 304 initial teaching candidates surveyed at exit from the program, not just the students in the cohort programs.) The mentor leaders also used mostly Excellent or Good (89%) to rate their students (n = 210) as on their overall readiness as beginning teachers. The proportion of their ratings of excellent ratings was much higher for the students than for the mentor leaders, which we expected to find. The difference between these two sets of ratings was statistically significant using a Chi Square test collapsed to a two by three cell table. Ratings of poor and fair were collapsed into one cell ($\chi^2 (2) = 20.8, p < .001$).
There were some positive and statistically significant correlations of the student and mentor leader ratings on about one third of the skills rated. This is where the preservice teachers and their mentor leaders agreed most on their abilities. Highest correlated were the ratings for managing behavior, the use of technology, and designing units of study. These ratings were statistically significant at the p < .01 levels. The actual Spearman Rho correlation coefficients were quite low (Rho = .22 was the highest). This is probably due to the restriction in range of the ratings (dependent variables) since most of the ratings were either a 3 (good) or a 4 (excellent). However the three skills correlated the highest are skills that are relatively easy to observe in performance or written products.