

**Educator Professions New Program  
Review Form**

**Private Institutions of Higher Education**

**Institution:** Furman University

**Proposed Program:** Educational Leadership; Ed.S

**Review Date :** 8/31/2015

**Overall Finding: Please see comments at end of document**

Recommended for approval

**Not recommended for approval**

Components	Met	Met With Conditions	Not Met
<b>I. Cover Sheet</b> A. Name of proposing institution B. Title of the proposed program C. Date of submission D. Signature of CEO of institution E. Contact person – Title/Email/Phone/Fax	X		
<b>II. Program Overview</b>  <b>IV. Classification</b> 1. name of proposed program 2. academic unit involved 3. designation, type and level of degree 4. proposed date of implementation 5. classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code 6. identification of program as <i>new</i> or <i>modification</i> 7. delivery mode	X		
B. Justification for the program 1. program purpose and long range goals 2. need for the program 3. centrality of the program to the institutional mission 4. relationship of the program to other programs within the institution and to other SC institutions of higher education	X		
C. Enrollment 1. admissions criteria specific to the program 2. table for projected total enrollment for first five years	X		
D. Curriculum 1. sample curriculum for undergraduate programs and for graduate programs that will use a required core of courses 2. a list, with catalog descriptions, of all new courses that will be added	X		
E. Faculty 1. table detailing the rank and academic qualifications of each staff member involved in the program (identified only by rank and not by name)	X		
<b>II. Physical plant</b> 1. adequacy of existing physical plant for the first five years of the proposed program 2. additional physical plant requirements, including modifications	X		

Components	Met	Met With Conditions	Not Met
G. Equipment – major equipment items needed for first five years	X		
H. Library resources	X		
I. Articulation 1. entry path for students from two-year institutions into four-year institutions as possible 2. statement of how the proposed program leads to a terminal degree	X		
J. Assurance of Institutional Approvals (academic provost approval, etc.)	X		
<b>III. South Carolina State Department of Education Requirements</b>  Description of the ways in which the new program will meet state requirements as outlined in the <i>Policy Guidelines for South Carolina Educator Preparation Units</i> :  A. ADEPT B. PADEPP (If applicable) C. EEDA D. Standards of Conduct Assessment Plan E. South Carolina Safe School Climate Act F. PreK-12 Academic Standards G. Admission Requirements- Initial and Advanced H. Field and Clinical Experiences, including number of hours and integration of ADEPT and/or PADEPP I. Eligibility for Initial Certification J. Annual Reports (AACTE/NCATE and Title II submission) K. Professional Development Courses (if applicable) L. Advanced Programs for Teachers Alignment with NBPTS M. Experimental or Innovative Programs (if applicable) N. ISTE Alignment		X	

Components	Met	Met With Conditions	Not Met
<p><b>IV. SPA or Other National Specialized and/or Professional Association Standards</b></p> <p>Each new program must present evidence that it is aware of the relevant national standards for the new program and has a plan for achieving national recognition once the program has ten completers or at the time program reports are due for a unit accreditation visit. *Download the program report template for the relevant program and complete the template to the best of your ability at this time.</p> <p>Using the applicable program report template, this section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Context (institutional/State policies that may influence application of standards)</li> <li>B. List of assessments (completion of chart to reflect 6-8 assessments)</li> <li>C. Relationship of assessments to standards (completion of chart)( National SPA Standards attached)</li> <li>D. Planned evidence for meeting standards (description of assessment and its use, directions to candidates, the rubric or scoring guide, will the standards, assessments and evidence align with individual disciplinary within the field, and a discussion of any other evidence to be collected in support of the standards)</li> <li>E. A plan for the use of assessment results to improve candidate and program performance</li> </ul> <p>It should be clear to a peer review team that the program is likely to achieve national recognition once data from actual candidate and program performance is added to the report.</p>		X	

## Comments:

### Reviewer 1:

The only area that was not clear to this reviewer was the relationship of the program to fulfill the requirements of addressing diversity. Although it is addressed by saying that the University is committed to the ideals of addressing diversity, a direct connection between the program and addressing the many faceted connections of educational leadership were somewhat indirect. The reviewer would also recommend that the South Carolina Safe Schools Climate Act components be expanded beyond the present focus on bullying, e.g., crisis management planning. Overall, this is a well-written and concise document.

Since the program is based on the Furman University's already accredited Masters in Educational Leadership program, this reviewer has no reservations approving the proposal.

### Reviewer 2:

I've thoroughly read this application and I'm sorry to stay that I would not recommend approval. It's an unfortunate finding because I think that the unit is doing many good things. The biggest issue is that the program is using the ELCC standards from 2001 (<http://npbea.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%205-02.pdf>) and a new set of standards was adopted in 2011 (<http://www.emich.edu/ncpeaprofessors/News%20NCPEA%20Website/ELCC%20BUILDING%20LEVEL%20STANDARDS-2.pdf>).

NCATE allowed institutions to use the old standards while the new standards were implemented so that institutions could have 2 cycles of data for each standard. I think that they said that they were approved in 2014, which surprised me because I thought that they would have to use the new standards at that point. Maybe there is some wiggle room here because of the timing. However, this report would no longer be acceptable to ELCC and CAEP since new standards are in place.

I thought that the section on state standards was weak as well.

- A. Standards of Conduct Assessment Plan  
Not Met – The information here is incomplete – the report states how the Furman Standards of conduct are met, but there is no alignment to SC
- B. South Carolina Safe School Climate Act  
Not Met – This is not clearly described; a faculty member who has published on the topic doesn't show how the standard is met
- C. PreK-12 Academic Standards  
This is where I think that things begin to get problematic – the report makes mention of NCATE (now CAEP) and uses old ELCC standards. All assessments are aligned to the old standards, so the entire assessment plan is out of date and needs to be rewritten.
- D. Field and Clinical Experiences, including number of hours and integration of ADEPT and/or PADEPP – I thought that state requirements were for 200 total hours in the

internship so the program doesn't meet state standards.

E. Advanced Programs for Teachers Alignment with NBPTS – This was not included

The rubric for assessment 2 is not clearly aligned to the standards; it looks more like it was written to grade the assignment. I'd suggest using the language from the standards in the actual rubric. That would help the review to see that you are assessing candidate mastery of the standard rather than the elements of the assignment.

The report is well written. It is clear that the unit has used the standards to develop their program and that the unit is collecting data on candidate performance and reflecting on that data for program improvement. Unfortunately, the unit is using standards that are outdated. For that reason, and that reason only, I'd not recommend acceptance of the program.