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Background Information

Praxis I tests are a series of three competency examinations in the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton, New Jersey. The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) requires all persons seeking initial teaching certification after March 1, 1999 to have taken and passed these tests before certification will be given. All students seeking to be admitted to the JHL-SOE undergraduate or graduate programs for initial teacher certification must have passed all three Praxis I tests in order to be admitted. Passing scores were raised on March 1, 2001. The Georgia PSC allows the students to exempt the Praxis I testing if they have either Scholastic Aptitude Test or Graduate Record Examination scores above a specified level.

Praxis II tests (also from ETS) are specific competency evaluations for various teacher certification fields. The Georgia PSC has chosen specific tests and set minimum cut scores for passing. Most teacher certification areas require passing a core (basic) concepts test in the major teaching field and a specific content area test depending on the specialty for which the candidate is seeking certification. Each year all teacher education institutions in Georgia must submit a "report card" to the state that gives the passing rates for all program completers (persons who have graduated and now hold a degree in education). In turn, each state submits a Title II report card to the federal department of education.

Data Source for This Report

The data from the testing is provided to the educational institution both in terms of individual scores for each candidate and in annual reports of partially disaggregated data with demographics for the group taking each specific test. The new data in this analysis was taken from the Institutional Summary Report, Report ID # 00461, run date 10/15/2001 from the Educational Testing Service.

Purpose of this Analysis

The 1998-1999 data are used as a baseline for both our teacher preparation program and our liberal arts core curriculum. This analysis will look at the new 2000-2001 data to compare data for the past three years. Although the JHL-SOE requires all students to have passed the Praxis I tests before being admitted to teacher education, it has no control over when the students choose to take the Praxis II tests. Although it is recommended that students take the tests near the end of their coursework, many take the tests much earlier. Students must register for the tests on specific dates preassigned by ETS and pay for the testing on their own. Scores are then sent to the student and to GC&SU independently.
Praxis I: Academic Skills Assessments

Praxis I is offered both as a paper and pencil version (PPST) and a computer-based version (CBT). The testing center at GC&SU is a site for the PPST, which is offered approximately on a quarterly basis. The results are usually available in about six weeks. The closest place where the CBT version can be taken is at the Sylvan Learning Center in Macon by appointment. The results are available immediately. The following chart shows about how many students took the PPST and the CBT during the time periods covered in this report. This year the ETS has modified this report to show each test taker only once. If a student took a test more than once, only the most recent score is represented. The two previous reports (below in yellow and blue, included multiple attempts to pass the test).


These students would have taken their core classes here or actually have graduated from GC&SU and are applying for slots in the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program which is for secondary education majors who wish to teach in High Schools or eighth grade in a middle school.

In the undergraduate cohorts, the percent exempting Praxis I has grown from 5% of those who started in 1997, to 9% in 1998, to 12% in 1999 to the 17% for the cohort starting in fall of 2000. The MAT cohorts starting in 2001 had 39% of the total of 23 students who were exempt. These scores also reflect attempts of persons who have undergraduate degrees in noneducational majors who were attempting to enter alternative teacher preparation programs and may have graduated from GC&SU quite a few years ago.
**Passing Rates**

The passing rates are shown below. Although the cut scores changed in March, there was no way to know (from this data set) when the student took the test. So the passing rates shown in red below are comparable to the previous two years, because the old cut scores were used to calculate the passing rate.

Again the passing rates for the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST), a paper and pencil version, are much lower than the Computer Based Test (CBT) versions.


![Chart showing passing rates for CBT and PPST tests from 1998-1999 to 2000-2001](chart.png)

The students taking the Praxis I tests from GC&SU between 9/1/2000 and 8/31/2001 probably were core curriculum first or second year education majors seeking admission to an undergraduate cohort beginning in fall 2001 or fall 2002. There also may have been juniors, seniors or graduate students taking the Praxis I to be admitted to either the MAT secondary program or to an alternative teacher preparation program such as the M.Ed. program leading to initial certification in special education.
Males do better in math and they also do better on CBT versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Test</th>
<th>Number Female</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
<th>Number Male</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPST Reading</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPST Writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPST Math</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Reading</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Writing</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Math</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minorities do Worse on 5 of 6 Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Test</th>
<th>Number White</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
<th>Number Minority</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPST Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPST Writing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPST Math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Reading</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Writing</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Math</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Math is more problematic for Undergraduates than Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Test</th>
<th>Number Sophomore</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
<th>Number Junior</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
<th>Earned Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Percent Failing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBT Reading</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Writing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT Math</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above chart there are missing groups due to the rule of 10 for disaggregating data. If there are not at least 10 scores, the data are not grouped for reporting.
Conceptual Areas Tested by the Various PPST Tests

The data were also presented so that specific conceptual areas were broken down for each PPST test and the quartiles for the whole national sample were furnished. This makes it possible to look at specific conceptual areas where GC&SU might improve its instruction in core area classes which are mostly taken in the College of Arts & Sciences during the freshman and sophomore years. The tables below and on the following pages show the concept area breakdowns, and the percent of GC&SU students tested who scored below the national median. However, in this reporting period there were only 22 students who took the PPST versions, the majority took the CBT versions and no breakdowns are available for CBT. These 22 students as a group scored below the national median in everything except parts of the PPST Writing test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representations of quantitative information</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement &amp; informal geometry, formal mathematical reasoning</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual knowledge and procedural knowledge</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical and Inferential Comprehension</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal comprehension</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiom &amp; word choice, mechanics, no error</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical relationships</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural relationships</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual knowledge and procedural knowledge</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Praxis II: Subject Assessments / Specialty Area Tests

Results for Undergraduate Program Completers in 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pass/Fail</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36/2</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30/7</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrelated Special Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15/0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.T.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15/5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94/16</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above is an unofficial calculation by comparing our completers’ list with the PSC test scores list.

*Benchmark Schools in May 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pass/Fail</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>114/12</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer University</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>103/8</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115/5</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont College</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79/17</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*GC&amp;SU</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98/12</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional Standards Commission, Table 1, Type 1 Program Completers

*State-wide Pass Rates by Field in May 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pass/Fail</th>
<th>State Pass Rate</th>
<th>GC&amp;SU Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1248/106</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>457/78</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrelated Sp.Ed.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104/5</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>90/31</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional Standards Commission, Table III, Type 1 Program Completers

2000-2001

These program completers in the undergraduate field-based cohort programs were Early Childhood Education (n = 38), Middle Grades Education (n = 38), Special Education Interrelated (n = 15), Master of Arts in Education (n = 11), Health & Physical Education in the School of Health Sciences (n = 8), and Music Education (n = 1) in the School of Liberal Arts.
The chart above does not include the six students who took the music education tests nor the special education students. It shows the declining numbers of students in elementary education, middle grades education and health & physical education over the past three years who took these tests. People can take the tests even if they are not current students or if they are graduate or nondegree certification only students who want to add another field to their certificate.

**Tests Required in Georgia for Initial Certification by Major**

ETS passing rates below are for all persons who took these tests during the 2000-2001 period, but not all of them are program completers during this reporting period using the PSC definition of completers.

**ETS Numbers for Majors with Ten or More Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Name of Tests Required in Georgia</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>Middle School: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles of Learning &amp; Teaching: Grades 5-9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Knowledge-Based Core Principles</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of Core Principles across Categories of Disability</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Specialist</td>
<td>Library Media Specialist</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Educational Leadership: Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Test Takers in Majors with Less than 10 Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Name of Tests Required in Georgia</th>
<th>Number ETS</th>
<th>Pass Rate PSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Essays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>English Language Literature Content Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Language Literature Comprehensive Essays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpret Materials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productive Language Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Music Content Knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Concepts &amp; Processes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education Movement Forms: Analysis &amp; Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>General Science Content Essays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Science Content Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>SE of Students with Mental Retardation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE of Students with Behavior Disorders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE of Students with Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other subject area fields are listed by the ETS in this report but there is only one student’s score listed; for example, French and Health Education. There are also subject area fields with only one score, but these are majors that the JHL-SOE does not have. Examples are Family & Consumer Sciences, School Guidance & Counseling, and Special Education Preschool/Early Childhood.

However these numbers do not match the PSC numbers in the spreadsheet they sent us with ETS scores on it, because the test dates are not always included in this ETS reporting year. To further complicate matters, neither list matches our list of program completers for this reporting period. Some people complete the programs in one reporting period (for the PSC it is July to June of the following year), but they take the Praxis test after June 30 of that year or they have taken it earlier before July 1 of the previous year. For example, in Mathematics for this ETS reporting year, there is only one examinee listed. However, on our completers list for 2000-2001, there are four math majors who completed either the MAT program (1) or an alternative program (3) and the PSC has their test scores listed (but three of them took the two Mathematics tests before this ETS reporting period). The PSC has reported 4/4 passing the Mathematics Content Knowledge test and 2/3 passing the Mathematics Proofs, Models, and Problems Part 1 test.
Passing Rates

Passing rates as calculated with this ETS data show that most are a little higher this year. HPE was not reported this year due to the “rule of ten”. Special Education is included on another chart.

The data for Praxis II were also presented so that specific conceptual areas were broken down for each major with the quartiles for the national sample. This makes it possible to look at specific conceptual areas where GC&SU might improve instruction in our preservice teacher education programs and in major area courses offered by the College of Arts and Sciences. The table below shows the concept area breakdown for each Praxis II test and the percent of GC&SU students tested who scored below the national median. This can give us an idea of the relative strengths of our programs.

### Early Childhood Education Praxis II Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Content Area</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Social Studies</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; Language Arts</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Early childhood education scores improved greatly in this group over the previous group of students for the test shown above.
Early Childhood Education Praxis II Tests Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; Language Arts</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information about Curriculum / Assessment</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Results shown above are mixed for Early Childhood.

Middle Grades Education Praxis II Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Studies</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The results are about the same as last year, GC&SU students appear to have strength in Math again this year. The Core Knowledge test will no longer be required after this year, but will be replaced by individual subject area tests. The students will have to pass only two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professionalism</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Answer</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an Environment for Student Learning</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching for Student Learning</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The results are mixed this year. The breakdown for Creating an Environment for Student Learning is especially worrisome. However three of the five are higher than the previous year.
Special Education Praxis II Tests

Since initial certification programs in Special Education are offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the data for the Core Knowledge test and for the Across Categories of Disabilities reflect test takers at both levels. The JHL-SOE undergraduate cohort program graduated 15 students who had 100% pass rates for both these tests.

The rest of the students taking the Core Knowledge test and one of the four Georgia Certification areas were graduate students either in the initial preparation M.Ed. program or graduate students adding a new area of certification to their teaching certificate. Many of the latter were in M.Ed. programs and were taking coursework for advanced practitioners since they already had an undergraduate degree in special education.

Number taking Special Education Praxis II Tests

Overall the number of test takers declined this reporting year. In Georgia, the Interrelated Certification is the most versatile and teachers can be assigned to teach in any one of the three areas of Intellectual Disabilities (MR), Learning Disabilities, and Behavior Disorders (EBD). Therefore students taking the Interrelated tests have not declined and may grow again next year.
Passing rate of the Core Knowledge test is still the lowest.

**Special Education – Core Knowledge (All Areas of Exceptionality Take This)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Exceptionalities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Societal Issues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Services to Students with Exceptionalities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


All parts of the core have improved.

**Special Education – Across Categories of Disabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Learning Environment</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Roles, Issues, Literature</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Two of the above five areas appear to have improved significantly. The rest are about the same.
Results for Service Areas

**Percent Passing**

![Bar chart showing percent passing for EdLeader and LibMedia across years](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection, Acquisition, Organization, Maintenance of Resources</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resources &amp; Program Services</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization, Administration, Evaluation of Library Media Center</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The number of test administrations last year was 18 with a pass rate of 78%. Almost all areas could benefit from better curriculum alignment with the test. The GC&SU program emphasizes technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Design &amp; Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development &amp; Program Improvement</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Leadership Skills</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Pupil &amp; Community Needs</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The number of test administrations 1998-1999 was 68 with a pass rate of 94%. In 1999-2000 there were 80 administrations with a pass rate of 93%. The statewide pass rate was 99%. This year there were 64 test takers with a passing rate of 81%. Some of these test takers were at the M.Ed. level and some were at the Ed.S. level, but all of them took the same test. These results are about the same as last year.