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MEMORANDUM

TO: Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
FROM: Anne Gormly, Vice President and Dean of Faculties
       Linda Irwin-DeVitis, Dean, School of Education
       Beth Rushing, Dean School of Liberal Arts and Sciences
DATE: June 4, 2004
RE: Sixth Annual Institutional Report of Progress
    Regents’ Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators

We are pleased to submit the sixth annual institutional report of progress toward meeting the Regents’ Principles and Actions for Preparation of Educators for the Schools. As requested, the report is submitted in four parts.


Part 2: Teachers: Required Items—IJ, IK, IL, and IIA(7)

Part 3: Leaders: Self-assessments and corresponding evidence are submitted for all rubrics.

Part 4: Counselors:--NA

Thank you for the opportunity to share our accomplishments with you. We continue to improve the preparation of teachers and leaders for the state of Georgia.

Part I: Teachers

SELF-ASSESSMENTS AND EVIDENCE
FOR ITEMS RATED BELOW “4” IN FY2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY BOR 2003 Rating</th>
<th>FY 2004 Self Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IIA(8)—Faculty Reward System

Institutions support and recognize faculty participation in teacher preparation and in school improvement efforts through decisions in such areas as promotion and tenure, salary increases, workload, and allocation of resources (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Faculty reward system under study for teacher preparation faculty in education
2 = Faculty reward system understudy for teacher preparation faculty in education and the arts and sciences
3 = Teacher preparation faculty in education and the arts and sciences supported and recognized in reward system
4 = Evidence that success of teacher preparation faculty in promotion, tenure, merit salary increases, and post-tenure review is comparable to that of non-teacher preparation faculty

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 3; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Promotion and Tenure
The faculty in the School of Education is supported through promotion and tenure. During 2004 we had seven people apply for promotion or/and tenure, and all were approved.

Associate Professor—Dr. Amy Childre, Dr. Nancy Mizelle, Dr. Sharene Smoot

Tenure—Dr. Amy Childre, Dr. Marianne Edwards, Dr. Brenda McCoy-Trice, Dr. Nancy Mizelle, Dr. Cynthia Alby, and Dr. Carol Bader

Salaries
The salaries within the Teacher Preparation Unit (including Schools of Health Sciences, Liberal Arts & Sciences and Education) are not comparable to other salaries within the institution. The Teacher Preparation Assistant Professors make on average 14% ($6,890) less than assistant professors who are not full-time in teacher preparation. The Teacher Preparation Associate Professors make on average 16% ($9,284) less than associate professors in the other areas. The Teacher Preparation Full Professors make on average 17% ($11,174) less than the average for the other full professors across campus.

### Chairperson’s Comparisons

When comparing chairpersons’ salaries at GC&SU, the Teacher Preparation Chairs (including departments outside the School of Education) rank at the very bottom of the scale. They comprise the four least paid positions. The Teacher Preparation Chairpersons’ salaries average $70,872 while the other chairs across the university average $88,270. The Teacher Preparation Chairs on average make 20% ($18,270) less than the other chairs who are not in Teacher Preparation.

Note: One former dean (outlier) was left out of the SOE data as were the Dean and the Assistant Dean whose positions are primarily administrative.
Market Sensitive
The salaries for persons in Teacher Preparation are not market sensitive.

Public School Market
At the public school level, salaries are determined by (1) number of years creditable service (0 to 19+) and (2) level of certification (i.e. 4 through 7 based upon years of college and degrees: (Source: GA Dept. of Education, http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/doe/finances/salaries.asp)

At GC&SU salaries are based on line item budgeted dollars. The full-time years of service in public schools, other post-secondary institutions, or other related teaching situations are not factors in determining salaries. The Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPAAC) continues to suggest that K-12 experience be considered when determining salaries for university faculty.

Because the Teacher Preparation salaries are so much lower than the market value of our educators at the K-12 levels, we have a difficult time recruiting and/or keeping faculty.

The fact that we are continually hiring and losing faculty is evident in the chart below. The Educator Preparation faculty profile usually depicts a new program rather than one that has a long and well-established history. In 2003-2004 less than half (45%) of the Teacher Preparation faculty members hold the rank of associate or full-professor. Over half (55%) of the Teacher Preparation faculty members are junior faculty members at the ranks of instructor and assistant professor.

Each year we lose good personnel to the public school systems. This year Dr. X is leaving to teach in Salem High School in Rockdale. Dr. X will make 50% more working in the public school than he earned at GC&SU. His salary will go from $42,000 to $63,000 for an increase of $21,000 (50%).
On average, the SOE Faculty could make $8,626 each if they worked in public schools for 9 months at the base state pay rate. They would make an average of $17,985 more each if they worked 9 months in Dekalb County. They would make an average of $18,164 each if they worked in Gwinnett County. State and county pay scales take into account years of experience and levels of degrees.

The above chart uses public K-12 school data for 2003. With no raises at GC&SU this year, the variance would be even greater since GC&SU faculty would have one more year of experience, and the public K-12 schools have step increases.
In addition to losing faculty because of lower pay scales, the SOE has trouble attracting new faculty because of the pay scale. Often our searches are the last to be filled; our candidates turn us down, and we have to go deeper and deeper into the pool to find qualified persons who will accept our positions at our rates of pay. Sometimes we cannot fill positions permanently and resort to temporary or part-time faculty to tide us over for the year. Not only do these searches cost the university money repeatedly, they also take a toll on the search committee members.

**COPLAC**

When Teacher Preparation Faculty members are compared with salary averages from the other COPLAC schools, the GC&SU Teacher Preparation Faculty are paid lower in all ranks except instructor.

**Workload**

The workloads for the Teacher Preparation faculty are technically in-line with the faculty in other parts of the university. A full semester is equivalent to 12 hours as are others in the university. However, with more and more emphasis on field experiences and field supervision, the TIME required by SOE faculty to perform their jobs well has increased.

The rationale that university salaries were lower when compared with K-12 teachers because a university faculty member has more flexibility is no longer applicable. Not only do the SOE faculty members now have time requirements similar to K-12 teachers, but they also are still held responsible for P-12 involvement, service, and research.

**Allocation of Resources**

The Teacher Preparation Faculty is treated equitably in terms of allocation of resources. We receive comparable money for faculty development, travel, new faculty start-up funds, and other campus-wide initiatives.
II B (2). Teacher candidates set high learning standards for all students in a school classroom and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for teaching in standards-based schools
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates set high learning standards for all students in a school classroom and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards
3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can set high learning standards for all students in a school classroom and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards
4 = Evidence confirms that teacher candidates recommended for certification are able to set high learning standards for all students in a school classroom and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 4

All initial certification students (B.S., MAT, MED) are required to have extensive field experiences (800 hours on average) in P-12 classrooms. Teacher candidates are introduced to the Georgia QCC’s throughout their coursework. Units, teacher work samples, lesson plans and assessments are based upon the Georgia curriculum. In addition, teacher candidates are prepared to understand the basic learning theories, the need for setting high expectations with appropriate scaffolding and the use of students’ background knowledge as a foundation for learning. In all programs, candidates are expected to assess students’ learning, plan appropriate instruction and assess and modify lessons based upon student performance.

All teacher candidates are given coursework, seminars based upon field observations and their own reflections to uncover and address assumptions and stereotypes that might cause them to lower their expectations for individual students or for groups of students who have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The teacher work samples (TWS) required for exit from our programs call for students to examine the learning of several diverse students. Candidates are expected to assess, plan and implement instruction that meets the varying needs of students and then to reflect upon the success of their instructional strategies. The TWS is graded by rubric and feedback is provided to the candidate on their performance (see TWS http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/tchworksamp03.html). Each candidate has a minimum of two and as many as four placements in their preparation. Care is taken to provide teacher candidates with a variety of placements that provide students with diverse classrooms in terms of culture, ethnicity, linguistic patterns and economic variables. Students are placed in classrooms and schools with high levels of inclusion whenever possible. Such placements enable students to address misconceptions about student abilities with their peers and their mentor leader. GC&SU also works hard with host
teachers to stress high expectations and to guide teacher candidates during their early experiences in classrooms.

In addition to the TWS, teacher candidates are expected to teach coherent units of instruction in order to support their accomplishment of “proficiency” on our Standards Based Assessment of Initial Teacher Candidates (SBAITC) (see http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/SBAIT03.html). The SBAITC rubric delineates “levels” of attainment. Teacher candidates do not exit the program unless they can show how they have met “Proficient Performance”. All ten standards taken as a whole provide evidence for a teaching professional; however, the first standard probes the candidate about content and content pedagogy (The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for every student). Performance in 2002 was as follows:

Georgia College & State University
April 2002 – B.S.Ed. in Education
Senior Assessment Portfolio Results

72 Graduating Seniors in Early Childhood, Middle Grades, and Special Education
Milledgeville and Macon Campus

By individual count and percent of total of graduating seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Major</th>
<th>Passed with Honors</th>
<th>Passed with Distinction</th>
<th>Passed with Recognition</th>
<th>Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (15%)</td>
<td>23 (32%)</td>
<td>27 (38%)</td>
<td>10 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GC&SU students must also submit a classroom organization and management plan that demonstrates their ability to organize a classroom, set up an effective management system and provide a learning community that respects individual differences; clear procedures and expectations; and organize, allocate, and manage time, space, and activity that is conducive to learning (SBAITC). GC&SU is aggregating data from the rubric-based evaluations to provide information for self-study for our programs. That data is currently being worked on, but the following Table I is an example of the way the partially aggregated data from one program looks. In order to facilitate this examination of our candidates’ performance, GC&SU will be beginning LIVETEXT in Fall 04 for the junior level cohorts and the MAT cohort. This web-based software will allow our students to enter their work samples, case studies, unit plans, reflections, and assessment data in electronic format. Thus the SBAITC data will be aggregated for individual
classes, programs and the unit. Such software will provide more up-to-date and accurate data for program self-study and for candidate assessment and self-assessment.

**Partial Reporting—Table I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Standard 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U= Unsatisfactory, B = Basic, P= Proficient, M=Mastery
II B (3). Teacher candidates customize instruction for individual students or groups of P-12 students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for customizing instruction
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates customize instruction for individual students or groups of P-12 students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can customize instruction for individual students or groups of P-12 students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
4 = Evidence confirms that teacher candidates recommended for certification are able to customize instruction for individual students or groups of P-12 students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 4

Teacher candidates at GC&SU must take coursework on special education, learning theory, multiple intelligence theory, linguistic diversity and its implications for learning and teaching, using literacy as a tool for learning, and foundations courses examining the role of the teacher in 21st century America. When students do not demonstrate the ability to meet the individual needs of P-12 students, intervention and mentoring are provided in the context of specific expectations for candidate performance. These interventions are documents in an improvement plan in the candidate’s file.

In order to be proficient (the minimum required for graduation), GC&SU teacher candidates must evaluate student performances to design instruction appropriate for social, cognitive, and emotional development and design instruction appropriate to students’ stages of development, learning styles, strengths and needs, adjust instruction to accommodate the learning differences of students (SAIBTC). Content for our initial candidates has been aligned with our conceptual framework, National Learned Society Standards, Praxis II objectives, and Georgia Quality Core Curriculum. We look forward to implementing the new Georgia Performance Standards as part of the teacher education curriculum.

Again, we use our performance assessments, Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and SBAITC, to substantiate evidence which confirms teacher candidate attainment of the criteria. The final SBAITC performance assessment is turned in as a portfolio to the teacher candidate’s mentor leader. The mentor leader evaluates the document and then holds a conference with the candidate to provide feedback and detail any needed interventions. Initial teacher candidates (BS, MEd and MAT) do not exit or graduate from the program without attaining “Proficient Performance” on the TWS and SBAITC performance assessments. This has meant that a few teacher candidates will have to extend internships and resubmit documentation to show attainment before we will graduate the cohort.
student and recommend the candidate for certification (See Teacher Candidate Handbook http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/HandbookForTeacherCandidates.pdf). Currently, data indicate that over 90% of the teacher candidates entering our programs in teacher education meet the proficient criteria on the SBAITC and the TWS and graduate successfully.

The performance criteria for teacher candidates can be found in the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) in the following areas:

- Contextual Information and Learning Environment, Standard 3, page 6—uses knowledge of different cultural contexts within the community to connect with the learner through meaningful interaction and assignments
- Instructional Design and Implementation, TWS, Standard 3, page 11—adjusts instruction to accommodate the learning differences or needs of students; Standard 7, page 12—plans lessons and activities to address different learning styles, performance modes, and developmental levels
- Assessment Rationale, TWS, Standard 8, page 14—solicits information about students’ experiences, learning behavior, needs, and progress from parents, other colleagues, and students
- Daily Implementation Notes, TWS, page 16—creates relevance for students by linking current learning to prior experiences and knowledge; page 17—analyzes the classroom environment and interactions, and makes adjustments to enhance social relationships, student motivation/engagement, and productive work

The listed criteria can be found in the Standards Based Assessment of Initial Teacher Candidates (SBAITC) in the following Standard:

- Standard 3, Diverse Learners, page 2—adjusts instruction to accommodate the learning differences or needs of students; uses knowledge of different cultural contexts within the community to connect with the learner through meaningful interaction and assignments; designs instruction appropriate to students’ stages of development, learning styles, strengths, and needs; page 3—creates a learning community that respects individual differences.

We survey graduating students each year on their self-assessment of their preparation in the various areas identified in SBAITC and in our conceptual framework. The 2003 results are below. Each column represents a self-assessment on how well prepared students are in the various areas. The scores are the aggregation of those who indicated their preparation was excellent or good.
II B (5). Teacher candidates use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward continuous improvement (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment  
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for using data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress  
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates are able to use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks  
3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks  
4 = Evidence confirms that teacher candidates recommended for certification are able to use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks

Last Year  
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year  
2004 Self Assessment = 4

Teacher candidates at GC&SU must learn a variety of assessment techniques ranging from close observation and anecdotal records to the use of standardized test data for individual students. Candidates are taught to triangulate data to form sound judgments of individual student performance. Student learning is the focus of all planning---from classroom arrangement and classroom management to curricular planning and assessment. Our candidates demonstrate their ability to impact student learning in a variety of ways: pre-post tests, analysis of student work samples, learning journals, student-teacher conferences, formal assessments, etc. Candidates document the performance of individual students in the case studies required in the TWS. Students document student learning in their portfolios and demonstrate their ability to impact P-12 student achievement.

We use our performance assessments (TWS and SBAITC) to provide evidence which confirms teacher candidate attainment of the criteria. For the BS, the TWS is submitted as a part of ‘field practica’. For the MAT and MEd, the TWS is submitted in conjunction with student teaching and successful completion/evaluation is considered one of the exit criteria for the programs. The SBAITC performance assessment is turned in as a portfolio to the teacher candidate’s mentor leader. The mentor leader, in consultation with other faculty, evaluates the document and then holds a conference with the candidate to provide feedback. Initial teacher candidates (BS, MEd and MAT) do not exit or graduate from the program without attaining “Proficient Performance” on both performance assessments. This has meant that a few teacher candidates will have to extend internships and resubmit documentation to show attainment before we will graduate the cohort student and recommend the candidate for certification (see Teacher Candidate Handbook http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/HandbookForTeacherCandidates.pdf).
This listed criteria can be found in the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) in the following areas:

- Contextual information and Learning Environment, TWS, Standard 3, page 6—evaluates student performance to design instruction appropriate for social, cognitive, and emotional development
- Instructional Design and Implementation, TWS, Standard 7, page 12—develops plans that are appropriate for curriculum goals and utilizes effective instructional strategies
- Assessment Rationale, TWS, Standard 8, page 14—maintains useful records of student work and performance and can communicate student progress knowledgeably and responsibly.
- Daily Implementation Notes, TWS, Standard 3, page 16—evaluates student performance to design instruction appropriate for social, cognitive, and emotional development.
- Reflection on Teaching and Learning, TWS, Standard 6, page 21—uses classroom observation, information about students, and research in order to evaluate the outcomes of teaching and learning, to reflect, and to revise practice

The listed criteria can be found in the Standards Based Assessment of Initial Teacher Candidates (SBAITC) in the following Standards:

- Standard 7—The teacher candidate develops, implements, and evaluates curriculum based upon student, district, state, and national performance standards.
- Standard 8—The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of every student.

Again, we are in the process of aggregating this data for program and unit self-study. Aggregated data will be available next fall based upon the SBAITC and the TWS. Currently, we do have inferential validation through correlations for the SBAITC exit outcomes, mentor leader ratings and portfolio exit assessments. Some other correlations we have found include: (1) Mentor leaders scores of student performance in promoting P-12 learning correlated with SAT scores on the Verbal and Mathematics Subtest, candidate GPA, and the PRAXIS II Content Knowledge tests in the order named: (2) Overall, candidate GPA correlated with PRAXIS II Content Knowledge tests, Principles of Learning and Teaching tests, and student self-assessments; (3) Student SBAITC ratings by mentor leaders correlated with PRAXIS II tests and portfolio assessments; (4) Team ratings of the exit portfolio correlated with mentor leader ratings of student outcomes. For more details see http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/SOE%20Praxis_2002_aggregated.pdf.

The overwhelming majority of our host teachers, principals and parents of P-12 students all report that our teacher candidates have had a positive impact upon student learning and achievement. See
III A. Teacher candidates are accomplished in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement at point of initial recommendation for certification (1999).

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates are accomplished in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement
3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they are accomplished in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement
4 = Evidence that teacher candidates recommended for certification are accomplished in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement.

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 4

Each candidate has a minimum of two and as many as four placements in their preparation. Care is taken to provide teacher candidates with a variety of placements that provide students with diverse classrooms in terms of culture, ethnicity, linguistic patterns and economic variables. Students are placed in classrooms and schools with high levels of inclusion whenever possible. Teacher candidates must accomplish “proficiency” in all categories on the “Standards-Based Assessment for Initial Teacher Certification” (SBAITC) Rubric (SBAITC http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/SBAIT03.html). The rubric is aligned with the INTASC principles and thus with the BOR-USG 1998 Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools.

The SBAITC proficiency column (which is used to evaluate the Teacher Work Sample as well as the performance of the candidate in the initial preparation program), addresses Standard III: Diverse Learners coupled with Standard VIII: Assessment of Student Learning and addresses the criteria for the Regents’ Principles.

Standard III: Diverse Learners

- The teacher candidate understands how all students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Proficiency Criteria:**

- designs instruction appropriate to students’ stages of development, learning styles, strengths, and needs.

- selects approaches that provide students opportunities for students to demonstrate knowledge in a different performance modes.
• accesses appropriate services or resources to meet the exceptional learning needs of students.

• adjusts instruction to accommodate the learning differences or needs of students.

• uses knowledge of different cultural contexts within the community to connect with the learner through meaningful interaction and assignments.

Standard Eight: Assessment of Student Learning

• The teacher candidate understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of every student.

Proficiency Criteria:

• selects, constructs, and uses assessment strategies appropriate to the learning outcomes.

• uses a variety of informal and formal strategies to assess student progress and to make decisions about instruction.

• uses assessment strategies to involve learners in self-assessment activities in order to help them become aware of their strengths and needs and to set personal goals for learning.

• solicits information about students’ experiences, learning behavior, needs, and progress from parents, other colleagues, and students.

• maintains useful records of student work and performance and can communicate student progress knowledgeably and responsibly.

The four main themes of our conceptual framework directly addresses successful teaching of diverse learners. Students are involved in identifying and meeting diverse learning needs in every course they take in the program. Measures of this outcome are contained in the student self-assessment, host teacher assessments, mentor teachers assessments as well as in the SBAITC and TWS requirements. Candidates are specifically required to document the learning of several students who are diverse along a variety of criteria. Candidates must demonstrate that they have successfully facilitated learning and achievement with each of these students individually as well as providing aggregate data for the class.

We expect that within the next two years, we will be able to provide aggregate data on candidate performance in a timely manner to support the efficacy of our programs. We can now report that over 90% of our candidates meet the expectations of the TWS and the SBAITC by the time they are scheduled to graduate. Those candidates who do not meet
expectations are either required to do additional coursework, field experience of other appropriate steps to remedy their deficiencies or they are counseled out of teacher education.
III B. After two years of teaching, program graduates show advanced levels of accomplishment in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Plan in place to track graduates who move into teaching positions in Georgia schools within two-years of graduation
2 = Plan in place to gather baseline data on student learning and achievement in Georgia schools where new graduates teach
3 = Plan in place in all programs for induction and mentoring of teachers during the first two years of teaching
4 = Evidence confirms that graduates show higher levels of accomplishment in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement after two years of teaching as compared to impact at time of graduation

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 4

Supporting our graduates through their first years in the classroom presents special challenges for GC&SU. Given our state-wide mission, our students come from all over Georgia with only a small percentage from the immediate area. Many of our graduates return to their home communities to teach. To meet this challenge, mentor leaders continue to offer assistance through email, listservs and occasional visits.

We continue to support our initial graduates in the area during the first two years of teaching through planned contact with mentor leaders, professional development, and workshops which invite both the new teacher, the school administrator and the school-based mentor (See Induction Committee Report that follows) Currently, we have expanded our induction conference to include all new teachers in the area rather than just our graduates. Such support is vital for the success of new teachers and we are anxious to work toward a state model that would serve all new teachers with equal resources.

In measuring impact upon student learning, we would urge the Regents, the PSC and the SDOE to investigate a systematic assessment of teacher impact that has validity. The “Tennessee Value-Added Model” by Sanders is one example of a competent measure of teacher impact upon student learning. Individual colleges are not equipped to do such advanced statistical design, arrange data access and do the analysis. Any methodology less vigorous would provide inadequate to such serious judgments. We do, however, seek informal and formal feedback from employers on our graduates’ performance. (See http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/Feedback%20from%20Principals%20at%20Partner%20Schools.pdf Principals Report) This data suggests a need for better preparation in classroom management and in the use of technology. Both of these major areas have been the subject of discussion and revision of our curriculum. Currently, students are required to submit a classroom management plan based upon their formal study, their own philosophy, teaching style and professional judgment. The required technology courses have been revised to extend the learning over three semesters, to make the
content more appropriate to the increased skills of our students and provide support for the electronic portfolio which will be required of all students who graduate in 2006.

**Induction Committee**

**2003-2004**

**Accomplishments**

From the pilot work the Induction Committee has conducted the last two years with the SOE Induction Plan the following plans have been developed for the 2004-2005 year:

- We continue to gather interview data with program graduates and their principals
  - IRB needs to be extended
  - Names and addresses of graduates should be requested from Ana Edwards
  - Letters and post cards should be sent to graduates
  - Online survey continued and refined

- The Induction Committee is now a standing committee in the SOE.
- All 2003 graduates were contacted by their Mentor Leaders for a field visit or for e-mentoring.
- An induction conference was held in October on our campus for the 2002 and 2003 graduates, their mentor teachers and administrators. Breakout sessions for administrators included teacher retention and mentoring, breakout sessions for mentor teachers included mentoring tips and advice for being effective in the mentor role, and new teachers attended a variety of sessions designed to meet their needs and pique their interests.
- We partnered with Mike Walker, Oconee RESA Director, to provide the conference for the four area RESAS and invited new teachers and their mentors and administrators to come as teams.
- CDs were provided for all new teachers with the information and resources shared by all presenters.
- New teachers were asked to evaluate the conference and provide suggestions for next year.
- We have discussed the possibility of a Spring Follow-Up for the new teachers next year to complement the Fall Conference.
- We obtained the promise of some support from PSC for the conference next year.
III C. Experienced teachers completing graduate programs are accomplished in the five core principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (1998)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes the five core principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)
2 = Assessments in place to measure the extent to which teachers in graduate programs meet the five core principles of NBPTS
3 = Teachers in graduate programs have opportunities as part of their programs to demonstrate that they can meet the National Board Standards
4 = Evidence confirms that teachers who complete graduate programs meet the five core principles of NBPTS

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 3; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 3

All departments in the John H. Lounsbury School of Education continue to respond to the challenge of incorporating the word and spirit of the NBPTS five core propositions. During the past year all undergraduate initial educator preparation programs received recognition by their respective learned societies. Departmental requirements include professional portfolios addressing the core principles and learned society criteria as part of a set of culminating activities for program completion. Evaluation rubrics reflecting both the principles and specific program criteria are in place with initial completion data being evaluated.

The Department of Early Childhood/Middle Grades Education is currently field testing a culminating activity in the advanced practicum classes. The activity is structured along the requirements of the National Boards, including a professional portfolio presentation with National Board certification as a specific goal for all Specialist candidates. Early Childhood is in the process of “re-visioning” their graduate program with a greater emphasis on NAEYC standards and NCLB and a focus on Birth to age 5 children. That work is in the conceptual development stage.

The Department of Foundations and Secondary Education has designated EDFS 7728 – Critical Issues in Education- as the National Board preparation venue. “The National Board Certification Handbook” and the downloaded standards appropriate for each individual’s discipline are employed as texts with all activities related back to certification requirements.

The Department of Special Education and Administration has moved all program course work to a cohort structure. Candidates are required to collect evidence illustrating the enhancement of student learning and demonstrating the high level of knowledge, skills and dispositions reflected in the National Board Standards throughout the two year program.
Course syllabi, across the school, have been revised to align specific course objectives to mirror NBPTS principles and language while addressing discipline specific standards and requirements. Rubrics and objectives are in place. Achievement data is being collected and incorporated into program improvement.

Faculty members are being encouraged and supported in the pursuit of NBPTS certification. Release time is available for meeting classroom hour requirements. Other resources available in the School of Education further support the candidate. It is believed that these faculty members who experience the process, will be better suited to guide student candidates in the process of certification. This is of particular concern in this particular area with Oconee RESA having only 3 NBTS certified teachers.
III D. Through partner schools (or approved alternative) P-12 students from diverse groups are learning and achieving at high levels (1998)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Plan in place to measure extent to which P-12 students from diverse groups who attend partner schools (or approved alternative) are learning and achieving at high levels
2 = Plan implemented in some partner schools (or approved alternative)
3 = Plan implemented in all partner schools (or approved alternative)
4 = Evidence confirms that P-12 students from diverse groups who attend partner schools (or approved alternative) are learning and achieving at high levels

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 2

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 3

Each candidate has a minimum of two and as many as four placements in their preparation. Care is taken to provide teacher candidates with a variety of placements that provide students with diverse classrooms in terms of culture, ethnicity, linguistic patterns and economic variables. Students are placed in classrooms and schools with high levels of inclusion whenever possible. We have been particularly successful in working with Hancock County in special education settings and hope to expand our work there with the placement of early childhood students beginning this fall.

Information from our survey of partner school principals indicates that our students are having a positive impact upon student learning. (See http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/school_ed/Feedback%20from%20Principals%20at%20Partner%20Schools.pdf Principals Report)

We continue working with the area RESA directors to improve student performance.

The John H. Lounsbury School of Education faculty at Georgia College & State University has taken on the challenge of establishing professional partner schools with great commitment. The Board of Regents’ principles and implementation plan encourage the use of a partner school model with all cohorts. The partner school as defined by the Regents is “a regular P-12 school, with no change in mission and governance, that chooses to enter into partnership with a university to work on a least four goals:

- Increasing P-12 student learning and achievement,
- Mentoring beginning teachers,
- Providing field-placements for teacher candidates to demonstrate outcomes of guarantee,
- Collaborating in the preparation and development of teachers, and
- Increasing the amount of school-based research on improvement of schools and on teacher preparation and development programs (2001)

The John H. Lounsbury School of Education developed and adopted two models for partnership:
The Host school model does not embrace a formal partnership. Students are placed in schools for student teaching or short practicum experiences. No specific goals are defined in this relationship. The only signature required is that of the superintendent giving permission to the college to allow placement of college students in the county schools. The use of dispersion schools is for placement of students in programs for which professional partner schools are impossible or impractical. For instance, often there are only ten or fifteen special education placements available in our partner schools and we may need forty. The same situation occurs in music education, physical education, and sometimes in early childhood education. We try to keep placements in host schools to a minimum.

The Professional Partner School Model is the model the faculty members at Georgia College & State University endorse. This model provides opportunities for diverse placements for the teacher candidates. A formal agreement is signed by the superintendent and principal from the public school and by the dean and university faculty liaison(s) from the college. In accordance with the Board of Regents’ Principles, the agreement lists the goals the two institutions will work together to meet. The public schools and the John H. Lounsbury School of Education agree to collaborate in all goal areas, as well as address other needs and concerns in the schools. The five current partner schools are located in Baldwin and Jones counties. The five Professional Partner Schools are Oak Hill Middle School, Baldwin County Child and Family Development Center, Mattie Wells Elementary School, Wells Primary, and Clifton Ridge Middle School located in Jones County. We are actively seeking to develop partner school relationships with Hancock and Bibb counties over the next year.

Below are data from two of our Professional Development Schools. Comparative percentages are available for Oak Hill Middle School, Clifton Ridge Middle School. Mattie Wells Elementary was divided to form Mattie Wells Elementary and Wells Primary School in 2002. Unfortunately, information on the number (if any) of teacher candidates working in the peer schools was not available on line. Data from these schools demonstrate base line data for comparisons in the future.

**Examples of Impact in PDS and Partner Schools**

For purposes of illustrating the impact of our MAT students, we have also included data from Baldwin County High School, currently classified as a host school, where a significant number of our high school interns do their student teaching. The data provided on improved test scores must be carefully considered in light of the many variables that impact student achievement gains. While our students and faculty are integral at our partner schools, we fully realize that the gains made in these schools are based upon a large number of factors in addition to the PPS relationship and *Architects of Change* program. Certainly, school leadership and faculty endeavors have been most critical in these gains.
### Oak Hill Middle School 6th Grade CRCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>4 year change</th>
<th>4 yr change Comparison School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeding Stds</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meeting Stds.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Meeting Stds</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeding Stds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meeting Stds.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Meeting Stds</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fort Hill Middle School as identified as the top comparison school by the Georgia School Council Institute [www.gsci.org/ReportCenter/testscores/crctscores.jsp](http://www.gsci.org/ReportCenter/testscores/crctscores.jsp)

### Baldwin County High School SAT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>4 year change</th>
<th>4 yr change Comparison School*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Tested</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At Gray Elementary School, the host school where *Architects of Change* is heavily involved, there has been a 17% growth over four years in the number of students exceeding the 4th grade reading standards. A 12% increase has taken place in the number of students exceeding the math 4th grade standards. Gray Elementary also saw a decrease in the number of students who did not meet the standards in 4th grade reading and mathematics.

Clifton Ridge Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>3 year change</th>
<th>3 yr change Comparison School*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeding Stds</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meeting Stds.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Meeting Stds.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeding Stds</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Meeting Stds.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Meeting Stds.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A principal’s comment on our 2003 survey captures our partnership work: “We have received many benefits and resources from the partnership---I hope we can continue to work together.” *Architects of Change* prepares educators and works with faculty and administration in our professional development and partner schools to create stable learning communities, increased student achievement and school improvement in middle Georgia.

**Part II: Teachers**

**REQUIRED ITEMS IJ, IK, IL, AND IIA(7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY BOR 2003 Rating</th>
<th>FY 2004 Self Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I J.  Early childhood teachers, Area F compliance (2003)

1 = Area F in the early childhood education program does not conform to the guidelines approved by EPAAC  
4 = Area F in the early childhood education program meets the guidelines approved by EPAAC

Explanation: To receive a rating of “4” on this Principle, the following must be present:
- Nine hours of professional education courses—may be designated as Foundations of Education, Human Growth and Development, and Exceptional Child
- Nine hours of academic content courses with an appropriate mathematics course specified. Other content courses may include reading, science, English, mathematics, humanities courses, social science courses, arts courses.

The 2002-2004 catalog (p. 253) has the following for Area F in Early Childhood:
- EDIT 2210 Infusing Technology into Education (3 hours)
- EDFS 2224 Education in Today’s Schools (3 hours)
- PSYC 2102 The Developing Individual (3 hours)
- EDEX 2210 Exceptional Individuals in the Regular Classroom (3 hours)
- HLTH 2010 Personal Health and Fitness (3 hours)
- Elective  Speech, Music, Drama, or Art (3 hours)

The 2004-2006 catalog will have the following for Area F in Early Childhood:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA F. MAJOR RELATED</th>
<th>(18 semester hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Pedagogy (9 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEX 2210</td>
<td>Exceptional Individual in Reg. Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFS 2224</td>
<td>Education in Today’s Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 2102</td>
<td>The Developing Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area Courses (9 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select One Not Used in Area A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math requirement may be met by taking a math course in Area D. If students choose this option, then they select an additional 3-hour course from either Communications Development or Sociocultural Contexts below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications Development (3 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 2210</td>
<td>Small Group Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ENGL 2208  Introduction to Creative Writing 3 hours
### ENGL 2xxx  Children's Literature 3 hours
### THEA 1300  Acting I: Voice and Movement 3 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociocultural Contexts (3 hours)</th>
<th>Select One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 1101  Introduction to Human Geography 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 2410  African-American History 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 2010  Personal Health and Fitness 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCM 2200  Mass Media and Society 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 2350  Introduction to the Law 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 1101  Introduction to General Psychology 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 2200  Psychology of Gender 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI 1160  Introduction to Social Problems 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I K.  Middle grades teachers, Area F compliance (2003)

1 = Area F in the middle grades education program does not conform to the guidelines approved by EPAAC

4 = Area F in the middle grades education program meets the guidelines approved by EPAAC

**Explanation:** To receive a rating of “4” on this Principle, the following must be present:
- Nine hours of professional education courses—may be designated as Foundations of Education, Human Growth and Development, and Exceptional Child
- Nine hours of academic content courses to support two of the following content concentrations—Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Science

The 2002-2004 Catalog (p.254) has the following for Area F in Middle Grades Education:
- EDIT 2210 Infusing Technology into Education (3 hours)
- EDFS 2224 Education in Today’s Schools (3 hours)
- PSYC 2102 The Developing Individual (3 hours)
- EDEX 2210 Exceptional Individuals in the Regular Classroom (3 hours)
- ENGL 2210 Writing about Literature (3 hours)
  Choose three hours in lower division courses to support the content concentration in mathematics, science, or social sciences.

The 2004-2006 catalog will have the following for Area F in Middle Grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA F. MAJOR RELATED</th>
<th>(18 semester hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Pedagogy (9 hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDFS 2224  Education in Today’s Schools  3 hours  
PSYC 2102  The Developing Individual  3 hours  
EDEX 2210  Exceptional Individual in Reg. Class  3 hours

**Content Area Courses**  
*(9 hours)*

**Content Area Electives**

Choose six hours in lower division courses to support one content concentration area: mathematics, science, or social sciences.

---

**I L. High school teachers, Area F compliance (2003)**

1 = Area F in secondary education programs does not conform to the guidelines approved by EPAAC  
4 = Area F in secondary education program meets the guidelines approved by EPAAC

**Explanation:** To receive a rating of “4” on this Principle, the following must be present: Area F meets the requirements for an academic major in a single discipline; programs for which Area F has been approved for 69 hours to include the three professional education required courses.

Our high school certification program is an M.A.T. program so Area F is not applicable.

The 2002-2004 Catalog (p.254) has the following for Area F in Special Education:

- EDIT 2210 Infusing Technology into Education (3 hours)  
- EDFS 2224 Education in Today’s Schools (3 hours)  
- EDFS 2229 The Developing Individual (3 hours)  
- Electives (Select 2) Speech, Music, Drama or Art elective (3 hours)  
- EDEX 2210 Exceptional Individuals in the Regular Classroom (3 hours)

The 2004-2006 Catalog will have the following for Area F in Special Education:

**AREA F. MAJOR RELATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Pedagogy (9 hours)</th>
<th>(18 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDFS 2224 Education in Today’s Schools 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 2102 The Developing Individual 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEX 2210 Exceptional Individual in Reg. Class 3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content Area Courses (9 hours)**

**History**  
*(3 hours)* **Select One**

HIST 2111 United States History 3 hours  
HIST 2112 United States History 3 hours

**Select six hours not taken in AREAS A,B,C,D,E**

- ART 1105 Understanding Visual Culture 2 hours  
- MUSC 1105 Music and Civilization 2 hours  
- THEA 1105 Theatrical Heritage 2 hours  
- IDST 2210 Ethics and Society 2 hours  
- IDST 2215 Communications In Society 2 hours  
- IDST 2310 The Fine & Applied Arts in Civilization 3 hours  
- IDST 2315 America’s Diverse Cultural Heritage 3 hours  
- HLTH 2010 Personal Health and Fitness 3 hours
II.A.(7) PRAXIS—80% Pass Rate

Institutions have at least an 80% annual pass rate on PRAXIS II for each reportable demographic group of teacher candidates by 2006, (Reportable group is defined as a demographic group with 10 or more students) while maintaining or increasing the number of minority teachers prepared; institutions set annual goals toward the 90% threshold between 2002-2006 (2001).

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Partial plan in place
2 = Plan in place for each program that includes baseline data, annual goals, timeline, milestones as to numbers targeted, strategies for reaching goals, how progress is to be evaluated
3 = Less than an 80% annual pass rate on PRAXIS II for all reportable demographic groups within each field in which the institution prepares teachers, while maintaining or increasing the minority teachers prepared
4 = At least an 80% annual pass rate on PRAXIS II for all reportable demographic groups within each field in which the institution prepares teachers, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority teachers prepared

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 3; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year = 3
2004 Self Assessment = 3

Praxis II: Subject Assessments/Specialty Area Tests

Results for 2002 Program Completers as of July 1, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number Pass</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for 2002 Program Completers Including Those Passing After July 1, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th># Pass</th>
<th>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>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minority Teachers

2002 Program Completers by Race
### 2002 Program Completers by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th># Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th># Passed</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>96%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GC&SU Race/Gender Praxis II Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</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</th>
<th>99-02 Passed</th>
<th>99-02 Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>92%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gender                |            |              |            |            |              |            |            |              |            |            |              |             |
| Male                  | 16         | 12           | 75%        | 18          | 12           | 67%        | 15          | 12           | 80%        |            |              |             |
| Female                | 95         | 88           | 93%        | 109         | 99           | 91%        | 94          | 90           | 96%        |            |              |             |
| **Total**             | **111**     | **100**      | **90%**    | **127**     | **111**      | **87%**    | **109**     | **103**      | **94%**    |            |              |             |

### 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</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>Interrelated Special Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Goals
GC&SU’s goal is to reach a minimum of 80% and increase by 0.5% per year until we reach 90% in each category. Then we plan to maintain the 90% pass rate.

Timeline and Milestones
We anticipate increasing our goal of 80% by 0.5% per year until we reach 90% by 2006. All the programs housed in the School of Education have met these milestones. The smaller programs in music and kinesiology have numbers below 10 each year. The small numbers in the programs impact the validity of the data. If the “rule of 10” is used, GC&SU met all the goals this year in each category.

Strategies for Reaching Goals
GC&SU was involved with several initiatives during the 2003-2004 academic year to improve the percentages of teacher candidates successfully completing the PRAXIS II exam.

- PRAXIS II preparation is offered through PAGE.
- We are creating a data base with PRAXIS II subscores whereby we can collect data and share areas of strengths and weaknesses with faculty who teach the Core Courses.
- Through Mentor Leader advising, we have encouraged students to take the PRAXIS II earlier in their studies.
- Early Childhood and Middle Grades have shifted their programs of studies to encourage teacher candidates to take the PRAXIS II after their junior year of study.
- We continue discussing the idea of requiring MAT students to pass PRAXIS II before student teaching.
- A music faculty member is researching the national data concerning pass rates on the music PRAXIS II test.
- PRAXIS II is now part of the music program. Because some students in music do not plan to become teachers, some of them never took the PRAXIS II previously.

How Progress Evaluated
- We review our data annually with feedback through the assessment cycle. Currently, the major vehicle for that is the Annual Performance Revision Report.
- We monitor children’s learning through work samples.
- We examine our PRAXIS II score report.
- We evaluate our graduate questionnaire, employer feedback and informal feedback from induction work with particular emphasis on the “being prepared” question.
Part III: Leaders
SELF-ASSESSMENTS AND EVIDENCE
FOR ALL RUBRICS

I. Inputs

I A. Responsibility for leader preparation programs vested in a collaborative of education, other academic units, and school partners (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Controlled by the college of education; roles of other colleges and school partners at input level
2 = Equitable representation among college of education, other colleges, and school partners; advisory to education dean
3 = Equitable representation among 3 groups, responsible for aspects of leader preparation, but no authority over programs
4 = Equitable representation, responsibility, and authority for the preparation of leaders among education, other academic units, and school partners

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 0
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 4

The JHL School of Education has an active Educational Preparation Council (EPC) that provides direction, advice and approves programs and major revisions for the Educational Leadership Program. The EPC meets a minimum of four times each year. Collaborative partners include representatives from the College of Liberal Arts, Partner Schools, School of Education, RESA, and local school administrators and teachers. It is the responsibility of this group to review program changes that are proposed by leadership faculty, approved by the department and the SOE faculty, and to determine whether the proposals are consistent with the mission of developing leaders who are Architects of Change. The procedures currently in place call for discussion and input on major changes, new programs, or other issues of concern with opportunity for input prior to formal presentation of new programs, major curricular or policy changes. After input from the Council, the leadership faculty incorporates feedback and ideas and present formal requests to the EPC for approval.

I B. Active practitioner-based advisory committee in place to provide ongoing feedback as to the success of graduates in meeting the outcomes of the guarantee and to suggest strategies for continuous improvement (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Advisory committee meets infrequently and gives feedback on program redesign presented by the college faculty
2 = Advisory committee meets regularly and relies on surveys of graduates and their supervisors as measures of success
3 = Advisory committee meets regularly and relies on extent to which graduates meet the performance and results outcomes of the guarantee as measures of success
4 = Advisory committee meets regularly and relies on extent to which graduates meet the performance and results outcomes of the guarantee as measures of success; advisory committee recommends strategies for continuous improvement of the program based upon the data
The Educational Leadership Faculty is in the process of gathering data from graduates and leader candidates who are in the field to determine their impact on student success. The process includes for graduates completing a Self-Assessment of Performance and a Supervisor’s Assessment of Performance. For leader candidates, Mentor Evaluation and Internship Self Assessment are also used to gather performance data. Regular meetings with the Leadership Advisory Board (currently being formed) will occur quarterly to review the data for program improvement.

The Leadership Advisory Board will include representatives from P-12 administration, the School of Education, the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and Oconee RESA. This board will not change the formal approval process of the EPC, but will serve as a more focused advisory board for the Leadership programs to focus on leadership candidate performance and outcomes.

**I C. Field-experiences—at least 150 contact hours—well integrated into courses (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Students complete less than 100 clock hours of field experiences in schools in each program
- 2 = Students complete more than 100 but less than 150 clock hours of field experiences in schools in each program
- 3 = Students complete at least 150 clock hours of field experiences in schools in each program but they are not integrated into courses
- 4 = Students complete at least 150 clock hours of field experiences in schools in each program and they are well integrated into courses

**Last Year**
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 4

**This Year**
2004 Self-Assessment = 4

Leader candidates complete 150 clock hours of field experiences at both MED and EDS levels. At the MED level, student field experiences have a school building/program focus. The EDS also has this focus but integrates additional field experiences from the district leadership perspective. The activities from the field experiences are real world, are imbedded in the course work, and are standards based. They are mutually guided by a local school based mentor and University faculty. The Capstone experience for both levels allows candidate to showcase artifacts from the cumulative experience that is guided by the ELCC Standards.

**I D. Admission requirements comparable to those of other graduate programs within the institution (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Admission requirements in leader preparation are lower than those used in other graduate programs within the institution
2 = Plan in place for raising the admission requirements in leader preparation to be within the range of admission requirements for other graduate programs within the institution
3 = Students admitted to leader preparation programs have either cumulative GPAs or score(s) on test(s) required for admission that are within the institution’s range of GPAs or test scores for graduate students
4 = Students admitted to leader preparation programs have cumulative GPAs and score(s) on test(s) required for admission that are within the institution’s range of GPAs and test scores for graduate students

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 3; BOR Assessment = 3
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 4

Leader candidates meet the institution admission’s requirement – cumulative GPA and test scores - for graduate programs. The JHL School of Education has revised the admission’s process to move the potential candidate review to the leadership faculty level. A Leadership Graduate Admission’s Committee has been formed and meets monthly to review persons who are applying to be candidates in the program. Specifically, the requirements for admission are:

- Master of Education
  - Hold or be eligible for a clear renewable, level four Georgia Teacher Certificate
  - Submit scores from the GRE General Test. To be granted regular admission status the applicant must score 1100 on the School of Education admission formula. The formula is: GRE verbal score + GRE quantitative or analytical score + (100 times the undergraduate grade point average-2.25 minimum) + 1100.
  - Submit two professional recommendations.
  - Meet specific program requirements.
  - Where appropriate have successfully satisfied all PRAXIS I requirements.
  - Must have a Program of Graduate Study approved, signed and filed.
  - Verification of Immunization.

- Educational Specialist
  - Hold either a Master of Education or comparable degree which includes advanced professional education or any other masters degree to which has been added advanced professional education and be eligible for a clear renewable level five Georgia Leadership Certificate
  - Submit scores from the GRE General Test. To be granted regular admission, the applicant must score a 1225 on the SOE graduate admission formula. The formula is: GRE verbal score + GRE quantitative or analytical score + (100 times the Graduate GPA-3.25 minimum) = 1225.
  - Submit two professional recommendations.
  - Submit verification of tow years teaching experience.
  - Submit a complete program of graduate study.
  - Submit a year-long program of professional activities.
  - Verification of Immunization.
These requirements are comparable to the requirements for entry into all graduate programs at GC&SU.

II A. Performance—Institutions

II A (1). Institutions guarantee that graduates meet all expectations listed under performance and results, and provide additional training for any graduate identified by a school system as not meeting expectations (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Partial plan in place for districts in service area to invoke the “take back” provision
2 = Partial plan in place to invoke “take back” provision statewide
3 = Full plan in place for districts in service area to invoke “take back” provision
4 = Full plan in place to invoke “take back” provision statewide

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Since 2001, the institution has had the guarantee in place for leader candidates who graduate from the program. The “take back” involves collaborative planning for remediation of students in particular areas of need identified by school/district. The institution’s guarantee has been communicated to the local districts. To date the University has no requests to “take back” a graduate of the leadership program.

II A (2). Institutions increase the numbers of high quality applicants from majority and minority groups (201)

0 = Insufficient evidence to make a judgment
1 = Partial plan in place
2 = Plan in place that includes baseline data, recruitment goals, timeline, strategies, and assessments for increasing the number of high quality applicants from majority and minority groups
3 = Evidence of progress toward reaching recruitment goals set for all targeted groups of students
4 = Evidence confirms continuous progress toward reaching recruitment goals set for all targeted groups of students

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

JHL School of Education Graduate Coordinator recruits potential leader candidates from colleges and universities that are considered historically black institutions. The following table represents minority participation for the years 02 and 03. The percentages are of the total number represented by each program category. In yr 02 total minority participation for the MED program was 32%. This number increased by 16% to a total of 48% in yr 03. The EDS program also saw an increase from 14% in yr 02 to 21% in yr 03. The total program reflects an increase of 12% in minority participation from 02 to 03.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 02 MED</th>
<th>Fall 02 EDS</th>
<th>Fall 02 MED &amp; EDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>WM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II A (3). In collaboration with the schools, institutions mentor graduates on all dimensions of the guarantee during their first two-years of practice as newly certified educational leaders in Georgia (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Partial plan in place to provide support, assistance, and professional development on all dimensions of the guarantee for first two years of practice as newly certified leaders only for graduates identified by school district as “struggling”
2 = Partial plan in place to provide some support, assistance, and professional development on all dimensions of the guarantee for first two years of practice as newly certified leaders to all graduates, with a primary focus on those who are “struggling”
3 = Partial plan in place to provide support, assistance, and professional development on all dimensions of the guarantee for first two years of practice as newly certified leaders for all graduates practicing in region served by institution
4 = Full plan in place to provide support, assistance, and professional development on all dimensions of the guarantee for first two years of practice as newly certified leaders for all graduates practicing in Georgia public schools

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

There is a plan in place (Guarantee) to provide support, assistance and professional development for graduates who are struggling once they are in leadership positions. Struggling individuals are identified by the school system and a mutual plan of professional development is designed to remediate the problem. Additionally, leaders in the field are asked to rate their performance as new leaders and their supervisors are also asked to rate the new leader’s performance. This information will be used by the Leadership Advisory Committee to make recommendations for program improvement.

II A (4). Institutions focus partner schools (or approved alternative) on:

- Increasing P-12 student learning and achievement,
- Mentoring beginning leaders,
• Seeking nominations of potential leaders for admission into preparation programs,
• Providing field-placements for leader candidates to demonstrate outcomes of guarantee,
• Collaborating in the preparation and development of leaders,
• Encouraging practitioner research by providing appropriate training in research on school improvement, and
• Increasing the amount of school-based research on improvement of schools and on leader preparation and development programs (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Partner school (or approved alternative) model under development that focuses on all dimensions stated in the Principle
2 = Partner school (or approved alternative) model that focuses on all dimensions stated in the Principle implemented in some schools
3 = Full network of partner schools (or approved alternative) in place that focuses on all dimensions stated in the Principle; all field-placements confined to partner schools; all have contractual agreements.
4 = Evidence of impact of partner schools (or approved alternative) on P-12 students, pre-service and in-service leaders

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment =2

Leader candidates are placed in field experiences in both professional partner and other non-designated schools. These placements are often driven by necessity as most of the students are employed as full-time educators. The underpinning support for the placement is a strong field-based guided mentorship by designated local administrators who are active participants and collaborative partners in the ongoing assessment of the candidate’s leadership development. Faculty work hard to insure that leadership candidates are placed with strong field-based mentors. In addition, practitioners who have special expertise are asked to present to the cohorts on various topics and to serve as informal mentors to the cohort in their areas of expertise.

One major source of applicants for the program is from the recommendation of current leader candidates in the field. School improvement activities that are data driven and grounded in best practice research are a primary focus for leader development. The leadership faculty have been a part of the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement and also rely on the resources of that program in tailoring curriculum and mentoring for candidates. Mentors are also supported in their work by cluster meetings in each region with leader candidates and University faculty.

II A (5). Institutions have at least an annual 80% pass rate on certification exam(s) for each reportable demographic group of leader candidates by 2006, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority leaders prepared; institutions set annual goals toward the 80% threshold between 2002-2006 (2001)
1 = Partial plan in place
2 = Plan in place that includes baseline data, annual goals, timeline, milestones as to numbers targeted, strategies for reaching goals, and how progress is to be evaluated
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
3 = Less than an 80% annual pass rates on certification exam(s) for all reportable demographic groups, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority leaders prepared
4 = At least an 80% annual pass rate on certification exam(s) for all reportable demographic groups, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority leaders prepared

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 4

In yr 02 with 23 percent minority participation, of the 53 people who took the Praxis II, one person was not successful for a 98% pass rate. In yrs 03-04 with 35 percent minority participation, of the 39 people who have taken the Praxis II all have been successful (100% pass rate). These figures do not reflect leader candidates who have taken the exam more than one time.

II A (6). Institutions support and recognize faculty for participation in leader preparation and in school improvement efforts through decisions in such areas as promotion and tenure, salary increases, workload, and allocation of resources (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Faculty reward system under study for leader preparation faculty in education
2 = Faculty reward system under study for leader preparation faculty in the college of education and other colleges vested in the collaborative that prepares educational leaders
3 = Leader preparation faculty in the college of education and other colleges vested in the collaborative are supported and recognized in reward system
4 = Evidence that the success of leader preparation faculty in promotion, tenure, merit salary increases, and post-tenure review is comparable to that of non-leader preparation faculty

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 3; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 4

Leadership faculty have received merit raises each year. One faculty member was promoted to the rank of Professor, while two faculty members were tenured. One faculty member successfully completed the post tenure review. One faculty completed pre tenure review. Salaries of leadership faculty are above average in School of Education, but are not comparable to P-12 salaries and are below the University average. Given entry requirements (terminal degrees, significant experiences in school administration, and a teaching background) recruiting and retaining faculty is a challenge.

II B. Performance—Leader Candidates

II B (1). Leader candidates set high expectations for all students in the school or system and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for leading standards-based schools
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to set high expectations for all students in the school or system and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities in field-placements to demonstrate that they can set high expectations for all students in the school or system and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to set high expectations for all students in the school or system and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Leader candidates complete field placements projects where school improvement activities are organized around high expectations for student success. Activities include analysis of data and implementation of evidence based best practice for the organization and supervision of curriculum and instruction. The program is designed to support school improvement initiatives and NCLB requirements for high expectations and achievement among all groups of students. Sample evidence of meeting this expectation can be found in candidate portfolios at both the initial and advanced levels of the program and in content driven exercises such as benchmarking for student success.

II B (2). Leader candidates use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward continuous improvement (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for using data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able use data on P-12 student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Leader candidates through their field experiences are asked analyze the data for their school/school district and identify areas where school improvement is indicated to support the concept of high expectations for all students. The benchmarking process is then used to identify a successful school/school district that is demographically similar to the one in need. Strategies from the benchmarked school are then evaluated for context and appropriateness and modified as appropriate before being incorporated into the
continuous improvement model. A plan to monitor progress and evaluate the efficacy of the practice in the target school is put into place.

II B (3). Leader candidates use technology to meet the individual learning needs of P-12 students, teachers, and administrators (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes use of technology to meet individual learning needs of P-12 students, teachers, and administrators
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to use technology effectively to meet individual learning needs of P-12 students, teachers, and administrators
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use technology effectively to meet individual learning needs of P-12 students, teachers, and administrators
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to use technology effectively to meet individual learning needs of P-12 students, teachers, and administrators

Last Year
2003 Report Self Assessment = 4; BOR Assessment = 3

This Year
2004 Self Assessment = 4

Assessments of the extent to which leader candidates use technology to meet learning needs of students is measured by the school/school based mentor evaluation, the student’s self assessment and the performance of the student completing tasks assigned by University faculty. The program itself uses list servs, Web Crossing and Web CT and requires the use of technology in data gathering and analysis. The planned incorporation of LIVETEXT for e-portfolios and the exploration of other appropriate tools for leadership candidates (IBM Change Toolkit, TestTrax, eBalanced Scorecard, etc.) is being explored. Candidates are encouraged to share information on the technology systems being used in their home schools and districts.

II B (4). Leader candidates lead schools using standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for leading schools using standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to use standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to lead schools using standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Leader candidate’s, University faculty’s and local school based mentor’s role in the preparation of successful leaders is to design activities that are grounded in the ELCC
Standards. Each candidate is asked to assign all tasks and process activities to specific standards as apart of the Capstone experience. The ELCC faculty members draw upon a variety of sources in education leadership, business models, and broad leadership theories. Through the school improvement process, analysis of data and the feedback loop for continuous improvement are emphasized as integral parts. An example of this and of content, embedded activities is the use of the school improvement model to analyze data sources and from that information develop a school improvement plan with a curricular focus.

II B (5). Leader candidates raise perceptions of all parties that the school or system can do better (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for raising perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to raise perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can raise perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to raise perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment =3

A central facet of all programs at GC&SU is the emphasis on facilitating change. Leadership candidates actively work throughout their program to design, implement and assess changes and innovations designed to improve schools. Field based school improvement projects are completed collaboratively with school based personnel and guided by university and school based mentor(s). As important, leadership candidates are taught to recognize the role of public perception, the need to provide the community and all constituents with information on school achievements, improvements, and performance. This is based upon creating a shared vision and a sense of shared ownership among students, faculty, staff, parents and the community. GC&SU ELCC works actively to shape programs that emphasize the need for active leadership as well as efficient management.

II B (6). Leader candidates develop a school or system plan for improvement (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for developing school and system plans for improvement
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to develop a school or system plan for improvement
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can develop a school or system plan for improvement
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to develop a school or system plan for improvement

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment =3
Leader candidates are required to take an in-depth look at the school/school system and its improvement plans, to identify a particular challenge or issue, to collect and/or to analyze data related to the school improvement project they choose, do root cause analysis, collect and analyze the research on evidence-based best practices, and develop a continuous improvement plan that includes monitoring for student success. This is a key component of the exit portfolio required of all leadership candidates in L5 and L6 programs.

II B (7). Leader candidates help P-12 teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for customizing instruction for individual students or groups of P-12 students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to help P-12 teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can help P-12 teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to help P-12 teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students’ own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1

This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Leader candidates through their field experiences are required to supervise learning activities of students and work with teachers to customize instruction to meet the diverse needs of students. Embedded activities, such as these, are found in the supervision, curriculum, and personnel coursework.

II B (8). Leader candidates provide P-12 students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services (2001)
0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes the study of a comprehensive program of student support services for standards-based schools
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to provide P-12 students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can provide P-12 students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to provide P-12 students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services

Last Year
Leader candidates are given opportunities during field experiences to assist student to manage their behavior. They also participate in such activities as SST and IEP meetings and counseling services. These activities are recorded in the internship log. Logs are discussed with input from other candidates, mentors and faculty to identify options and best practices for managing student behaviors.

II B (9). Leader candidates increase P-12 student learning-time as needed, using flexible schedules, structures, and technology (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes strategies for increasing P-12 student learning-time through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to increase P-12 student learning-time as needed through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can increase P-12 student learning-time as needed through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to increase P-12 student learning-time as needed through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology

Leader candidates are required to develop schedules for teachers and students for a variety of activities, which may include activities such as utilization of the technology lab. It may also include reworking traffic flow of vehicles and students and managing bus schedules.

II B (10). Leader candidates establish a safe and orderly school or system environment that supports reaching the goals of the improvement plan (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes study of the importance of and strategies for establishing a safe and orderly school or system environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to establish a safe and orderly school or system environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement plan
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can establish a safe and orderly school or system environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement plan
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to establish a safe and orderly environment school or system that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement plan

Leader candidates are given opportunities during field experiences to assist student to manage their behavior. They also participate in such activities as SST and IEP meetings and counseling services. These activities are recorded in the internship log. Logs are discussed with input from other candidates, mentors and faculty to identify options and best practices for managing student behaviors.
Each leader candidate are required to develop a risk management plan with his/her school-based mentor which includes all facets of the school program, facilities and grounds to assure a safe and orderly school/system environment. This activity is embedded in the school law coursework.

II B (11). Leader candidates lead the school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes the study of school law and professional ethics
2 = Assessment in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to lead a school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can lead a school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to lead a school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 3

Leader candidates have shared anecdotal information where they provided the latest information related to school law to current school leaders. Apart of their mentor assessment relates to the ethical practices of their leadership abilities. Reference to this is in the Mentor Evaluation of leader candidates.

II B (12). Leader candidates use state-of-the-art technology practices from business and industry to effectively and efficiently manage resources, planning, record keeping, and evaluation of schools or systems (2001)

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
1 = Curriculum includes the study of state-of-the-art technology practices in planning, managing, record keeping, and evaluating schools or systems
2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which leader candidates are able to implement state-of-the-art technology practices to effective and efficiently manage resources, planning, record keeping, and evaluations of schools or systems
3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use state-of-the-art technology practices in planning, managing, keep records, and evaluate schools or systems
4 = Evidence confirms that leader candidates recommended for certification are able to use state-of-the-art technology practices in planning, managing, record keeping, and evaluating schools or systems

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 2

Leader candidates have opportunities to demonstrate state of the art technology through the use of Web-Ct, Web-Crossing, email, e-portfolio and power point. Currently, ELCC faculty are exploring the use of LIVETEXT, the IBM Change Toolkit, and seminars on other software to help with management of students and resources, self study projects and monitoring and benchmarking goals. Assessments are completed by University faculty
and school based mentors related to the evaluation of their leader candidate’s successful use of each.

III. Results:

III A. Graduates from educational leadership programs who move immediately into educational leadership positions improve schools by increasing P-12 student learning and achievement within two years of practice as educational leaders (2001).

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 1
University faculty is in the process of gathering this data from previous cohorts by utilizing our listservs.

III B. Through partner schools (or approved alternative) P-12 students from diverse groups are learning and achieving at high levels (2001).

University faculty is in the process of gathering this data from previous cohorts by utilizing our listservs. Professional partner schools used widely in initial teacher education do not lend themselves to leadership training given the reality that almost all of the leadership candidates are full time teachers and cannot be assigned to professional partner schools. Given the limitations, ELCC faculty members invite practitioners with special expertise to provide seminars and workshops for the cohort, match leader candidates with school and district administrators who are most suitable for the development of leader candidates’ individual competencies.

Last Year
2003 Report: Self-Assessment = 1; BOR Assessment = 1
This Year
2004 Report: Self-Assessment = 1