

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

**FY 2007 Educator Preparation Report to the Board of Regents
(Submitted 1/31/08)**

Use Links to:

- [Section I: Teachers](#)

[Section II: Leadership: Not Required, Rules under development]

- [Section III: School Counselors](#) (documentation listed is available on request.)
- [Evidence for Section I](#)

Reporting Process for Institutions with Continuing Status

The *Regents' Principles* are closely aligned with the NCATE Standards. In an effort to streamline reporting for national, state, Board of Regents, and university requirements, all USG institutions with continuing accreditation status will submit NCATE documents based on their cycle of NCATE review as evidence of implementation of the *Regents' Principles* on Quality Assurance and Collaboration as indicated in Table 2 below. As part of their NCATE reporting process, USG institutions will submit data using the common points of assessment adopted by EPAAC.

Please submit the appropriate NCATE documents and complete the boxes below concerning GACE II and Professional Development Schools. In addition, for those *Regents' Principles* on Responsiveness, which are not aligned with the NCATE standards (listed in Principles #3, 4, 5, and 6 below), institutions should respond in the space provided (space may be expanded as needed). Please submit electronically by February 1, 2008.

**Table 2
Reporting for *Regents' Principles* on Quality Assurance and Collaboration**

Quality Assurance and Collaboration	
UAB Report Cycle	Submission to Board of Regents
NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board Report received in current academic year (UAB approval is one semester following NCATE onsite visit).	Submit letter from NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board. Any institutions with standards not met will submit a plan for how that standard will be met in the next two years.
All other years prior to or after NCATE review	Submit NCATE Annual Report C with brief description and data demonstrating progress toward all cited Areas for Improvement or standards not met (Due October 1). Please see the attached file (Appendix A – AACTE-NCATE Annual Report 2007 Part C) for evidence of our AFI progress. In addition, please see the following documents as evidence of our progress on Standard 1, AFI 2: Candidate performance assessment criteria and reported data are not consistently aligned with unit, state, and national standards, as well as the BOR Common Points of Assessment . 1. Early Childhood Key Assessments Alignment sample

	<p>documents (Appendix B - ECED Planning Assessment and Appendix C – ECED Planning Assessment for GA Framework) as evidence that our key assessments have been aligned with COE and national standards, and are now being aligned with the Georgia Framework (see Appendix A – AACTE-NCATE Annual Report 2007 Part C for further discussion.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 2006-2007 Teaching and Learning Initial Programs Key Assessment aggregated data spreadsheet (Appendix D), as evidence that our program, department and unit assessment is aligned with the common points of assessment approved by EPAAC. 3. 2006-2007 Teaching and Learning Advanced Programs Key Assessment aggregated data spreadsheet (Appendix E) as evidence that our program, department, and unit assessment is aligned with the common points of assessment approved by EPAAC.

GACE II

Institutional Response: Please list here or attach the number of completers, disaggregated by ethnicity, level, and subject area and unit pass rate

The attached file, ([Appendix F](#)) provides a view of our 2006-2007 initial and advanced teacher preparation program completers' pass percentage from various demographic perspectives. Overall, 343 of the 354 program completers took and passed their content area tests. This is a unit pass rate of 99%, with a median and mode pass rate of 100%. Failures are distributed across 6 programs. With the exception of French Education (n=1) and Technology Education, all programs had a pass rate of >80%. The Technology Education program has been monitored closely for several years and the decision was made that no students were admitted to the program as of Fall 2007. The French Education B.S.Ed. program has been removed and redesigned as part of the

M.A.T program, thus allowing more content in the undergraduate languages program. The attached file ([Appendix G](#)) shows that of the 11 completers who failed the GACE II, 7 were white females, 2 were black females, and 2 were black males. Failures are distributed across 6 programs.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

Institutional Response: Please list here or attach Professional Development Schools using NCATE definitions

Please see attached file ([Appendix H](#)) for evidence of our school partnership work. This list reflects that the majority (65) of our schools are Clinical Sites (Beginning), three are Partner Schools (Developing), and three are a PDD (Professional Development District), at Standard. We have Clinical Associates at 32 sites. Due to our heavy usage of teachers in these building, we pay Clinical Associates a stipend to coordinate field and clinical experiences in their buildings, as a liaison to our College of Education (COE) Field Experiences and Partnerships Office. We have begun the process of rebuilding our school partnerships, using the NCATE PDS definitions as the structure for our evaluation and development self-study rubric. Because of their current heavy teaching and supervision loads, our faculty are willing to be involved in the partnerships only to the degree that it will clearly benefit also their scholarship and research. Therefore, using the “Faculty Work in the Schools” BOR policy and our updated university and **COE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines**, we are developing (as a component of our partnerships) a mentoring support system which will facilitate for our faculty successful field-based research and scholarship projects within our partnerships. The work on this should be complete by May 2008 and implemented in our three “Partner School” sites in Fall 2008. Examples of two 2006-2007 and ongoing partnership initiatives (PDD and Brooklet Elementary School) that give evidence of our commitment to the NNER principle of “simultaneous renewal” can be found in our Principle #4 discussion.

In addition to the traditional partnership work, the COE is engaged in work with two national and international organizations that are focused on improved teaching and learning for all students, P-16. These activities are described below.

National Network for Educational Renewal (www.nnerpartnerships.org)

The COE is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). This is an organization that focuses on simultaneous renewal of schools and universities (colleges of education and the arts and sciences), based on the principles of education in a democracy originally espoused by John Goodlad. As a member setting we are supported in our simultaneous renewal

efforts through grants and training opportunities. As a result we have received grant support to develop a network (“Partnering for Portal”) within the schools and community of Portal, GA, one of our partner schools, to improve learning opportunities for all students. Another example of NNER support is their “Leaders for Teacher-Preparing Schools” training that has been provided for several of our partner schools principals and aspiring principals. A third example is the opportunity to be involved in the “League of Democratic Schools,” a network of principals and faculty from schools that are engaged in activities and curriculum within their schools to further their students’ successful participation in our democratic society. Please see [Appendix I](#) to view our LODS brochure.

International Network for Educational Transformation (iNet)

The COE is a member of iNet. This organization serves as a networking agent to connect schools and universities worldwide in the partnering efforts to raise the level of academic achievement and professional learning throughout the international network. During the fall of 2007, the COE’s Georgia Center for Education Renewal (GCER) supported the COE’s international partnership focus by sending written communication to all system superintendents and colleges of education in Georgia to inform them about iNet and to invite them to join. Dean Chance paid the dues for all the Georgia Southern partner schools and one partner school in Derbyshire, UK. The Director for the GCER visited 20 area schools to share the opportunities provided through the iNet web link. The GCER continues to make a special effort to establish contacts in all the schools and to keep them updated on iNet happenings through email. The Georgia Association of Educational Leaders 2008 Winter Conference in Atlanta will feature Tom Clark, Associate Director of the Specialist Schools and Academics Trust in the UK. (<http://www.sst-inet.net/>)

PRINCIPLE #3: University System institutions that prepare teachers will implement aggressive recruitment, retention, progression, completion, and induction policies to increase the numbers, to expand the diversity of candidates, and to balance supply and demand.

Institutional Response: Please refer to institutional data from Teacher Production Report and Double-Double targets. If progress is not adequate in any area, please put your reaction to these data below. Also include the relevant implementation strategies you are using to improve your progress. (Please refer to strategies listed in the *Principles*).

Please see [Appendix J](#) for evidence of our production rates. This data, taken from the BOR’s 2007 *Report on the Preparation of New Teachers by University System of Georgia Institutions*, shows that our total numbers have fluctuated from year to year, mirroring the aggregated “USG Institutions” trend data for years 2004 through 2007. With the exception of 2004, the percentage of minority to total has remained within a range of 14% -19%. Put demographics for our partner counties here.

During 2006-2007 we were engaged in the following activities (within our college and campus-wide) to improve recruitment, progression, and/or graduation:

General COE:

Prospective Students web site area - <http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/prospectivestudentinfo.html> This page was developed as a recruitment tool to provide links to information prospective students will want to consider when selecting a college of education.

Current Candidates web site area - <http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/studentinfo.html> This page was developed to provide resources and COE informational updates that aid candidates in successful progression.

Department of Teaching & Learning (containing all teacher preparation programs):

Faculty from several programs in the Department of Teaching and Learning made numerous curricular and program delivery adjustments to increase the ease with which candidates can access and progress through programs. Changes have been made in undergraduate and advanced programs. One such example was the increase in online courses in all initial programs and implementation of completely on-line programs in advanced teacher preparation programs. The M.Ed. in Teaching and Learning, with concentration in Instructional Improvement, the M.Ed. in Accomplished Teaching, the M.Ed. in Instructional Technology, and the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning are now offered totally on line (<http://online.georgiasouthern.edu/>). Additionally, graduate course rotation was published on the Teaching and Learning web page, for easy access by candidates, faculty, and prospective students (<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/tandl/>).

In undergraduate teacher preparation at the Dublin Center, Middle Grades and Early Childhood programs stabilized field experiences in Dublin City, Laurens County and Bleckley County schools and began to lay the foundation for new partner schools to support those programs. Additionally, the Early Childhood and Middle Grades Education programs' course rotations in Dublin were synchronized to make better use of courses common across both programs and faculty resources. Finally, all required content courses were scheduled to be offered in the evening to make easier access for working students. As a result of all of this work, all programs in Teaching and Learning are now either hybrid or totally online.

COE Student Affairs Committee:

The College of Education's Student Affairs Committee (<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/studentaffairscomm.html>) is responsible for developing, evaluating and revising the college's Recruitment Plan. Recruitment and enrollment data are used by the committee, along with evaluative feedback on the effectiveness of specific recruitment strategies, to determine which recruitment strategies

should be continued for the upcoming year and which strategies should be revised or discontinued. The committee, using the data and with input from department chairs and program coordinators, identifies areas that should receive focused attention. This involves consideration of various recruitment targets such as minority recruitment, two year colleges, undeclared majors, etc. or high need program areas. The annual revision of the Recruitment Plan is then assessed based on the availability of university resources to implement certain strategies or to accommodate increased enrollments in particular programs. The Student Affairs Committee is in the process of finalizing the recruitment plan evaluation and revisions for 2008 implementation.

COE Advisement Center:

Our Student Success Center (SSC) is part of a closely connected group of advisement centers operating in each of our campus colleges. During 2006-2007 associate deans and Advisement Center directors from each of the colleges met monthly with the Associate Provost to manage enrollment issues and address other policies and procedures that are central to the successful retention and progression of our students (<http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/advisement/>). Our College of Education's Student Success Center (SSC) worked with all Advisement Centers on campus to develop and implement strategies that continuously improve retention, progression and graduation rates of our students. For example, beginning in their Freshman year, our COE SSC staff advise Pre-Education majors. The Registrar's office identified students who are having difficulty by providing us a mid-semester grade report. Our SSC contacted those students to provide support and guidance. Another strategy implemented by our SSC was to contact students who were slow to register for the following semester. By reminding them/encouraging them to register in a timely manner, we increased the likelihood that they would get the courses they needed, thus impacting their successful progression through coursework. Another newly implemented strategy was the pre-advisement of all transfer students prior to our established student orientation and advisement sessions (SOAR). This is another new service that has enhanced our students' chances of securing necessary classes in a timely manner. The successful implementation of these and other such strategies was a result of the collaborative work of the Advisements Centers, the Associate Provost, the Registrar's Office, and the First Year Experience Office (<http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/fye/academics.htm>).

A related 2006-2007 activity which was proposed and initiated by our SSC and financially supported by our Associate Provost's office in the provision of ongoing inservice training for our advisors. This is done through use of a series of National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) webinars. These webinars have aided our advisors in keeping current with and implementing recommended practices in higher education advisement and other student services.

New Teacher Retention in the Field (Induction):

Beginning Fall 2007, the College of Education implemented a new comprehensive Induction Program that is based on university-school system collaboration. The program is intended to support new teacher graduates as well as any beginning teacher in one of the university's partner schools. The program offers on-line mentoring (e-mentoring) by expert K-12 teachers and university education and arts-and-sciences faculty and on-line professional learning modules (<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/induction.html>). The induction program provides training, resources, and other support for mentor teachers as well as school administrators. The intent is to not only support beginning teachers directly by providing supplemental support, but to also help schools/systems develop effective, research-based comprehensive induction programs that will help guarantee the success of our graduates in their first three years of teaching. During 2008 the program also will include graduates of other certification programs, such as Instructional Technology, School Counseling, Educational leadership, and School Psychology. The program has a strong evaluation component that will help determine and guide future direction of the program to ensure its effectiveness in supporting new educator success on the job.

PRINCIPLE #4: University System institutions that prepare teachers will develop and implement innovative teacher preparation programs to respond to state need and to contribute to increased student learning and achievement in Georgia's public schools.

Institutional Response: Please describe innovations that the institution plans and/or has implemented to make new or existing programs more flexible, accessible, and responsive to state needs. Institutions may wish to refer to menu of options listed in the *Principles* under Principle #4 as well as to data concerning advanced program completers, endorsements, field and level of initial and advanced program completers, and statewide shortage fields.

The COE agreed to participate in the Board of Regents' USG franchise programs and submitted proposals for the Teaching and Learning and Instructional Technology M.Ed. programs. We were given the *Instructional Technology M.Ed.* franchise, and were given a shared portion of the *Accomplished Teacher M.Ed.* (shared with Columbus State and Valdosta State). In addition, our Teaching and Learning faculty designed the courses and delivery model necessary to propose the *M.Ed. in Teaching and Learning, with concentration in Instructional Improvement* to be a totally online program, beginning Fall 2008. (<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/tandl>). This web site will also give evidence of the M.A.T program developed in 2006-2007. In an effort to improve our candidates' content area test scores (reflecting increased achievement), we dropped our B.S.Ed. programs in the secondary content areas, and redesigned those programs to be delivered through a M.A.T.

Our PDD sites, Screven Elementary, Middle and High Schools continued their final year of grant-supported work on addressing curricular and service delivery changes in the infrastructure of their schools in order to better address the learning needs of students in poverty. Please see [Appendix K](#) for a more complete discussion of the PDD work and outcomes. The goals of this ongoing work were to (1) decrease the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students and between low SES and more advantaged students; and (2) increase the knowledge, skills and dispositions of our teacher education candidates which will enable them to teach all children. This work included the involvement of our faculty in initial training of Screven County faculty on poverty issues, culturally responsive teaching, and differentiated instruction. Redelivery was then done by Screven County faculty to their faculty and to our COE initial teacher preparation candidates.

An example of partnership activities that influenced the learning of public school students was the partnership with Brooklet Elementary School (Bulloch County) in which special education teacher candidates provided tutoring support for learners that are at risk. The Tier 2 intervention tutorial program has been in place for three years. Georgia Southern teacher candidates provide tutoring for students two days a week after school. During the 2006-2007 school year all but one tutored student passed the CRCT test. This program was credited with contributing to that positive outcome.

PRINCIPLE #5: University System institutions that prepare teachers will support and reward all faculty who participate significantly in approved efforts in teacher preparation and school improvement through decisions in promotion and tenure, pre-tenure and post-tenure review, annual review and merit pay, workload, recognition, allocation of resources, and other rewards.

Institutional Response: Please describe how institution is implementing policy to support and reward faculty who participate significantly in approved efforts in teacher preparation and school improvement. Please reference BOR policy 803.17. Cite examples of successes.

In December 2006 the COE Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee developed a document titled “Effort Assignment and Evaluation Policy for Faculty in the College of Education” (<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/rolesandrewards.html>). This document was developed to contextualize and clarify the university-wide Faculty Roles and Rewards model completed in 2004. The COE document was designed to support the COE Conceptual Framework and comply with criteria specified in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook 2006-2007. This document makes two statements related to faculty work in schools, as follows: “Also important are faculty instructional contributions as manifested in various forms of work in schools. In the College of Education, certain types of work in schools may lead to scholarly products and activities.” In addition to these statements which support of faculty work in

schools, each department was then encouraged to develop or update their departmental promotion and tenure guidelines to reflect the value placed on faculty's work in schools.

The Department of Teaching and Learning developed a "Faculty Roles and Rewards matrix ([Appendix L](#)) tailored to recognize their work in schools. This document is used in goal-setting and evaluation. Faculty's merit pay is directly connected with this evaluation. Work in schools is also evident on the Teaching and Learning list of Evidence Categories ([Appendix M](#)). As stated in the earlier discussion regarding our partnership work, our Teaching and Learning faculty have heavy teaching and supervision loads, and are willing to be involved in the partnerships only to the degree that it will clearly benefit also their scholarship and research. Therefore, using the "Faculty Work in the Schools" BOR policy and our updated university and COE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, we are developing (as a component of our partnerships) a mentoring support system which will facilitate for our faculty successful field-based research and scholarship projects within our partnerships. The work on this should be complete by May 2008 and implemented in our three "Partner School" sites in Fall 2008.

The Board of Regents policy on "Faculty Work in the Schools" was released at the same time our COE Roles and Rewards document was completed. While the two documents are in most ways parallel, the request will be made to our Faculty Executive Committee that the appropriate body review the BOR policy with our "Effort Assignment and Evaluation Policy for Faculty in the College of Education" and all departmental documents to insure alignment with BOR expectations regarding evaluation of faculty's work in schools. The outcome of this alignment procedure will be noted in our 2008 BOR Report.

PRINCIPLE #6: The University System will continually assess the impact of the Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Teachers for the Schools to determine whether successful implementation contributes significantly to desired changes in preparation programs, to school improvement, and to increased student learning and achievement in Georgia.

Institutional Response: Optional: Please submit research, analysis, or best practices for assessing impact of graduates on P-12 student achievement in professional development schools, service area, and/or state. See Guide to Ratings below for this Principle.

Five years ago we proposed for and were awarded a grant to do simultaneous renewal work with our Screven County PDD. This work is described and cited in the Partner School section of this report. This PDD partnership, based upon the principle of simultaneous renewal activity, was to be the model for future new or refurbished partnerships. Because one of the major goals was to decrease the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students and between low SES and more advantaged students, outcomes data in

the form of achievement data and qualitative reporting was gathered and analyzed. (see [Appendix K – FIPSE Final Report CREP 2007](#)). As we continue the work of renewing our partnerships (see earlier discussion), we expect to use this model of data collection and analysis to help strengthen the teaching and learning within our partnerships.

2007 Part C of the AACTE Annual Report

Section 1 - Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	10421	AACTE SID:	1305
Institution:	Georgia Southern University		
Unit:	College of Education	Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C:	01/15/2008
Next Accreditation Visit:	S13	Last Accreditation Visit:	S06

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

Unit Head Name:	Dr. Lucindia H. Chance	Unit Head Title:	Dean
Unit Head Email:	lchance@georgiasouthern.edu	Unit Head Phone:	(912) 681-5649
Unit Head Fax:	(912) 681-5093	Institution Unit Phone:	(912) 681-5649
1st NCATE Coordinator:	Dr. Stephanie L. Kenney		
1st Coordinator Title:	Associate Dean, Undergraduate Teacher Education & Accreditation	1st Coordinator Email:	skenney@georgiasouthern.edu
1st Coordinator Phone:	(912) 681-5247	1st Coordinator Fax:	(912) 871-1068
2nd NCATE Coordinator:			
2nd Coordinator Title:		2nd Coordinator Email:	
2nd Coordinator Phone:		2nd Coordinator Fax:	
CEO Name:	Dr. Bruce F. Grube		
CEO Title:	President	CEO Email:	bfgrube@georgiasouthern.edu
CEO Phone:	(912) 681-5211	CEO Fax:	(912) 681-0598

Section 3 - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial & advanced) during the 2006-2007 academic year?

679

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2006-2007 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section 4. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. A change in the name of the unit or institution.
2. The status of the institution (e.g., campuses merged, campuses separated, etc.).
3. Changes in key personnel, particularly the unit head, NCATE coordinator, or university/college president.
4. The addition and/or removal of programs.
5. The addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., addition of a master's degree or doctoral program).
6. Changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs. (NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.)
7. Significant changes in physical facilities.
8. Significant changes resulting from unforeseen conditions such as natural disasters or health calamities.

4. Addition and/or removal of programs

- M.Ed. in Teaching and Learning, with concentration in Instructional Improvement (Addition- new concentration, program totally on line)
- M.Ed. in Accomplished Teaching (Addition-new program, totally on line)
- Alternative M.Ed. in Music Education (removed)
- M.A.T. (P-12 Art, all Secondary Education content areas (except Family and Consumer Science and Technology Education),

Middle Grades Education, Foreign Languages (Spanish and French), and Special Education. (Addition)

- Complete redesign (courses and structure) of Area F (Pre-professional block courses (9 hours); and a great amount of new course development and course revisions across all teacher preparation programs as a result of Area F redesign/new ECE and Middle Grades program requirements.

5. Addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., addition of a master's degree or doctoral program).

- Removed BSEds in P-12 Art , Foreign Languages (Spanish and French), and all Secondary Education content areas (except Family and Consumer Science and Technology Education), and redesigned/added these programs at M.A.T. level.

6. Changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs (50% or more not delivered fact-to-face).

- Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning (Placed existing program totally on line)
- M.Ed. in Instructional Technology - certification and non-certification programs (Placed existing programs totally on line)

Section 5. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit's conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

No evaluations/changes at this time.

Section 6. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. Candidates in art, English, history, and mathematics do not achieve an 80% pass rate on state-required content knowledge exams.	(ITP)
2. Candidate performance assessment criteria and reported data are not consistently aligned with unit, state, and national standards.	(ITP)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

1. Candidates in art, English, history, and mathematics do not achieve an 80% pass rate on state required content knowledge exams. (ITP)

In 2005 a Master of Arts in Teaching program was developed and approved for the following areas: art, business, history, geography, political science, economics, biology, chemistry, geology, physics, English, Special Education, and Middle Grades Education. (see <http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/MAT.html>) This was implemented and continually refined during 2006-2007. The move from the initial preparation B.S.Ed. to initial preparation at the MAT level, particularly in the secondary education content areas, was done to create additional hours of preparation in the content areas. Entrance into the MAT requires that candidates

have

passed their area GACE II. Since this change we have continued to meet with the Arts and Sciences content programs to assist them in aligning their course objectives/course assessment construction with our new state certification test, GACE II. We have also continued to pay test fees for all Arts and Sciences faculty teaching the content area courses who are willing to take the GACE II test for their content area. The state of Georgia worked closely with NES to develop a very faculty- and student- friendly web site full of test review, test orientation and self-assessment, and program assessment tools. Through our Teacher Education Committee we have provided training to faculty on how to use the web site. Faculty members have then shared this training with their students. Candidate test profiles have been reviewed by all programs and changes in course objectives and test response modes have been/continue to be made. Pass rates for 2006-2007 Program Completers are provided on the table below.

2006-2007 Program Completers Pass Rates (art, English, history and mathematics)

Program # Passed/Attempted Percentage Passed

Art Education 7/7 100%

English Education 8/9 89%

History Education 10/10 100%

Mathematics Education 1/1 100%

2. Candidate performance assessment criteria and reported data are not consistently aligned with unit, state, and national standards. (ITP)

The Department of Teaching and Learning faculty are developing common key assessments across undergraduate and graduate programs. These key assessments are aligned with the Georgia Framework and individual SPA standards. Each program will have six rubrics, one per key assessment. Each rubric has two parts, with part one addressing the Georgia Framework (common across all programs) and part two addressing the program's SPA standards (specific to that program only). Data collected and aggregated from part one of each rubric will be analyzed at the department and unit levels, while the data collected and aggregated from part two of each rubric will be analyzed at the program level. The expected timeline for this development is that part one of these documents will be completed during Fall 2007 and part two of these documents will be completed during Spring 2008, with implementation of the entire document (in a set of six key assessments) across all programs scheduled for Summer 2008. The unit-level spreadsheet for key assessments (part of our Unit Assessment Toolkit) has also been redesigned to reflect unit-wide aggregated key assessment data.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Section 7. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1. The unit does not have an established process for candidates, school faculty, and university faculty to conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout clinical practice.

(ADV)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

1. The unit does not have an established process for candidates, school faculty, and university faculty to conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout clinical practice. (Advanced)

While all initial teacher preparation and advanced-level Other School Personnel programs have clearly articulated and documented assessment procedures for candidate performance throughout clinical experience, the field components within the advanced teacher preparation programs have been less clear. All programs that have been designed and/or implemented since the April 2006 visit (including the Secondary Education, Special Education, P-12 Education, and Middle Grades M.A.T. programs) reflect, in Steps Two and Three of their programs, supervised field experiences. (See <http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/MAT.html#matsequence>.)

Programs that remain to be updated to include a clear and well-supervised/assessed field experience component are the MEd in Teaching and Learning. While all program concentrations in this MEd program currently have course-embedded field experiences, all concentrations, with the exception of Special Education, will redesign their field components to include an established process for candidates and schools and university faculty to conduct assessment of candidate performance throughout clinical practice. This task will be completed when the current work on common key assessments is complete (Summer 2008).

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

[Empty yellow box for response]

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

[Redacted area]

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

[Empty yellow box for response]

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

[Empty yellow box for response]

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

[Redacted area]

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

[Empty yellow box for response]

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

If you have another comments, use the space below:

Assessment 3: Instructional Teaching Unit 1

Methods II Practicum Instructional Teaching Unit

This assignment is aligned with ACEI standards 1, 2.1-2.4 and 2.8 and addresses all four of the Conceptual Framework commitments. Each candidate will design and implement an instructional unit to partially fulfill the requirements of Methods II. The unit includes the following components:

1. Contextual Information. Contextual Information Report—Each student will work collaboratively with the other preservice teachers in his/her assigned classroom to complete a contextual information report that includes the following components: (1) school information; (2) classroom information; (3) group composition; (4) group dynamics; and (5) a written commentary regarding the data depicted in the components.

2. Unit Purpose. The unit purpose includes a rationale, content and state/district standards, concept statements, goals, and objectives. Provide a clear succinct justification for teaching this unit. Identify the content and state/district by their codes. Identify, then code, developmentally appropriate concept statements to be taught. List the goals that are aligned with the content, state and district standards. Design objectives that are developmentally appropriate and consistent with content, state and district standards.

3. Assessment Plan. The assessment plan includes an assessment chart and a written commentary describing the assessments. Provide a chart outlining the pre-, post- and formative assessments to be utilized in the unit and administered to the class. The formative should include a variety of formats enabling you to evaluate the progress toward the unit's objectives and ultimately, the unit goals. Provide a written narrative describing the rationale for selecting the listed assessments. Indicate and support the modifications to be provided.

4. Pre-Assessment Analysis. The pre-assessment analysis includes a graphic presentation of pre-assessment data and a written commentary. Provide a graphic representation of the data gathered through the pre-assessment instrument. Provide a written narrative citing the specific evidence from the assessment data that describes the student's prior knowledge of the topic and describes how the data will be used for the instructional design.

5. Instructional Design. The instructional design includes a graphic organizer, a written commentary and lesson plans. Provide a graphic organizer for the instruction to be delivered during the unit. Include the following: Concept statements, objectives, types of assessment, instructional strategies, format of assessments, modifications, resources and time frame. Provide a narrative that describes the connection of the instructional design and the content and state standards. Explain why the instruction was sequenced in this way and support the modifications provided. Include lesson plans for each day.

6. Instructional Design Adjustments. List the adjustments to the instructional design plan and classroom teaching based on pre-assessment analysis, formative assessments, and classroom teaching. Explain the reasons for each adjustment.

7. Formative Assessment Analysis. The formative assessment analysis contains formative assessment information. Select and describe two students who are different types of learners and have distinct instructional needs. For each student provide the following: 1) Background information, 2) analysis of the student's performance on formative assessments, 2) recommendations for future instruction. In the

appendix section include a graphic representation of the scored class set of student responses to the formative assessments.

8. Post Assessment Analysis. The post assessment analysis includes a graphic presentation of the post assessment data and a written commentary. Provide a graphic presentation comparing the pre- and post assessment data. Provide a written narrative citing specific evidence from the assessment data which includes an item analysis, whole-class achievement of goals and objectives, the featured students' achievement of the goals and objectives and the level at which those were met.

9. Final Reflection. The final reflection includes adjustments to instruction and the role of the teacher in the total unit process. Describe what adjustments you would make if the unit were to be taught again. Integrate the role of the teacher in the total unit process.

10. Resources and Instructional Aids. List the references and resources used in the preparation and instruction of the unit. Be thorough and comprehensive and use the APA format to reference ALL your bibliographic material.

Early Childhood Education Unit Assessment Rubric: Methods II

Name _____ Date _____
 School _____ Lesson _____

University Supervisor _____ Clinical Supervisor _____

	Distinguished	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Contextual Information	<i>Sections A – D</i> *Thorough documentation of school/classroom/group information *Includes a thorough description of student differences (e.g. developmental levels, extenuating circumstances, etc.) <i>Written Commentary</i> *Insightful reflection on gathered data *Thorough delineation of impact on planning and instruction based on gathered data	<i>Sections A – D</i> *Documentation of school/classroom/group information *Includes a thorough description of student differences (e.g. developmental levels, extenuating circumstances, etc.) <i>Written Commentary</i> *Reflection on gathered data *Delineation of impact on planning and instruction based on gathered data	<i>Sections A – D</i> *Partial documentation of school/classroom/ group information *Includes a partial description of student differences (e.g. developmental levels, extenuating circumstances, etc.) <i>Written Commentary</i> *Partial reflection on gathered data *Partial delineation of impact on planning and instruction based on gathered data	<i>Sections A – D</i> *Insufficient relevant information provided *Omitted sections <i>Written Commentary</i> *Insufficient reflection on gathered data *Insufficient delineation of impact on planning and instruction based on gathered data
Unit Purpose	*All parts aligned *Rationale: Clear, succinct *Clearly stated, relevant (meaningful to life experiences) purpose *Standards: All focal standards identified *Appropriate GPS (QCC) *Clearly stated concept(s) *Clearly stated objectives *Developmentally appropriate goals	*Rationale: Clear *Clearly stated purpose *Standards: Some focal standards identified *Developmentally appropriate concepts *Goal(s) identified *Objectives written as outcomes	*Unclear *Standards not clearly related *Some concepts not clearly aligned or developmentally appropriate *Objective poorly constructed *Standards not coded *Incomplete	*Not developmentally appropriate * Incomplete, missing a component
Assessment Plan Part A	*Precise *Includes at least 3 formats of assessment *Leads to accurate evaluation *Complete	*Includes at least 2 formats of assessment *Leads to accurate evaluation *Complete	*Only one format of assessment *Poorly described and/or unpolished sample	*Inappropriate assessment *Sample omitted *Lacks modification for students

Assessment Plan Part B	*Thorough delineation of rationale for assessments and modifications	*Delineation of rationale for assessments and modifications	*Partial delineation of rationale for assessments and modifications	*Insufficient delineation of rationale for assessments and modifications
Pre-Assessment Analysis	*Thorough analysis of gathered info *Accurate *Complete *Clearly presented	*Accurate analysis of gathered info *Complete *Clearly presented	*Analysis lacks minor detail *Somewhat confusing presentation	*Inaccurate analysis *Incomplete
Instructional Design Pt. A	*Precise *Complete *Clear alignment of instruction with unit goals *Includes at least <i>five</i> instructional strategies	*Complete *Alignment of instruction with unit goals *Includes at least <i>four</i> instructional strategies	*Lacks some detail *Mostly aligned *Includes at least <i>three</i> instructional strategies	*Incomplete *Lacks alignment *Includes less than <i>three</i> instructional strategies
Instructional Design Pt. B	*Strong connection between instructional design and content and standards	*Connection between instructional design and content and standards	*Weak connection between instructional design and content and standards	*No connection between instructional design and content state standards
Instructional Design	*Identifies all relevant patterns *Detailed, complete modifications *Precisely identifies next steps for instruction *Clearly presented	*Complete modifications *Identifies next steps for instruction	*Some identification of modifications *Does not justify reasons for modifications needed or not needed	*Irrelevant data *Omitted
Formative Assessment Analysis	*Precise, thorough analysis of students' performance *Reflective and aligned modifications for future instruction *Thorough analysis of student responses *Detailed and accurate data in adequate display	*Complete analysis of students' performance *Modifications for future instruction can be used but lack specific reference to individual students	*Contains a few inaccuracies *Lists some modifications but not detailed *Identifies general steps for instruction	*Inaccurate analysis *No modifications identified *No class set of students' responses included *Incomplete
Post-Assessment	*Detailed, complete and accurate data in clear display	*Detailed, complete and accurate data in adequate display	*Accurate data that lacks some detail in adequate display	*Incomplete *Inaccurate *Irrelevant data in poor display
Post-Assess Analysis	*Cites specific evidence from data to clearly and thoroughly address all points: Validity and student learning, whole class achievement, featured students *Clearly evaluates and identifies how teaching influenced learning	*Cites specific evidence from data addresses all points: Validity and student learning, whole class achievement, featured students *Identifies how teaching influenced learning	*General information that addresses all points: Validity and student learning, whole class achievement, featured students *Gaps in identification of how teaching influenced learning	*Incomplete
Final Reflection	*Unusual insight into self *Considers all areas of reflection *Addresses all components	*Considers all areas of reflection *Addresses all components	*Gaps in completeness of areas of reflection *Partially incomplete	*Incomplete

Bibliography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Clearly presented * Includes all references * Uses APA format * Uses a variety of sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Includes all references * Uses a variety of responses * Uses APA format with minor discrepancies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Incomplete resources * Doesn't utilize APA format * Contains some references not included in appendix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Incomplete * Omitted
Mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Professionally presented, well written * 0 - 3 errors 	* 4 - 5 errors	* 6 - 7 errors	8 + errors

Assessment 3 Rubric Key

1-2 mean score = Unacceptable (1=unsatisfactory on rubric; 2=needs improvement on rubric)
3 mean score = Acceptable (3=satisfactory on rubric)
4 mean score = Target (4=distinguished on rubric)

Assessment 3 Analysis: Data Table

	Unacceptable (Needs Improvement/Unsatisfactory)	Acceptable (Satisfactory)	Target (Distinguished)
2004-2005 (N= 117)	6	87	24

Key Assessment #3
Department of Teaching and Learning
Planning Assessment

Candidate's Name: _____
Semester/Year: _____
Program: _____

	Unacceptable 0-6 Points	Acceptable 7-8 Points	Target 9-10 Points	Score/ Comments
<i>Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 1: Content and Curriculum</i>				
1.4	Fails to relate content to everyday lives of students.	1.4.1 Relate content to everyday lives of students.	1.4.2 Relate content to students' lives and to one or more other areas of the curriculum.	
<i>Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 2: Knowledge of Students</i>				
2.5	Fails to develop instructional strategies to meet diverse needs of all students.	2.5.1 Identify students' stages of development, multiple intelligences, learning styles, and areas of exceptionality and, with help, begin to develop and use a repertoire of strategies to accommodate individual needs.	2.5.2 Differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of all students.	
<i>Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 3: Learning Environments</i>				
3.2	Fails to effectively manage time, space and other educational resources to increase student learning.	3.2.1 Organize and manage time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources necessary for providing learning activities for students.	3.2.2 Organize, allocate, and manage time, space, activities, technology, software, and other resources to increase active engagement of students in learning activities.	
3.4	Fails to utilize strategies that support student learning.	3.4.1 Seek, use, and refine strategies for motivating learners.	3.4.2 Implement strategies for organizing and supporting student learning that are based on human motivation and behavior.	
3.6	Fails to connect with, utilize, or integrate community, district and school resources into instruction.	3.6.1 Learn about and use resources specific to the school, district, and community.	3.6.2 Access and become involved with school, district, and community resources as an integral part of teaching.	

Georgia Framework for Teaching Domain 5: Planning and Instruction				
5.1	Fails to develop meaningful and research-based rationales for instructional choices.	5.1.1 Locate, comprehend, and build rationales from curriculum guides, other applicable documents, and experienced colleagues.	5.1.2 Develop rationales for their instructional choices and use them appropriately.	
5.2	Fails to demonstrate instructional strategies based on an understanding of standards, curriculum, students, learning environments and assessment.	5.2.1 Plan and carry out instruction based on state and local performance standards.	5.2.2 Build a complex understanding of planning that grows out of standards and includes increasingly integrated knowledge of content and curriculum, students, learning environments, and assessment.	
5.3	Fails to plan instructional strategies in order to engage all students.	5.3.1 Select and vary instructional strategies, assessing their impact on student engagement and learning.	5.3.2 Select and vary instructional strategies based on knowledge of the specific learners in a classroom in order to engage all students.	
5.6	Fails to select or use adequate resources to support learning in the classroom.	5.6.1 Assess individual learners' needs and seek resources to improve instruction and learning.	5.6.2 Develop a repertoire of resources, materials, and technology/software to enhance instruction and learning for all students.	
5.7	Fails to collaborate with colleagues to plan for instruction.	5.7.1 Learn to work and plan productively as part of a team, grade level, and/or department group.	5.7.2 Plan with others to create coherent experiences to enhance student learning.	
Total Score/Grade:				

Scoring Guide: 90 – 100 = Target, 70 – 89 = Acceptable, 69 and below = Unacceptable

Evaluator's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Candidate's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Academic Year	Program	Entry to Program									Entry to Clinical Practice								Program Completion							One Year Follow Up											
		# Applicants	# Admitted	Calculated Average % Admitted	Avg Entry GPA	Praxis / GACE Exempt %	Praxis / GACE I Applicant pass %	Praxis / GACE I Pass %	KA Entry Dispositions N	KA Entry Dispositions Pass %	N for GPA	Avg Pre-Clinical GPA	KA Content N	KA Content Pass %	KA Field Experience N	KA Field Experience Pass %	KA Pre-Clinical Dispositions N	KA Pre-Clinical Dispositions Pass %	N for GACE II	GACE II Pass %	KA Clinical Observation N	KA Clinical Observation Pass %	KA Effect on Student Learning N	KA Effect on Student Learning Pass %	KA Clinical Dispositions N	KA Clinical Dispositions Pass %	Avg Completer GPA	Completer Survey N	Completer Strong %	Completer Adequate %	Completer Weak %	Employer Survey N	Employer Strong %	Employer Adequate %	Employer Weak %		
2006-2007	MGED	70	56	80%	3.16	45%	38%	100%	56	100%	36.0	3.27	142	100%	142	96%	142	96%	163.0	69%	141	3%	142	96%	142	96%	3.27	6	100%	0%	0%	10	80%	20%	0%		
2006-2007	ECED	182	128	70%	3.15	51%	29%	100%	128	100%	141.0	3.35	185	100%	138	96%	152	96%	185.0	68%	144	99%	144	99%	152	99%	3.35	32	97%	3%	0%	64	64%	36%	0%		
2006-2007	SPED	44	35	80%	3.22		16%	100%	35	100%	34.0	3.31	32	97%	34	100%	34	97%	76.0	79%	34	100%	31	100%	34	100%	3.31	5	100%	0%	0%	3	100%	0%	0%		
2006-2007	FACS	6	2	33%	3.51	33%	50%	100%	2	100%	5.0	3.29	10	70%	10	70%	10	70%	5.0	80%	5	100%	5	100%	4	100%	3.29	0				1	100%	0%	0%		
2006-2007	TCED	13	10	77%	3.35	62%	15%	100%	10	100%	17.0	3.16	8	100%	17	100%	17	100%	14.0	29%	17	100%	17	100%	17	100%	3.16	2	100%	0%	0%	2	50%	50%	0%		
2006-2007	POLS	0	0						0		4.0	3.31	4	75%	4	75%	4	100%	3.0	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	3.1	0				1	0%	100%	0%		
2006-2007	PHYS	0	0						0		0.0		0		0		0		0.0		0		0		0						0						
2006-2007	MATH	11	9	82%	3.45	79%		100%	9	100%	12.0	3.04	12	83%	12	83%	10	100%	20.0	65%	10	100%	10	100%	10	100%	3.04	3	100%	0%	0%	3	67%	33%	0%		
2006-2007	HIST	12	9	75%	3.45	70%		100%	9	100%	13.0	3.1	13	85%	13	85%	15	93%	30.0	40%	15	93%	15	93%	15	93%	3.1	0				2	100%	0%	0%		
2006-2007	GEOG	1	1	100%	3.07				1	100%	0.0		0		0		0		0.0		0		0		0						0						
2006-2007	ENGL	26	23	88%	3.21	61%	19%	100%	23	100%	11.0	3.21	14	93%	14	100%	14	93%	20.0	65%	11	91%	11	91%	11	91%	3.21	0				3	100%	0%	0%		
2006-2007	CHEM	0	0								2.0	3.3	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	5.0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	3.3	0				0					
2006-2007	BUSA	8	7	88%	3.29	67%	16%	100%	7	100%	13.0	3.14	13	85%	13	85%	9	100%	26.0	65%	9	100%	9	100%	9	100%	3.14	1	100%	0%	0%	2	50%	50%	0%		
2006-2007	BIOL	0	0								3.0	3.53	6	66%	6	66%	3	100%	14.0	57%	3	100%	3	100%	3	100%	3.53	1	100%	0%	0%	1	100%	0%	0%		
2006-2007	SCI	0	0								0.0		0		0		0		0.0		0		0		0						0						
2006-2007	SOC SCI	0	0								0.0		0		0		0		0.0		0		0		0						2	100%	0%	0%	0		
2006-2007	SPAN	2	2	100%	3.87	63%	37%	100%	2	100%	20.0	3.27	20	100%	20	90%	20	100%	38.0	53%	20	95%	20	90%	20	90%	3.27	1	0%	100%	0%	1	0%	100%	0%		
2006-2007	FREN	1	1	100%	3.23				1	100%	0.0		0		0		0		0.0		0		0		0						0						
2006-2007	GERM	1	1	100%	3.27				1	100%	0.0		0		0		0		0.0		0		0		0						0						
2006-2007	MUSIC	19	16	84%	3.16	12%	83%	100%	16	100%	6.0	3.5	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	6.0	100%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	3.5	0				0					
2006-2007	HPER	33	24	73%	2.98	29%	32%	100%	24	100%	25.0	3	24	100%	8	100%	25	100%	16.0	75%	24	96%	10	100%	25	100%	3	1	100%	0%	0%	2	50%	0%	50%		
2006-2007	ART	9	7	78%	3.18	25%	58%	100%	7	100%	22.0	3.09	13	100%	13	100%	13	100%	12.0	92%	22	100%	0		13	100%	3.09	1	100%	0%	0%	1	100%	0%	0%		

2006-2007 TOTAL UNIT TALLY

TOTAL STUDENTS	PASS	FAIL	%PASS	MALE	FEMALE	% MALE	% FEMALE	BLACK	% BLACK	WHITE	% WHITE	HISPANIC	% HISPANIC	MULTIRACIAL	% MULTIRACIAL	ASIAN/ISLAND PACIFIC	% ASIAN/ISLAND PACIFIC
354	343	11	99%	54	295	15%	83%	46	13%	302	88%	4	0.01%	1	0.003%	1	0.003%

Demographics of 2006-2007 Program Completers who Failed GACE II or PRAXIS II

Program (Total Test Takers)	Black Male	White Male	Black Female	White Female	Total
Early Childhood (139)			1	4	5
English Education (9)				1	1
French Education (1)				1	1
Math Education (11)			1		1
Spanish Education (5)				1	1
Technology Ed. (9)	2				2
Demographic Totals	2		2	7	11*

*Based on 354 test-takers, representing a 99% pass rate for our unit.

Please see the attached file (Appendix B – 2006-2007 Program Completers GACE II & PRAXIS II Pass Rate) which provides a view of our 2006-2007 initial and advanced teacher preparation program completers’ pass percentage from various demographic perspectives. Overall, 343 of the 354 program completers took and passed their content area tests. This is a unit pass rate of 99%, with a median and mode pass rate of 100%. Failures are distributed across 6 programs. With the exception of French Education (n=1) and Technology Education, all programs had a pass rate of >80%. The Technology Education program has been monitored closely for several years and the decision was made that no students were admitted to the program as of Fall 2007. The French Education B.S.Ed. program has been removed and redesigned as part of the M.A.T program, thus allowing more content in the undergraduate languages program.

“Appendix C – Demographics of 2006-2007 Program Completers who Failed GACE II or PRAXIS II” shows that of the 11 completers who failed the GACE II, 7 were white females, 2 were black females, and 2 were black males. Failures are distributed across 6 programs.

Professional Development Schools List

PDS/PDD (At Standard)

Screven County Elementary (CA)*
Screven County Middle (CA)
Screven County High (CA)

Partner School (Developing)

Langston Chapel Middle (CA)
Southeast Bulloch High (CA)
Stilson Elementary (CA)

Clinical Sites (Beginning)

Appling County Middle
Appling County High
Blandford Elementary
Bleckley County Primary
Bleckley County Middle
Brooklet Elementary (CA)
Bryan County Elementary
Bryan County Middle
Bryan County High
Burke County Middle
Burke County High
Claxton Elementary (CA)
Claxton Middle (CA)
Claxton High
Collins Elementary/Middle
Ebenezer Elementary (CA)
Ebenezer Middle (CA)
Effingham County Middle (CA)
Effingham County High (CA)
East Laurens Elementary
East Laurens Middle
Glennville Elementary
Glennville Middle
Guyton Elementary
Jenkins County Middle
Jenkins County High
Julia P. Bryant Elementary (CA)
Langston Chapel Elementary (CA)
Langston Chapel Middle (CA)
Lyons Primary
Lyons Upper Elementary
Mattie Lively Elementary (CA)
Metter Elementary (CA)

Metter Middle
Metter High
Mill Creek Elementary (CA)
Nevils Elementary (CA)
Northwest Laurens Elementary
Pooler Elementary
Portal Elementary (CA)
Portal Middle/High (CA)
Pulaski Middle
Rincon Elementary (CA)
Sallie Zetterower Elementary (CA)
Sandhill Elementary
S. Effingham Elementary
S. Effingham Middle (CA)
S. Effingham High (CA)
Southeast Bulloch Middle (CA)
Southeast Bulloch High (CA)
Springfield Elementary (CA)
Statesboro High (CA)
Swainsboro Middle
Swainsboro High
Tattnall County High
Toombs County Middle
Toombs County High
Twin City Elementary (CA)
Vidalia Comprehensive High
West Chatham Elementary
West Chatham Middle
West Laurens Middle
West Laurens High
William James Middle (CA)
Windsor Forest High

*CA=Clinical Associate



The League of Democratic Schools Eastern U.S. Region

*In Support of Schools That Dare
to Make a Better Society*



*An Initiative of The Institute for Educational Inquiry
(IEI), the Miami University Partnership Office, and
The Georgia Center for Educational Renewal at
Georgia Southern University*



Purpose of the League

The League of Democratic Schools was organized in 2004 in order to:

1. promote professional development that emphasizes the growth of students as individuals who are successful members of a democratic society.
2. to support schools that successfully advance the Agenda for Education in a Democracy.

The League functions through partnerships between public schools and supporting organizations, usually colleges of teacher education. These partnerships, in turn, belong to larger regional networks of partnerships. Miami University and Georgia Southern University are now forming such a partnership. The member schools will commit to pursue the following goals:

- **Democratic purpose:** Members of the school community believe the primary purpose of schooling is the development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in our nation's youths that support renewal of our nation's social and political democracy. These are "schools that dare to make a

better society," and they have a definite view of what that society should be. They share a commitment to the mission of the Agenda for Education in a Democracy.

- **Student achievement:** Students in such schools are successful academically and socially. Multiple measures of such success are used with portfolios, exhibitions, demonstrations, and other comprehensive assessments joining teacher-administered and externally prepared tests as ways of assessing achievement. Frequently, follow-up studies reveal continuing success by those who have completed their study at the school. Mastery of learning, not sorting or ranking of students, dominates assessment practices.
- **Ongoing professional development:** All members of the school community engage in continuous learning. The school community has both a capacity and a commitment to renewal—one in which the members have the ability to engage in civil discourse, to take risks, to critically examine different points of view. Members of the community engage safely in authentic dialogue. Outside partnerships (with universities,

businesses, and other agencies) strengthen the work of the school community.

- **Approaches to learning:** There are many opportunities for students to interact with each other and with adults in different roles. Students experience continuity and diversity in relationships with adults. The grade/age configuration of the school is not important, but it operates in a way that is appropriate for students of different developmental stages. Strategies that leave a student with the same core teacher are all right if the structure also ensures that students are engaged with other teachers. Team teaching with pre-service teachers or parents is one of the favored strategies. Multi-age groupings are commonly used. The schools encourage learning that takes place outside the boundaries of the school campus. These schools engage students with parents and other adults within the community.
- **Small size:** The school is small—small enough so that faculty members can gather as a group for dialogue. There are a small number of student contacts for each teacher and small advising groups to ensure that each student is

well known by an adult. In general, the basic instructional unit is no more than 500 or so students. (There may be several such units on a single campus. For example, a high school may have multiple career-themed academies, or a year-around elementary school may have 3 or 4 sub-schools.)

- **Governance:** These schools operate with substantial capacity to make decisions about their own functioning within the larger systems of which they are a part. Such schools

are often schools of choice—schools chosen by parents and/or students and schools in which faculty exercise considerable discretion regarding instructional practices and curriculum. The schools may be neighborhood public schools, magnet schools, charter schools, or private schools, but all take seriously their commitment to the public purposes of schooling. They are inclusive (not selective) and aggressively strive for a diverse student population.

The Benefits of Membership in the League:

Schools that join the League of Democratic Schools in partnership with Miami University and Georgia Southern University will enjoy a number of benefits:

- Connection to a larger community of like-minded schools who will work to achieve similar goals of preparing our young people for citizenship in a democracy.
- Access to the extensive resources of the University Communities.
- Regional conferences including an Annual LDC Spring Conference organized to serve the needs of member schools.
- A variety of support services targeted at the internally developed initiatives of school leaders, parents, staff, and students.

How to Become a Member of The League of Democratic Schools:

Partnership members agree to

- Participate in League meetings and events
- Submit brief reports each year about their efforts in advancing education for democracy
- Pay an annual membership fee of \$500

To learn more about the League of Democratic schools and to become a member, contact:

Dr. Thomas Poetter
Miami University
Partnership Office
124 McGuffey Hall
Oxford, OH 45056
513-529-6853
poettets@muohio.edu

or

Dr. Stephanie Kenney
Georgia Center for
Educational Renewal
at Georgia Southern University
(912) 681-5247
P.O. box 8133
Statesboro, GA 30460
skenney@georgiasouthern.edu



**The Georgia Center for
Educational Renewal**

P.O. Box 8133
Statesboro, GA 30460
(912) 681-5247
coe.georgiasouthern.edu/gcer.html



The Miami University Partnership Office

124 McGuffey Hall
Oxford, OH 45056
(513) 529-0434
www.muohio.edu/partnershipoffice



The Institute for Educational Inquiry (IEI)

<http://depts.washington.edu/cedren/IEI.htm>



New Teacher/Minority Teacher Production rates for Georgia Southern

	2004	2005	2006	2007
Total New Teacher Production	217	264	350	306
New Minority Teacher Production	89	51	63	44

GRANT NUMBER: P116B031259-05
INSTITUTION NAME: Georgia Southern University
FINAL PERFORMANCE NARRATIVE
PROJECT END DATE: AUGUST 31, 2007
FIPSE

A. Paragraph Summary:

In the fall of 2003, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) awarded the Georgia Southern University College of Education (COE) a three-year grant to support the work of developing the Professional Development District (PDD) with Screven County Schools, a local rural school district, and Savannah River Challenge Program (SRCP), a resident facility for juveniles located in Screven County. The focus of the grant was to address systemic causes for the gap in the academic performance between minority and non-minority students and between low SES (socioeconomic status) students and their more advantaged peers in the Screven County PDD. The project had a professional development focus that was addressed through professional learning communities throughout the PDD. The professional learning topics were: *Understanding the Framework of Poverty, Culturally Responsive Teaching, and Differentiated Instruction*. Additionally, to address a concurrent goal of increasing the knowledge, skills and dispositions of teacher education candidates that will enable them to teach all children, workshops on these topics were presented to teacher education program students at the College of Education. COE faculty collaborated with these schools in the areas of school counseling, special education issues, educational leadership, and parental involvement.

B. 1. Introductory Overview

The project grew as a natural expansion of collaborative partnerships between the COE and individual Screven County Schools. Comprised of three schools, in a location near to the University, combined with a history of collaboration between the University and the system, the

FIPSE project funding enabled a broader and more comprehensive and systematic approach to solving the targeted problems: 1) the gap in academic performance between minority and non-minority students and between low SES and more advantaged students; and 2) the preparation of preservice teachers to enable them to teach all children and to understand how "the system" is failing some youth. Activities were aligned around these two goals:

- 1) *Decrease achievement gap between minority and non-minority students and between low SES and more advantaged students:*

In partnership with the COE, the entire district of Screven County Schools, plus the SRCP, served as a "teaching/learning lab" in the simultaneous renewal of P-16 teaching/learning through the utilization of instructional coaches at each site and an embedded comprehensive professional development plan which featured Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Coaches provided support for the faculty through facilitating the learning communities and compiling assessment data to impact instruction and student learning. Three strands of Professional Development were identified: Understanding Poverty; Differentiated Instruction; and Culturally Responsive Teaching. To implement the training, coaches divided faculty into three expert groups, one for each strand, who attended training and then redelivered the information to the rest of the faculty. The vehicle for the redelivery was the PLC, and initial training was complete by August of 2006. During the final year of the FIPSE project, training strands were refined as the professional learning communities at each school identified additional subject- or grade-specific needs or topics which led to deeper understanding of the original three strands of PD. Additionally, PLC's identified material resources needed to continue the study and work of the PLC's beyond the FIPSE funding period, and FIPSE funds were utilized to build reference libraries for each site. During the project period, all Screven County faculty members,

plus COE students who were placed in the schools for pre-professional block and methods courses and as student teachers, participated in all strands of PD, a total of nearly 500 people. Although the outcomes of the FIPSE project will be discussed in more detail in the Evaluation Section (5), it is clear that this training had positive effects in four primary areas: 1) Student achievement data shows that test scores improved and the achievement "gap" decreased in many subjects and grade levels K-12, primarily at the high school level; 2) The practices of teachers in the classroom changed from teacher-centered to student-centered, as measured by the SOM; 3) PLC's became an institutionalized and embedded vehicle for all the major training initiatives of the system, including the new Georgia Performance Standards (GPS); 4) there was a fundamental shift in the beliefs and convictions of the teachers about student potential and best practices to improve their learning.

- 2) *Increase the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teacher education candidates which will allow them to teach all children.*

Additionally, the PDD served as the training site for teacher education candidates. Georgia Southern teacher education candidates reflect the national demographics—white middle class females from the suburbs. Teacher training in a rural PDD with a large population of low-income students required a re-examination of the teacher training model used by the College of Education, Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, Health and Professional Studies, and Science and Technology faculties. The re-examination, which continues, is also extending to all school/education personnel, helping to broaden and enhance the programs. Teacher educators and candidates working with students in a minimum-security facility and an alternative school helped them focus on educators' roles in ensuring that "the system" does not fail youth. In addition to training within the partner schools, mini-workshops in the three strands of PD were

integrated into preservice teacher preparation programs, during their Methods or Curriculum blocks of instruction. During the 3-year project funding period, 325 students were placed in SCS as observers and student teachers, etc. Also, 375 undergraduates were trained in the three strands of professional learning. Additionally, over 200 faculty members in COE and other GSU departments participated through meetings, receipt of emails, completion of surveys, etc. The outcomes for this goal can be measured primarily anecdotally for the present, as the students had no direct responsibility for measurable student data. COE faculty report through survey that their graduates are better prepared to teach at-risk youth. The Director for Field Experiences and the SCS principals report that student teachers request placement in Screven County, due to their seamless approach with professional development and to the partnership with GSU. In the future, as we track these graduates into teaching positions, we will be able to better measure their impact on student achievement.

2. Problem

The majority of schools with whom the College of Education collaborates are rural schools dealing with the issue of equitable educational opportunities. Specifically, many of these schools are faced with significant gaps in the academic performance between minority students when compared to non-minority peers, and between low SES students when compared with their more advantaged peers. Therefore, the College of Education must address the preparation of pre-service teachers (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) so they are able to teach all children while understanding how the system is failing some youth. Exit interviews and surveys completed by student teachers during 2000-2002 revealed that our graduates felt least prepared to work with students from diverse backgrounds. As the US population is growing increasingly diverse-- with schools teaching greater numbers of students from minority groups, poverty, and

with limited English proficiency-- teacher preparation programs must respond by ensuring its graduates are better equipped to teach all students. Additionally, administrators, counselors, and other school support personnel must gain in the skills necessary to promote and support high achievement from this increasingly diverse student body. Screven County Schools was an appropriate setting for tackling these issues as one of the state's poorest areas. In the years immediately preceding the FIPSE funding period, the performance of the county's African American students lagged behind their white peers, with an achievement gap typically hovering around the 20-30% mark. Additionally, the district's high proportion of students eligible for the federal Free and Reduced lunch program-- 75.3% of all students in 2000-- placed them at a distinct disadvantage. Two of the three schools submitted restructuring plans to the State Department of Education because of failure to reach AYP. As a setting for high numbers of pre-service teachers as well as graduate interns completing field experiences, combined with the significant at-risk factors, made Screven County an excellent setting to explore educational equity issues.

The PDD is an extension of the well-researched professional development school model supported and encouraged by recognized reform initiatives— the Holmes Partnership (1986), the National Network for Education Renewal (Goodlad 1984; 2000), the National Education Association Teacher Education Initiative (2000), and many others. In this PDD, all educational programs sought effective approaches to the two identified problems: 1) academic performance between minority students, non-minority peers/low SES students when compared with their more advantaged peers and 2) the preparation of pre-service teachers to enable them to teach all children. The PDD was a systemwide expansion of the professional development school model where each school must have a primary focus. Additionally, the project proposal intended to 3)

address the shortage of minority teachers and 4) reduce the perception among teacher educators that high achieving schools provide the best sites for training teacher candidates.

It was with these four goals-- two major and two minor -- that the FIPSE project began. As the project continued through the present, these goals remained in focus, but shifted in some cases, and other cases gained in complexity. In goal one (reducing the achievement gap between groups of students), the overall goal remained constant, because the population of Screven County remained the same. As time went on during the project, though, it became clear that the strands of PD that were identified -- poverty, culturally responsive teaching, and differentiated instruction-- were right on target to have the highest potential to reduce the achievement gap. These strands, based as they are in the belief systems of teachers and their understandings of students, really targeted the inner doubt and lack of conviction that some Screven County teachers had, about the abilities of all students to learn at high levels. As teachers gained in skills and understanding, they began to "buy into" the belief systems behind the FIPSE goals. Because of this connection to the cultural understandings and beliefs of teachers-- so ingrained in personality and practice-- the changes in teacher practice were sometimes slow in coming and are always more difficult to quantify. However, when these reluctant teachers practiced the differentiation strategies they had learned through the FIPSE training, and saw success with their own at-risk students, belief systems began to change. We observed a subtle, but definite, cultural shift throughout the system in the teachers' commitment that all students CAN learn; that a student's background is not an impossible obstacle; and that it is the teacher's responsibility to tailor instruction to the individual needs of students. The problem then deepened from a conviction that the achievement gaps must be reduced, to focus on "How?" and "How do we integrate what we have learned through FIPSE with what the state of Georgia is requiring with

the new Georgia Performance Standards?" Teachers demanded more strategies and approaches, and in turn this resulted in two things. First, during the last year of the funding period, the system-wide FIPSE goals diverged into problem identification and solutions that were school-specific and targeted to the needs of each school. There remained some similarities, but each school designed additional training and focus topics germane to their own teaching and learning goals. We believe this is a positive step which shows the readiness of faculty members to take the lead and refine their own problems independently of the other schools. Second, all schools embraced and institutionalized the Professional Learning Communities which were established through FIPSE, and these continue as a part of the schools' learning culture, as expert teachers inform the practices of each other.

Our second goal-- increasing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of future teachers to enable them to teach all children-- remained constant, with small adjustments. Additionally, as training strands were developed and delivered in Screven County, a version of the same strand was delivered to GSU COE students during their curriculum or methods blocks. By the spring of 2006, when all three strands had been redelivered, we had the experience and materials to be very flexible in our approach with our COE workshops. We combined and recombined training topics into long and short versions of training, and offered tailored workshops specific to each program and time period. For example, during the last two semesters, we delivered training in two 2-hour evening workshops to Secondary students, utilizing grade-specific materials and Screven High School teachers as guest instructors. For SpEd students, we delivered the material in one 4-hour block during their instructional block. SpEd teachers from Screven County were guest instructors, and we refined the material to focus on SpEd topics. Similar approaches were designed for the Middle Grades and Early Childhood students. By meeting with Program

Coordinators before each semester, we were able to design specific training which was desired by the COE faculty, rather than a "one-size-fits-all" approach.

Our mini-goals 3) addressing the shortage of minority teachers and 4) addressing the perception of what constitutes the best teacher training sites, remained somewhat in the background. Goal three is simply difficult to address, and both can be measured primarily anecdotally. During the annual Principal and Instructional Coach interviews conducted by our independent evaluator, which are included in the appendix, we can get a partial picture of our progress toward meeting these goals. To summarize, for goal 3), principals and coaches indicate that it is difficult to recruit teachers for Screven County, not because of the perceived quality of the schools, but primarily because it is a rural county which has a hard time attracting young teachers who are not from the area. Most Screven County teachers are "home-grown," and there is very little attrition. It is inappropriate to offer statistics of the number of minority teachers which entered and left the GSU COE during the FIPSE project, because our project objectives did not directly address their recruitment, merely their training once they got here.

For goal 4) we do have significant positive anecdotal evidence of what we have learned about the problem. As initially defined, we were primarily interested in changing the COE faculty members' perceptions of what constitutes high-quality teacher placements. However, one unintended result of targeting this problem was what we learned when our graduates, having been trained in the three strands during their undergraduate preparation, and then placed in Screven County schools, were then employed by Screven County. From even before their teaching careers started, these new teachers benefited from having a common vocabulary, approaches, and even consistency in personnel. Screven county instructional coaches also serve as clinical associates and new teacher induction personnel in the school, so new teachers hired by

the county often had been working with these coaches for at least a year already. This happened fairly often, because of the large numbers of students placed in Screven County. Through word of mouth and reports of experiences, Screven County became a popular placement partner, although its number of at-risk students remained high. Being able to observe this synergy of professional development gave us a working model of the best possible benefits of our partnership.

3. Background and Origins

Between 1999 and 2004, in an attempt to address the problems outlined in section 2, the COE formed informal, and then formalized, partnerships with Screven County Schools. During the planning and limited implementation stages that occurred from 1999 to the end of the 2003-2004 school year, both partners developed the capacity to begin the large-scale FIPSE project. Our partnership with Screven County is unique in that all three of its schools have been a PDS since 1999. During the prefunding period, the design of the partnership was finalized to include three components: Governance, Instructional Coaching, and Professional Learning. When FIPSE funding was approved, it was a natural next step to expand the partnership to include an alternative school and a minimum-security juvenile facility (Savannah River Challenge Program) into a comprehensive professional development district (PDD) which shared the common goal of closing the P-16 achievement gap. Anyone who works in or is closely connected to education is abundantly aware of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and that act's effects. While the intent of NCLB is good in the high standards for all children, the challenge in implementing NCLB at the school and system level is in the details. *How* do we ensure that all children are on grade level? In addition to improved test scores, how can we measure better teaching? The PDD model provides a comprehensive examination of learning and how to close the gaps in learning, but it

does more than develop a systematic overall plan. There is the realization that the plan must be feasible at the school and classroom levels. How do you make a plan a reality in the day-to-day operation with individual diverse schools? How do you impact the ethos of the school? How do you change the mindset of how schools and systems operate so these institutions become long-term change agents? Conversations in schools must be framed around what the students need instructionally so there is continuous ongoing learning by these students. Conversations in colleges of education need to focus on how to provide future teachers with the dispositions to meet the needs of diverse learners. Part of the work with the PPD was to examine teacher education programs. The questions being examined included: 1) How may future educators be better prepared to meet the needs of all learners? and 2) How are future educators prepared to understand the culture of schools in order to become better leaders within the field? It was in the context of these issues and concerns that the FIPSE project was developed and within which it operated. Screven County Schools was ready for answers, and the College of Education, faced with the obligation to serve the community of students which would be in the classrooms of the future teachers we prepare, required a teaching and learning "laboratory" in which all partners sought answers and the potential benefits are balanced. In sections 4 and 5 will be a more complete description of our successes and failures; specifics about targeted groups of learners; circumstances in place at partner institutions; the organizational policies that had to change for project; the forms of organizational or outside support we had at outset; and how this changed during time of grant.

4. Project Description.

Pre-Funding Period Activities:

In the Fall of 2001, Superintendent Whit Myers of a local school district, Screven County, approached College of Education Dean Cindi Chance about partnering with the school district as a whole to target identified needs, particularly to reduce the large gap in student achievement among groups of students. Screven County Schools at that time was a partner school of the COE, primarily in placements of COE students. Individual partnering situations -- PRISM mini-grants, guest lecturers, etc. -- were in place, but nothing to the scale of the PDD. As a small local system with a strong partnership relationship already in place, SCS offered an ideal situation for the PDD, and a meeting of COE program coordinators and SCS leadership team representatives (Principals and Central Office personnel) met to initially discuss formalizing the partnership. Larger-scale planning began in earnest in February of 2002, when the original version of the FIPSE Governance Council convened. This expanded the planning group to GSU representatives beyond the COE, representatives from SRCP, and Ogeechee Technical College. That meeting focused on the PDD model; successful collaborations currently in place; advantages to such a model; and keys to success. That group identified barriers to the proposed work, which included: energy, time, money, distance, resistance to or fear of change, motivation, turf issues, regulations, ensuring value of time and work at the University, the need to see tangible results, and the fact that the PDD would be the first of its kind in the U.S. One barrier which existed at SCS was the perception of teachers that their plates were already very full of other initiatives-- PRISM, GLISI, SACS, other training programs. This problem was generally solved when the SCS Improvement Team devised a matrix, wherein all system initiatives were categorized and depicted in their relation to one system goal-- the improvement of teaching and learning. It may be honestly said that many of the barriers existed primarily at the University level. Although partnerships were growing, the expectations by NCATE did not

yet focus on partnerships, and GSU's memberships in NNER and Holmes were new. The assumptions of all, however, were that it would take time and effort to gain "buy-in" from proposed partners. Enablers for the work were also identified, which included: a large fund of shared knowledge; strong existing partnerships; buy-in by GSU and SCS leaders; expertise; proximity; the recognition of needs; leadership opportunities for teachers; and the size and cohesiveness of SCS. External enablers included the Georgia Board of Regents, the GSU Strategic Plan, NNER, Holmes, and NCATE. Each organization had implicit or explicit standards regarding partnerships. These regulations were the "stick" for University Faculty, and the ability to gain service hours was the "carrot."

The Spring and Fall of 2002 were primarily involved with seeking funding and gaining support from GSU faculty. The group applied for Pew Educational Trust and FIPSE funding, but neither proposal was funded. However, the Dean presented the PDD at the NNER fall conference in 2002, and planning took place that fall for the PDD kick-off in January. Months of planning went into the size, agenda, format, publication, and tone of the kick-off. Invited dignitaries included Senators and the new Governor of Georgia. The ceremony was held in January of 2003 in the gym of SCES, and was covered by media. The Governance Council applied for FIPSE funding again in 2003, and funding was received that fall for the project to begin in January of 2004. During this prefunding period, the primary focus of the effort was to establish the partnership and to define each partner's roles in the PDD. Because this project was a formalization and expansion of previous partnerships, the basic premises and assumptions were already in place. However, it took a good deal of planning and encouragement, and strong leadership at the COE and SCS, to hold others accountable for participating at each level.

Early-Funding Period Activities: From January to October of 2004, the work of the FIPSE PDD was primarily involved in planning and designing all aspects of the project activities, and in refining the responsibilities of each partner. The Project Director who had supervised the funding proposal and initial PDD work left GSU, and his replacement, Pat Parsons, was hired. She coordinated the drafting of an evaluation plan, a plan to deliver the three strands of professional development, and plans to disseminate information about the FIPSE PDD. Additionally, SCS had hired an instructional coach at each school, and Pat coordinated their training, as well as the training of PLC's at each site. One major obstacle during this period was the newness of the project and the relationships. Because the PDD had no exact model, it took extra planning and discussion time to ensure that all partners were involved and represented, and that everyone's feedback was considered. Additionally, there was some resistance to change among SCS teachers and GSU faculty, along with a general lack of understanding about the benefits and potential for the PDD, so there was much discussion in all areas to increase the buy-in at the classroom level. All stakeholders acknowledged that if teachers did not implement the new instructional practices, the training would be wasted. Teachers felt pulled between needing to be in the classroom and the time necessary to pull them out of the classroom for professional development. This tension drove the creation of the "expert redelivery" model, where only 1/3 of the faculty attended each training topic session, then redelivered it to peers in PLC's during structured planning time. An additional obstacle was the limited opportunities for GSU and P-12 personnel to conveniently meet, due to differing schedules and calendar. This was resolved by compromise and by taking advantage of email communication and existing faculty and leadership team meetings already on the calendar, to limit additional meeting time.

Mid-Funding Period Activities: From November of 2005 through May of 2006, most the FIPSE Project's stated activities were implemented. During the planning stage, the three-tiered governance structure was established, consisting of the broad-focus Governance Council, which would meet yearly, the representative Management Team, to meet every other month, and the monthly meeting with Instructional Coaches and the PRISM coordinator. The Management Team had decided to vary the approach of the three professional development strands, to maximize the budget and introduce several perspectives, with one nationally-recognized expert trainer, one regional trainer, and one local / GSU trainer. The professional development strands were placed in order of probable receptiveness to the staff of SCS. The first strand, Understanding Poverty, was delivered to the first expert group in the fall of 2004, by GSU COE faculty member Missy Bennett, a professor in the Middle Grades Education program with certification in the Ruby Payne training, and years of experience in delivering the material. One obstacle she knew she would overcome was that the SCS faculty did not have a real connection with their students in poverty, so the solution was to take all faculty members on bus tours through Screven County during the training. This gave the teachers perspective and an appropriate context for the training. Dr. Bennett also used Georgia and Screven County statistics whenever possible, which further helped the teachers to connect to the learning. As part of the evaluation plan, each training module began with a pre-practice survey, and ended with a post-practice survey once the material was redelivered to all faculty members and they had had a chance to apply knowledge in their classrooms. This helped measure the changes in personal perceptions. We can tell by analyzing the results of these surveys that the training was effective. In the Spring, a nationally-recognized expert in Differentiated Instruction (a member of ASCD) trained the next expert group to use strategies to differentiate learning for ability, interest,

background, and learning styles. As with the Poverty training, participants completed pre- and post-practice surveys, and redelivery was designed by instructional coaches and expert groups to align with the training already in place in the school, within the PLC's. Principals at each site were responsible for holding teachers accountable for applying the strategies in the classroom. One hurdle which arose during this training was an outcry against having a third of each school's teachers out of the building on the same day. The solution was very creative; a "service learning" project was developed, wherein student teachers currently placed at the schools covered the classes as substitutes, bypassing the requirement that a supervising teacher be in the classroom at that time. Also during the spring of 2005, the action plan to address goal 2-- the skills and dispositions of COE undergraduate teacher education candidates-- was implemented in two ways. First, Dr. Bennett delivered the Poverty material to undergraduates in each COE preparation program, and second, the Project Director met with program coordinators to plan for the fall. They developed a plan to integrate the two professional development strands which had already been delivered, into the curriculum of all undergraduate programs. Teachers from Screven County who had been in the "expert groups" for each strand assisted in these sessions, demonstrating practices and strategies they were using in their classrooms. This benefited the COE students and the SCS teachers, who were empowered by the opportunity to show leadership and expertise.

In the Fall of 2005, Kelly Tharp replaced Pat Parsons as Project Director. This change had the potential to slow down the progress of the project during the hiring and catch-up period, but this was eliminated by Pat staying within the COE as Director of Field Experiences and Partnerships, providing a link between FIPSE and other partnerships and remaining as a source of support during the transition time.

The final strand of professional development-- Culturally Relevant Teaching, was planned that fall and implemented in the spring, along with undergraduate workshops. The regional experts were a group from University of Georgia with expertise in the subject. This close resource later resulted in a lasting relationship with one presenter, Malcolm Butler, who returned in the fall to provide follow-up training for SCS on a related topic.

Toward the end of the spring semester, the fall COE workshops were planned, but with two major changes. First, some of the topics embedded in the three strands were either redundant or complementary, so we decided to synthesize the training from three separate topics into one session with two subtopics: I. Differentiating: Foundations. Understanding Differences in Students (this incorporated the Poverty and Culturally Relevant foundational information) and II. Differentiating: Strategies. Changing your Practices to Meet the Needs of Students (this incorporated the application part of the Poverty and CR training, plus the bulk of the DI training). Second, instead of holding workshops in the evenings, which some students had to miss because of jobs, etc., we integrated the workshops into the class time for each program, and targeted the content specifically to the program. Teachers from each SCS school would again be guest instructors for the workshops.

Late-Funding Period Activities: We applied for a no-cost extension through the school year '06-'07 to allow us to complete activities within the school's calendar and to gather one more complete year of student achievement data, surveys, and SOM data, to better analyze our progress. The Management Team continued to meet to identify remaining needs for professional development within the schools. Some schools chose to refine the FIPSE training that had already been delivered. Malcolm Butler returned and spent a day in each school consulting with teachers on "Doing School and Motivating Students." Project Director Kelly Tharp met with all

PLC's at the high school and elementary school to present in depth information on Ruby Payne's Learning Structures. The coaches and Tharp co-presented a long orientation session for new SCS teachers during preplanning week, combining all topics.

One major change in personnel occurred during this year. When the half-time FIPSE secretary and the half-time FIPSE graduate assistant moved on to other positions during the summer of 2006, the Project Director decided not to fill these positions. The three major strands had been delivered, so the burden of budget paperwork, copying, and secretarial work was much less. Additionally, she felt that the schools would benefit more from the funds released by these positions. After input from the Management Team and the coaches, the funds were used to develop reference libraries for each school and for the COE, which remain as permanent resources for educators at each site.

In the spring, FIPSE training for COE students and SCS faculty was concluded. The Project Director and independent evaluator gathered data from surveys, interviews, SOM's, and standardized tests, and spent the summer analyzing the data and preparing the summative evaluation report.

Over the course of the FIPSE funding period, about 375 undergraduates participated in workshops, and about 200 SCS faculty were trained. Nearly 325 student teachers and other COE students were placed in SCS and received the benefit of working with the PLC's. Nearly 200 GSU faculty members participated through attending professional development training, serving on the management team, filling out surveys, and receiving information through email and mail. It is hard to evaluate the impact that the project has had on other campuses or organizations. The FIPSE project was shared locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, according to our

dissemination plan, and other organizations have doubtless adopted components of our plan for their own uses, although we have not tracked this.

5. Evaluation / Project Results.

Our independent evaluator, the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis, Tennessee, analyzed and synthesize the data we collected into annual and summative reports. The annual reports have been appended to the annual evaluation which has been sent to FIPSE, and the summative project report is appended to this report. It contains student data graphically displayed and summarized; along with the results of faculty, principal, and coach surveys, and discussion of trends and progress toward goals. Clearly, there were positive results in student achievement during the FIPSE project period, including a narrowing of the achievement gap, particularly in the Georgia High School Graduation Test, but in other subjects and grade levels across the board. Of course, having no control group with which to compare the data, it is impossible to tell what these scores would have been without FIPSE. There was a positive change in teachers' perceptions of students' abilities to learn, and in their own competencies to teach at-risk students. College faculty became more aware of and involved in partnerships with P-12 schools. PLC's became a part of the culture of all the Screven County schools, and teacher leadership grew.

Some areas of evaluation do not appear in the independent evaluator's report, and they are worth mentioning. The pre- and post- training surveys we developed for each strand of professional development clearly reflected a strong learning curve of our participants. We also administered "tickets to leave" at the end of the COE undergraduate workshop. Students indicated what they had learned that was most valuable to them in future classroom settings. We compiled the responses and returned them to each faculty member, to give opportunities for following up. The

Graduation Rate at Screven County High School rose drastically in the last few years, which may speak to the positive cumulative effect of FIPSE strategies, as evidenced by this chart:

SCREVEN COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATE

	2004	2005	2006	2007
All Students	58	58.3	56.9	71
Black	50.6	47.8	43.8	62.7
White	71	73.8	74.1	79.8
Students with Disabilities	18.9	18.9	35.3	26.8
Economically Disadvantaged	55.5	61.4	54	74.7

Anecdotally, most faculty, staff, and others involved with FIPSE have reported a positive change in the SCS and COE environment related to heightened professionalism, stronger focus on student achievement, and strengthened partnerships between P-12 and the COE.

Some of the activities related to FIPSE goals will continue, and their costs will be absorbed by other entities. There are plans to continue the COE workshops for undergraduate teacher education candidates, using the FIPSE training materials and SCS teachers as guest instructors. Mileage and substitute pay will be covered by COE funds. The SCS Board of Education will continue to support the salary costs of the Instructional Coaches at each school, so their activities will continue beyond the FIPSE period. There is also a great deal of continuity of FIPSE activities inherent in the new COE Induction Program, which is developing components to support school systems in their efforts to support and retain high-quality new educators. FIPSE Project Director Kelly Tharp will coordinate this program, and we will utilize FIPSE materials and strategies for Induction training modules and other components. The costs for this program are being borne by PRISM and faculty buy-out funds. Former FIPSE Director Patricia

Parsons has restarted the activities of the COE Partnership Council, a tripartite group of COE, community, and P-12 representatives to explore and implement partnership activities. Grants are being sought to support these activities. We will continue to disseminate FIPSE activities through these venues, and through the website and communications of the COE, and those of SCS. Although we will not contract with an independent evaluator, we plan to design an evaluation plan to follow our graduates long-term, to measure whether undergraduate preparation programs adequately prepare them to work with at-risk students. SCS plans to evaluate teachers based on many of the indicators in the SOM instrument, and whether they are applying strategies for differentiation in their classrooms.

6. Summary, Conclusions, and Lessons Learned.

We have gained a number of insights as a result of the FIPSE project, and there are clear aspects of the project which we can identify as being most critical to its success, which could be replicated in other systems:

- 1) **Clear articulation and goal alignment** between the Superintendent and Principals, and among feeder school patterns. Because SCS has only three schools, it was easy for them to align system goals and school goals, and it is easy for the Superintendent to be in each school every day. In larger systems, it may be necessary to develop general district-wide professional development goals, then allow Principals at feeder school clusters and grade level clusters (elementary, middle, and high) to plan together for how to meet the system's goals through objectives which are specifically targeted toward those schools' needs.
- 2) **Nominal responsibility** for professional development at each school. SCS utilized the instructional coach model, in which a full-time released teacher facilitated Professional Learning Communities, helped plan for other professional development activities, met with

teachers and observed in classrooms as an objective "friend," worked with testing, helped analyze data, and sorted through GPS training to pull out important material. In other systems, this person could be the Assistant Principal or a designated "lead teacher" with released time for observations and planning, or schools could possibly share an Instructional Coach between a few schools. This position should not be the Counselor, because of the other duties assigned and required. There may be creative ways to release personnel to act as a coach, which wouldn't require a lot of output in personnel costs.

- 3) **Sharing resources.** Schools in Screven County shared FIPSE and other money and resources to maximize dollars. This could be easily done within a larger system, if someone will coordinate and facilitate it.
- 4) **Limited number of realistic goals, measurable objectives, within a reasonable time frame.** The FIPSE Grant had two basic goals-- reduce achievement goals among student groups; and increase skills of undergraduate teacher education candidates, within a three-year time period. There were three strands of professional development, and all were interrelated. As time passed, pieces of the bigger picture were brought back out for retraining, combining in different ways, etc., but no new major goals were added. We used benchmarks for measuring success, plus the SOM evaluation and surveys. This could easily be accomplished by other systems. No Child Left Behind already sets benchmarks for systems; they could select maybe one other overarching goal-- improved parent involvement, reduction of discipline issues, increase of "exceeds expectations" scores, etc. Each cluster and individual school could select one or two objectives related to the overarching goals, and give themselves several years to accomplish them.

- 5) **Including all personnel in Accountable Professional Learning Communities** as the vehicle for delivering training and developing goals. This has been critical to the enculturation and cementing of FIPSE goals within the schools. Establishing these takes an initial input, and then a good deal of time to maintain, for training and planning, along with accountability-- someone actually going to meetings periodically to keep them focused on instruction, and someone demanding and reviewing minutes of meetings, troubleshooting, helping them find resources, purchasing books or finding articles for study, nudging, encouraging, communicating with each other, etc. It also takes commitment and creativity on the part of Principals to schedule common planning time, through the electives schedule, or a rotation of released time, etc. All of the effort has been worth it for FIPSE, and many PLC's in SCS are to the point where they design their own topics for the year, and basically run themselves.
- 6) **Governance Structure.** Critical to the success of FIPSE was a multi-level governance structure which combined the flexibility the Project Director and coaches needed, with the support and accountability of a representative Management Team and Governance Board. This structure would be easy to replicate anywhere, and the meeting time burden for those on the Management Team and Governance Board were not too heavy. The primary implementation of the grant activities was the responsibility of the coaches and the Project Director.
- 7) **Partnership With GSU.** The expectation with FIPSE was that the schools would collaborate with the College of Education. COE members were on the Governance Board and Management Teams of the project, which met regularly to review and plan project activities. Lots of "free" help flowed out to the schools through this channel. Additionally,

undergraduate teacher candidates also participated in professional development, and were often placed in pre-professional block and as student teachers in SCS, where they continued their training with the coaches (who were also clinical associates at each site). This helped "front load" future employees of SCS (and other systems) in the types of professional development most needed by the system. Finally, teachers from SCS helped deliver COE workshops, which led to a high expertise and empowerment of these teachers-- they "grew their own" professional development leaders at each school, cutting down on the need to hire expensive outside consultants, and increasing the tendency to want to share with their faculty, because they felt they each have valuable information to impart. In systems which do not have a university in close proximity, the growing ability to communicate and meet electronically may assist in this effort. Universities may partner with remote systems. The growing emphasis by state Boards of Regents and NCATE, as well as other university organizations, on partnerships, as well as their emphasis in PRISM, will no doubt make initiating these connections easier.

The project faced some obstacles and hurdles. Many of these were described some detail in the Section 4 Project Description. However, one obstacle was (and remains) the greatest challenge. The involvement of COE and other GSU faculty in the FIPSE project was the biggest challenge during the project. Most faculty members have a full class load and, unless there are buy-out funds or stipends, they may not be able to participate in these types of projects. Surveys of COE staff showed a clear improvement in awareness and support for FIPSE initiatives, which is a start, and there were certainly a number of faculty members who served on our Management Team and Governance Board, who attended some training sessions, or who invited us into their classrooms to share FIPSE information with COE

students each semester. All faculty members were kept aware through email and publications on the campus. However, FIPSE involvement of GSU faculty beyond the COE was spotty.

Appendices:

The following documents appear as an appendix:

2007 Evaluation by CREP (independent evaluator)

(Sample) Compiled "Ticket to Leave" Responses from Undergraduate Workshops

Department of Teaching and Learning
Faculty Roles and Rewards Matrix/Rubric
ANNUAL REVIEW

Faculty: _____
Academic Year: _____

Department Chair: _____
Date: _____

	Unsatisfactory 1	Satisfactory 2	Very Good 3	Excellent 4	Score
Teaching (40-80% max) _____%	Evidence does not support minimal standards of effective teaching as identified in faculty goal statement	Achieved faculty annual goal statement that reflects basic commitment of time & effort related to effective teaching	Achieved faculty annual goal statement that reflects considerable commitment of time & effort related to effective teaching	Achieved faculty goal annual statement that reflects substantial commitment of time & effort related to effective teaching	
Scholarship (10-40% max) _____%	Evidence does not support minimal involvement in scholarly work	Achieved faculty annual goal statement that reflects basic involvement in scholarly work	Achieved faculty annual goal statement that reflects considerable involvement in scholarly work	Achieved faculty goal annual statement that reflects substantial involvement in a variety of scholarly work	
Service (10-40% max) _____%	Evidence does not support minimal involvement in service activities	Achieved faculty annual goal statement that reflects basic involvement in service activities	Achieved faculty annual goal statement that reflects considerable involvement in service activities	Achieved faculty goal annual statement that reflects substantial involvement in a variety of service activities	

Evaluation Calculations:

Teaching: _____% x _____ (Chair's Rating) = _____

Scholarship: _____% x _____ (Chair's Rating) = _____

Service: _____% x _____ (Chair's Rating) = + _____

Overall Rating: = _____

*****DEPARTMENT CHAIR has the discretion to weight substantial contributions beyond typical categorical scores!**

Evidentiary Teaching Categories

In the Department of Teaching and Learning, evidence of effective teaching includes but is not fully defined by the following categories:

• Course syllabi including:

- Appropriate content, research, resources, and “best practices”
- Appropriate standards
- Objectives consistent with University, College, department, and program objectives
- Teaching and learning activities that support the mission and goals of the College of Education
- A range of presentation methods appropriate to diverse learners
- A range of evaluation methods that correlate with course objectives and assess acquisition of knowledge and/or skills
- A statement of grading standards and procedures, as well as the time-frames in which assignments are due
- A statement of attendance policy; an ADA statement
- Evidence of incorporation of feedback from appropriate sources

• Supervision of Students in the field and/or community-based teaching

• Work in Schools

• Peer evaluations (including those from school site personnel for field supervision as appropriate)

• Receiving a university, college, or professional association teaching award

• Student evaluation of instruction

• University student evaluation ratings

• Self-reflection on student evaluation ratings and comment

• Departmental or program surveys of students

• Signed letters from students

• New or revised course outlines or program materials

• Materials and/or letters indicating collaboration with P-12 educators regarding GSU teacher education programs and/or school reform initiatives

• Evidence indicating professional development in teaching

• Technological contributions to course materials

• Membership on dissertation and Ed.S. defense committees

• Other

Evidentiary Scholarship Categories

In the Department of Teaching and Learning, evidence of possible appropriate scholarly activities in one’s field of specialization includes but is not fully defined by the following categories:

• Publications

- Single and co-authorship of: books, book chapters, textbooks, refereed journal articles (both print and online, articles in non-refereed journals, monographs, articles and/or papers in refereed proceedings or articles and/or papers for international, national, state &/or regional distribution on electronic media
- Editor or co-editor of a book
- Serving as editor or editorial board member of a regional, state, national, or international journal
- Serving as a reviewer for a regional, state, national, or international journal

• Grants

- External funded grants
- Internal funded grants

• Presentations

- International, national, state, local
- Invited/Keynote

• Action Research in Schools

• Serving as an active panel member for a regional, state, national or international conference presentation

• Delivering an invited keynote address at a state, national, or international conference

• Software or equivalent products (software package, videotape, or other commercial materials)

• Dissemination of research projects

• Evidence of scholarship that includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge

• Development and publication of scholarly material designed for professional audiences

• Publication of a significant original curriculum project

Evidentiary Scholarship Categories (continued)

- Professional scholarship honors and awards
- Publishing a research report through a professional organization or association
- Publishing a book review in a regional, state, national, or international journal
- Additional professional training including degrees earned and postdoctoral work
- Acquiring or renewing state or national professional licensure or certification
- Contributing written material for a published professional newsletter
- Other

Evidentiary Service Categories

In the Department of Teaching and Learning, evidence of service contributions includes but is not fully defined by the following categories:

- Service to the department, college or university
 - Chairing or serving on a Department Committee
 - Chairing or serving on a College of Education Committee
 - Chairing/Co-chairing university level committee for systemic change
 - Chairing/Co-Chairing university/College-wide national accreditation committees
 - Chairing/co-chairing the development of new degree programs
 - Conference Chair for International conference
 - Chairing or serving on a Regents or University committee
 - Chairing or serving on accreditation committees
 - Service on NCATE/PSC or other accreditation committees/teams
 - Preparing NCATE or other accreditation documents
 - Serving as faculty advisor for a GSU student organization
 - Assisting programs in other departments or colleges
 - Participating in student recruitment activities
 - Academic Advisement
 - Program sponsored mentoring of students
 - Program sponsored mentoring of new faculty
 - Program and/or course design
 - Special assignments
 - Support of university related programs (e.g., homecoming, career day, scholar's day, family day)
- Service to the profession
 - Leadership in local/state/national/international professional organizations (e.g., elected officer, committee chair or committee member)
 - Coordinating a local workshop or conference
 - Conducting workshops for local schools and agencies
 - Reviewing curriculums for publishing companies
 - Reviewing manuscripts for state and national referred journals (non-blind review)
 - Reviewing manuscripts for local/state/national/international conferences (non-blind review)
 - Judging education related contests
- Service to the community
 - Leadership in local or state community organizations or agencies (e.g., Board member, committee chair or committee member)
 - Service through community organizations
 - Speaking to local school and agency groups
 - Serving as a resource to state and local educational agencies and community organizations/agencies (e.g. providing consulting services)
 - Judging education related contests
 - Coordinating a local workshop or conference
 - Conducting workshops for local agencies
- Other

**Teaching & Learning Program's Key Assessment
Alignment with
BOR's Common Points of Assessment**

Program Level	Entry into TEP	Entry into clinical practice	Program Completion (met all program requirements & taken GACE II)	Induction to practice (end of second year of teaching)
Initial (BSEd)	GACE I GPA PPB Field Dispositions Rubric	Dispositions Rubric – KA6 Planning –KA3 GPA	Dispositions Rubric – KA6 Instruction – KA4 Effects on Student Learning – KA5 Content- KA2 GPA	Graduate Survey Employer Survey
Initial (M.A.T.)	GACE I GACE II GPA Dispositions Rubric	Dispositions Rubric – KA6 Planning –KA3 GPA	Dispositions Rubric – KA6 Instruction – KA4 Effects on Student Learning – KA5 Content- KA2 GPA	Graduate Survey Employer Survey
Advanced	GPA T4	Not in Advanced Programs	GPA KA1-6	Graduate Survey Employer Survey