

Board of Regent's Principles and Action for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools

Georgia Southern University
Third Annual Progress Report
May 2001

Section I - Inputs

I. H. Admission Requirements - Takes Effect Fall 2001

Admission requirements to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) at Georgia Southern University were raised in Fall 1998 and again in Fall 1999. In order to be *admitted* into the Teacher Education Program, a student must have:

1. A cumulative GPA of 2.50 or better on all course work (both GSO course work and any transfer hours which have been accepted by GSO);
2. Completed Area A and Area F course work (including the Pre-Professional Block) with a "C" or better and an adjusted GPA of 2.75 or better in both areas combined;
3. Successfully completed the Regents Testing Program;
4. Successfully completed the Praxis I examination;
5. Earned a minimum of 50 semester hours in Core Curriculum courses, including Pre- Professional Block courses (COED 2110, EDUF 2120, EDUF 2121, SPED 2120, and ITEC 2120);
6. Successfully completed the TEP admissions folio review.

In addition, all of the following requirements must be met for *retention* in the TEP:

1. Students must maintain a cumulative GPA of 2.50 or better on all course work.
2. Students must maintain an adjusted GPA of 2.75 or better on all professional education and all teaching field course work.
3. Students must successfully complete all field experiences.
4. Students must not have been found in violation of the GSO Student Conduct Code. Reviews will be made on a case-by-case basis based on the seriousness of the violation and with regard to consistency.
5. Students must not have violated the Georgia Professional Practices Commission's Code of Ethics for Professional Educators. Students are provided a copy upon admission and must sign a statement agreeing to abide by this Code of Ethics upon admission into TEP.
6. Students must be making satisfactory progress toward meeting program objectives. Programs will be responsible for monitoring student progress and providing guidance to students who may be having difficulty meeting retention requirements. The Ambassadors for Diversity in Education (ADE) program will also assist in retention efforts.

(2000-01 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog, p. 101;
see <http://www2.gasou.edu/coe/evidence/categoryII.htm>)

A TEP admissions policy is in place to address the special circumstances presented by transfer, non-degree initial certification and Alternative M.Ed. students. The policy assures that all candidates meet all TEP admission requirements although assessed in different ways.

(See <http://www2.gasou.edu/teac/TEPadmTr.htm>)

Comparisons of students who were admitted into the Teacher Education Program with

the University's average SAT scores show that education majors continue to exceed the University's raised averages.

Average SAT

	Fall 1999	Fall 2000
Georgia Southern University	987	1008
TEP Admissions	996	1010

Section II A - Performance - Institutions

II. A.(1). In Collaboration with the Schools, Institutions Provide Support, Assistance, and Professional Development to all Graduates During Their First Two Years of Teaching

Georgia Southern University is collaborating with its Partner Schools to support and provide assistance and professional development to its graduates and all other beginning teachers who are employed by the schools during their first two years of teaching. During summer 2001, a group of approximately 50 P-12 teachers and administrators from 8 Partner Schools, First District RESA consultants, and University faculty (College of Education and arts and sciences faculty) will participate in a workshop that will result in the development of a collaborative model that can be shared and replicated. The induction program will be initiated at all interested Partner Schools beginning Fall 2001.

This collaboration will build upon existing induction and mentoring activities involving University faculty (Partner School field associates) which are already underway in some of the Partner Schools. For example, a secondary education faculty member worked with a cohort of beginning teachers at Southeast Bulloch High School, a Partner School, to strengthen their instructional strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners. One of the school's faculty Field Associates is now serving as a mentor to the beginning teachers in that school. An early childhood education faculty Field Associate is working with the beginning teachers at our newest Partner School, Claxton Elementary School, providing targeted consultation and inservice professional development. Another University Field Associate has been conducting a series of workshops on teaching children of poverty, based on Ruby Payne's A Framework for Understanding Poverty (1998) at several of the Partner Schools.

Extending this work in a systematic way, a structured and collaborative induction program will be implemented in the interested Partner Schools (expected to be at least 8 of the schools) beginning Fall 2001. The model will include an assessment system that will provide information on the success and areas of difficulty that the beginning teachers experience as well as feedback to guide refinements to the program.

(See <http://www2.gasou.edu/coe/evidence/Induction.htm>)

II. A. (3). Institutions Increase the Number, Raise the Caliber, and Expand the Diversity of Teacher Candidates and Balance Teacher Supply and Demand

A comprehensive Diversity/Recruitment and Retention Plan was developed by the Advisory Committee for Ambassadors for Diversity in Education during the 2000-01 academic year (See <http://www2.gasou.edu/coe/evidence/DiversityPlan.htm>). This plan addresses various target populations for recruitment and identified strategies to increase diversity of student and faculty populations. The plan also outlines ways to support candidate success and retention in the teacher preparation programs. Subsequently, a faculty/staff Recruitment Committee developed an action plan that targets the following populations:

1. Career changing individuals (including military and displaced professionals)
2. African Americans, especially males, and other minorities
3. High school students considering teaching careers
4. Transfer and undeclared/undecided undergraduates

The College of Education is working in collaboration with the Admissions Office, especially in the coordination of recruitment events (e.g. open houses, receptions, fairs) and developing recruitment materials. Following are the primary strategies being pursued as part of the overall recruitment:

- Develop new printed materials and video/Powerpoint presentations with the assistance of the Admissions Office and the Marketing and Communications Office and include information sheets for each program. Provide highlights of Georgia Southern's Teacher Education Program, including conceptual framework (reflection/diversity), Partner Schools, Demonstration Teachers, extensive field experiences, technology, Education Advisement Center, etc. (Target 1-4)
- Plan special recruitment events for target populations with informative and sophisticated presentations, FAQ materials, and participation of Demonstration Teachers, local school principals, and current education majors. (Target 1-4)
- Participate in Admissions Office events for high school counselors, two-year college counselors/advisors, and Eagle Club alumni. (Target 1,3, 4)
- Present or display materials at targeted student fairs and student organizations on campus; focus on minority groups and critical needs discipline-related groups. (Target 2, 4)
- Prepare a College of Education web page aimed at recruitment and with links targeted at career changers; provide job and scholarship information on critical needs areas. Provide e-mail links to current student representatives (e.g. Ambassadors) in education programs. (Target 1-4)
- Plan a Future Educators Week with orchestrated campus visits by high school groups, undeclared undergraduates, transfer students from two-year colleges, and career changers. Schedule class visits, campus tours, information sessions (e.g. admissions, financial aid, advisement, critical need program areas, etc.), and contacts with current students. (Target 1, 3, 4)
- Reestablish and/or strengthen connections with regional Future Georgia Educators (FGE) chapters, Teacher Cadet programs, and honor societies. (Target 3)
- Nominate education majors who complete Pre-Professional Block with high ratings on the TEP admissions assessment as Southern Ambassadors, in conjunction with the Admissions Office. Invite the education Ambassadors to help host in recruitment events. (Target 1-4)
- Prepare a recruitment kit that helps alumni and local teachers promote teaching as a career and Georgia Southern's teacher preparation programs. (Target 1, 2, 3)

- Develop a Speakers Panel of faculty, staff, and others (e.g. Demonstration Teachers, student Ambassadors) who are willing to visit schools and University orientation classes to promote teaching as a career. (Target 2, 3, 4)
- Survey current students and practicing teachers for information to use in planning and delivering programs and to use in marketing strategies. (Target 1-4)
- Work with the Admissions Office, the Financial Aid Office, the Advisement Center for undeclared majors, the Education Advisement Center, and the various academic departments on campus who help advise, counsel, and mentor students about teaching career opportunities, critical needs areas, and incentives/resources such as the HOPE Promise scholarships. (Target 2, 3, 4)

Targets Groups	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000
SAT 1000+ Students Enrolled / Average SAT	449/1085	460/1087	417/1095
HOPE Promise Scholars	29	38	61
Traditional Program Students Enrolled	1642	1527	1646
Alternative/Non-Degree Students Enrolled	55	54	72
Minorities–African-American Students Enrolled	470	399	278
Transfer Students Enrolled	601	551	438

Target Critical Fields	Fall 1997*	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000
Business	61	46	54	22
English	83	70	80	54
Foreign Language	22	29	23	19
Math	74	61	58	52
Middle Grades	193	193	173	102
Science	57	67	50	42
Special Education	206	192	156	117
Technology	44	43	37	30

* Admission requirements were raised in Fall 1998. These enrollment figures show the impact of raised standards between Fall 1997 and Fall 1998 and lingering impact as pre-education majors are admitted to the Teacher Education Program in later semesters.

Recruitment targets are identified as 10% annual increases for each target group and for each critical needs program area, as identified in the above charts. Each spring enrollment data will be analyzed as a part of the program review process conducted by departments and the Program Action Teams. Adjustments to targeted populations and targeted critical needs areas will be made based on changing needs and recruitment results.

II. A. (4). Institutions Increase by 10% the Number of Students with HOPE Promise Scholarships

Concerted efforts are made by the advisors in the Education Advisement Center (EAC) and the Financial Aid Office to inform eligible students about the HOPE Promise scholarship program and to facilitate the application process with the Financial Aid Office. Two steps are being taken which will insure that all students eligible for the HOPE Promise Award are notified of their eligibility and encouraged to apply. First, the EAC contacts eligible students and notifies them of the application process by letter and e-mail. Members of the EAC staff visit class meetings of each section of the Pre-Professional Block to discuss HOPE Promise and disseminate information. In addition, advisors continue to discuss the scholarship with individual students in advisement sessions. Second, the Office of Financial Aid notifies the Education Advisement Center of all students who receive the award so that additional contacts can be made with those students who still have not applied. Finally, the Education Advisement Center worked with the Offices of Financial Aid and the Registrar to develop an information sheet to accompany the scholarship application packet, giving students the easiest possible access to the resources they need to apply. In addition to informing and assisting current students regarding the HOPE Promise scholarship, high school students and transfer students who have strong academic records and who are considering teaching careers are provided information about the HOPE Promise scholarship program during recruitment events.

As a result of this effort, HOPE Promise scholarships have increased by 60% from Fall 1999 to Fall 2000. Since implementation of the BOR Principles in Fall 1998, HOPE Promise scholarships have increased by over 100%. In Fall 2000, approximately 600 of Georgia Southern's undergraduate teacher preparation candidates received Georgia HOPE scholarships, and about 10% of those candidates are HOPE Promise scholars.

Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Increase 1998-1999	Fall 2000	Increase 1999-2000	Increase 1998-2000
29	38	31%	61	60%	110%

II. A. (5). Institutions Recognize the Work of Teacher Preparation Faculty in Reward System: Own Teaching Effectiveness, Applied Research on Ways to Improve Teaching and Student Learning in Schools, Other Forms of Research and Scholarship, and Service to P-12 Schools

The Partner School initiative has provided more opportunity for University faculty to engage in field-based research with the intent of addressing specific concerns about student learning and teaching quality. Partner Schools submit proposals and then develop plans that focus on specific school improvement goals and these serve to guide partnership efforts. University field associates are central to this work. They spend a significant amount of time at their designated Partner Schools and solicit participation of other University faculty.

To support the Partner School work and the faculty members' research and service in the schools, Georgia Southern has targeted a set of mini-grants to support Partner School improvement projects. These are designed to encourage collaboration of University Field Associates and P-12 teachers in field-based research and service projects aimed at increasing student achievement. Examples from the 2000-01 academic year include:

- studying the impact of a 7-period day versus a 6-period day in a secondary Partner School.
- studying ways the state graduation test in writing influences the high school English curriculum.
- developing a reading tutor program for at-risk 9th graders.
- planning and facilitating workshops to assist Partner Schools in the process of math textbook adoption (elementary and middle school).
- helping develop a plan to improve targeted reading needs.
- facilitating the development and categorization of math content standards.
- guiding curriculum mapping activities in language arts.
- organizing a voluntary tutoring program involving P-5 curriculum students and Partner School teachers and students.
- conducting workshops on *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* at three Partner Schools.

In addition, the College of Education sponsors a set of dedicated mini-grants that support and encourage faculty in the College of Education and in the other colleges on campus to conduct applied research on ways to improve teaching and student learning in schools. The annual grants foster collaboration for the purpose of field-based research to improve schools and the preparation of educators for the schools. These include:

Crossing Borders - encourages and enhances collaboration between faculty in the COE and faculty in any other college at Georgia Southern.

Designing Colleagues - encourages and enhances collaboration among the four departments in the COE.

Making Connections - encourages and enhances collaboration between faculty in the COE and faculty in any local P-12 school.

Creating Pathways - encourages and enhances collaboration between faculty in the COE and colleagues at another university in the US or overseas.

Participation in schools, and especially the Partner Schools, by University faculty members is recognized each year through the annual faculty evaluation process. Raises that are awarded to faculty take into consideration faculty research and service in the schools. University, college and departmental tenure and promotion policies accommodate recognition of faculty's teaching effectiveness, their scholarship—including applied research, and service to P-12 schools.

An examination of COE departmental and college policies related to tenure and promotion was conducted by a committee of faculty and administrators in the College of Education. Issues were addressed regarding the clarification of the policies and procedures that would impact promotion and tenure decisions so that due recognition for faculty work in schools is assured. Guidelines for documenting and criteria for assessing faculty work in schools that are defined within the departments are duly recognized by

the COE Faculty Personnel Committee and the Dean. Recognition for faculty work in schools is also assured at the University level by the Provost and President.

(See Attachment A: *Institutional Statement on Teacher Education Faculty*)

Section II B - Performance - Teacher Candidates

II. B. (1). Teacher Candidates—Sufficient Content Knowledge in all Subjects Included Under Certification to Help Students Reach High Levels of Learning

Curriculum for each teacher preparation program is aligned with content standards (Praxis II, Georgia QCCs, and national standards), and performance-based assessment plans have been developed and are being implemented in the programs. This applies to the Early Childhood Education, Middle Grades Education, Special Education, and all the Secondary and P-12 Education programs. STEP content analysis has been completed in the three social science fields and is underway in English and math. Products of the STEP analyses include recommendations for program revision to strengthen content preparation and identification of strategies to strengthen assessment of content knowledge and application by both education and arts and sciences faculty.

The assessment plans that are in place include evaluations of teacher candidates' content knowledge to assure that it is sufficient to bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning. Student assessment data are used by the Program Action Teams (P-12, COE, and A&S membership) in annual program reviews which are part of program and unit assessment systems. Further explanation of the overall assessment systems (candidate, program, and unit) is provided under Section III.A. Following are specific responses as to how the Early Childhood program and the Middle Grades and Secondary Education programs have addressed this principle.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

The curriculum has been aligned with standards of appropriate professional societies, state standards, etc. A plan to evaluate whether teacher candidates' knowledge is sufficient to bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning is in place. Multiple assessment tools are used and include the following items.

- **Assessment of content understanding:** Varied methods are employed to determine the preservice teacher's understanding of the content to be taught. Content understanding is assessed through tests and quizzes (open-ended questions, multiple choice/short answer, essay), journals, case studies, and instructional planning (lesson planning, unit planning, learning plans).
- **Assessment of developing content and student understanding of content:** The evaluation of planning (lesson plan rubrics) focuses on the accuracy, depth, and appropriateness of content development within lessons. When the lesson is taught, the performance rubrics address whether content was accurately conveyed and whether the teaching of content promoted student understanding. After teaching, preservice teachers are required to evaluate the level of student understanding by presenting data of students' performance

on the objectives (raw data, narrative description of data, and a graph or chart of data gathered). The preservice teachers analyze the data to determine relevant patterns, to discuss individual variations, and to identify the next steps for instruction based on the data analysis.

- * In addition to the formative feedback, a preservice teacher's progress is also communicated via midterm and final evaluation conferences and forms.
- * If a preservice teacher is having difficulty in this area, a need for improvement form/performance agreement is completed that outlines what area needs to be improved, suggestions on how to improve the area, and a time frame for checking progress. If improvement is not demonstrated, an intervention and evaluation report/probationary letter is filed with additional recommendations and a new timeline for checking progress. If the student continues to struggle, a final action form/termination letter is completed.

Overall, a preservice teacher's level of content knowledge is evaluated continuously so an ongoing picture of the student's abilities is developed (progress along the way) as well as a summative perspective (level of accomplishment). At the end of the semester, faculty meet in small groups to review data gathered on how preservice teachers are performing in multiple areas. The Program Action Team (comprised of P-5 faculty, COE faculty, COE advisors, undergraduate students, and graduate students) also meets once a semester to discuss data. Based on findings, changes in program requirements may be made.

(See Attachment B: *Early Childhood Education Assessment Samples*)

MIDDLE GRADES AND SECONDARY EDUCATION:

During the 1999-2000 academic year, the content course requirements for the teaching concentrations in middle grades and the required content courses in each of the secondary and P-12 programs were reviewed by program coordinators in the College of Education and representatives from each of the academic departments. Course requirements were aligned with the Quality Core Curriculum (QCC), Praxis II objectives, and the standards from the appropriate professional organizations. In some cases, new courses were developed and implemented in order to address these content standards. Program objectives, pedagogy courses, and field experiences were revised to include a systematic process for monitoring student progress in content knowledge. Course syllabi and field experience rubrics were revised to reflect multiple forms of assessing the performance of candidates in their understanding of the key concepts and skills in the content they teach. In addition, a systematic process for screening candidates at the end of each semester throughout the junior and senior years was developed and implemented. Prior to enrolling in each of the pedagogy blocks, beginning in the junior year and throughout the program, faculty review each candidate's academic record and field experience evaluations to determine whether or not they are demonstrating competency in their understanding and use of appropriate content for instruction. Each pedagogy course and field experience is designed to assess the degree to which candidates select appropriate content for instruction, including appropriate instructional strategies and assessment procedures. Field experience rubrics include competencies that address instructional planning that promote high levels of learning, a variety of assessment procedures to

determine the degree to which students are learning, and a range of teaching materials that challenges students with a diverse range of learning styles.

(See Attachment C: *Middle Grades, Secondary and P-12 Education Assessment Samples*)

II. B. (2). Teacher Candidates are Able to Use Technology Effectively

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

The faculty revised departmental course outlines to insure that courses infuse the continuous evolution of technology (ISTE National Educational Technology Standards for Teachers). Each course in the program of study targets a specific technology tool that is taught and that students practice through a variety of course assignments.

Additionally, faculty require students to apply previously learned technology skills in course assignments. Students in field components are required to use technology in their teaching. Checklists have been designed to monitor the amount and type of usage planned by students in field experiences. Lesson plan rubrics and performance rubrics evaluate the technology usage to determine if it is used effectively as a tool for learning.

- * In addition to the formative feedback, a preservice teacher's progress is also communicated via midterm and final evaluation conferences and forms.
- * If a preservice teacher is having difficulty in this area, a need for improvement form/performance agreement is completed that outlines what area needs to be improved, suggestions on how to improve the area, and a time frame for checking progress. If improvement is not demonstrated, an intervention and evaluation report/probationary letter is filed with additional recommendations and a new timeline for checking progress. If the student continues to struggle, a final action form/termination letter is completed. At the end of the semester, faculty meet in small groups to review data gathered on how preservice teachers are performing in multiple areas. The Program Action Team (comprised of P-5 faculty, COE faculty, COE advisors, undergraduate students, and graduate students) also meets once a semester to discuss data. Based on findings, changes in program requirements may be made.

(See Attachment B: *Early Childhood Education Assessment Samples*)

MIDDLE GRADES AND SECONDARY EDUCATION:

Teacher preparation programs in middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teaching fields include a systematic process for measuring the extent to which teacher candidates use technology effectively as tools for learning. Program outcomes, course content and performance outcomes, and field experiences include competencies that candidates must successfully demonstrate in order to complete their program. These competencies address both the selection and use of technology for teaching and student learning. During the 1999-2000 academic year, course syllabi and field experience expectations were refined to include an array of technology-based performance outcomes for each program. Rubrics are used to monitor student progress throughout the program. Each candidate must demonstrate in each of the pedagogy courses and field experiences, including student teaching, that they are proficient in identifying, evaluating, and utilizing a range of technologies for instruction and understand how to use technology to enhance student learning. Candidates must select appropriate technology for a diverse classroom, evaluate the effectiveness of the technology, and demonstrate an effective use

of technology as a vehicle for promoting student learning. These competencies are monitored each semester by the education faculty, as well as the P-12 teachers who assist in the supervision of the field experiences.

(See Attachment C: *Middle Grades, Secondary and P-12 Education Assessment Samples*)

II. B. (3). Teacher Candidates Are Able to Manage Classrooms Effectively

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

The curriculum has been designed to introduce preservice teachers to classroom management strategies utilized by teachers in public schools. From this foundation, preservice teachers are evaluated on their ability to proactively plan for classroom management (are they able to foresee potential problems? have they planned procedures and established behavioral expectations to address potential problems?) (see lesson plan rubric). When teaching in the classrooms, preservice teachers are evaluated on how well they implemented directions/procedures, if they foresaw potential problems and took appropriate steps, and how well they responded to disruptive behaviors (see performance rubric). After teaching, the preservice teachers are required to reflect on their teaching to identify strengths and weaknesses with an explanation why things occurred and what they plan to do differently the next time that they teach (see lesson plan rubric). University supervisors conference with students to discuss strengths and weaknesses and to offer suggestions for improvement.

- * In addition to the formative feedback, a preservice teacher's progress is also communicated via midterm and final evaluation conferences and forms.
- * If a preservice teacher is having difficulty in this area, a need for improvement form/performance agreement is completed that outlines what area needs to be improved, suggestions on how to improve the area, and a time frame for checking progress. If improvement is not demonstrated, an intervention and evaluation report/probationary letter is filed with additional recommendations and a new timeline for checking progress. If the student continues to struggle, a final action form/termination letter is completed. At the end of the semester, faculty meet in small groups to review data gathered on how preservice teachers are performing in multiple areas. The Program Action Team (comprised of P-5 faculty, COE faculty, COE advisors, undergraduate students, and graduate students) also meets once a semester to discuss data. Based on findings, changes in program requirements may be made. (See Attachment B: *Early Childhood Education Assessment Samples*)

MIDDLE GRADES AND SECONDARY EDUCATION:

Teacher preparation programs in middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teaching fields include a variety of processes for measuring the extent to which teacher candidates can manage a classroom effectively. Program performance outcomes, course syllabi, and field experience rubrics include performance outcomes that address competencies in organizing classrooms, identifying appropriate materials for instruction, determining appropriate methodologies for diverse learners, and a range of assessment strategies. Each program emphasizes effective planning based on an analysis of student populations. Candidates demonstrate strategies for managing classrooms within the context of each pedagogy course, as well as in each field experience in the junior and senior years. Debriefing activities follow each candidate's teaching in order to reflect on ways to

modify instruction, assessment strategies, and instructional resources. Rubrics used to monitor the progress of candidates reflect a variety of competencies that address classroom management. At the completion of each semester throughout the junior and senior years, each candidate's progress is reviewed in order to determine whether or not they have demonstrated acceptable skills in organizing and managing classrooms in order to progress in the program. Instructional competencies are monitored by education faculty, as well as P-12 teachers who assist in the supervision of the field experiences.

(See Attachment C: *Middle Grades, Secondary and P-12 Education Assessment Samples*)

II. B. (4). Teacher Candidates in Early Childhood Education Can Diagnose Difficulties in Reading and Mathematics and Know What To Do About Them

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

The curriculum has been designed to introduce preservice teachers to the reading and mathematics content they will be expected to teach in schools. Utilizing their understanding of content, preservice teachers analyze the language arts and math skills that they teach. The task analysis serves as a basis for developing preassessments to determine individual strengths as well as instructional needs. These assessment profiles provide the data needed by students to outline a framework of instruction. Multiple assessment tools are used to determine the candidates' abilities in this area and include the following items:

- Assessment of content understanding: varied methods are employed to determine the preservice teacher's understanding of the content to be taught. Content understanding is assessed through tests and quizzes (open-ended questions, multiple choice/short answer, essay), journals, case studies, and instructional planning (lesson planning, unit planning, learning plans).
- Assessment of diagnosing difficulties: When planning instruction, the preservice teachers conduct preassessments to determine students strengths and instructional needs.

The data is analyzed and determines the framework for instruction to be followed. The evaluation of planning (lesson plan rubrics) focuses on the accuracy, depth, and appropriateness of content development within lessons. When the lesson is taught, the performance rubrics address whether content was accurately conveyed and whether the teaching of content promoted student understanding. After teaching, preservice teachers are required to evaluate the level of student understanding by presenting data of students' performance on the objectives (raw data, narrative description of data, and a graph or chart of data gathered). The preservice teachers analyze the data to determine relevant patterns, to discuss individual variations, and to identify the next steps for instruction based on the data analysis.

- * In addition to the formative feedback, a preservice teacher's progress is also communicated via midterm and final evaluation conferences and forms.
- * If a preservice teacher is having difficulty in this area, a need for improvement form/performance agreement is completed that outlines what area needs to be improved, suggestions on how to improve the area, and a time frame for checking progress. If improvement is not demonstrated, an intervention and evaluation report/probationary letter is filed with additional recommendations and a new

timeline for checking progress. If the student continues to struggle, a final action form/termination letter is completed. At the end of the semester, faculty meet in small groups to review data gathered on how preservice teachers are performing in multiple areas. The Program Action Team (comprised of P-5 faculty, COE faculty, COE advisors, undergraduate students, and graduate students) also meets once a semester to discuss data. Based on findings, changes in program requirements may be made. (See Attachment B: *Early Childhood Education Assessment Samples*)

Section III - Results

III. A. Teacher Candidates are Accomplished in Helping P-12 Students from Diverse Groups to Learn at High Levels

The Teacher Education Program at Georgia Southern University has assessment systems in place for measuring the extent to which teacher candidates are accomplished in helping P-12 students from diverse groups to learn at high levels. Through collaboration across departments and program areas, the following tenets were constructed and each teacher preparation program area incorporates these elements in its inputs and in its performance assessments of teacher candidates: (1) a well-developed series of *steps of engagement* followed by all teacher candidates, (2) *additional steps* to enhance the efforts of our candidates to teach to high levels of learning for students from diverse groups, and (3) an array of *impacting student learning activities* that further enable us to assess our teacher candidates' levels of accomplishment to effectively educate diverse students. The tenets of the model outlined below are based on the College's conceptual framework which articulates our focus on developing *reflective educators* who are competent in meeting the needs of *diverse learners*.

- ◆ In our efforts to prepare teacher candidates to bring P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and to assess their accomplishments in doing so, the following *steps of engagement* are employed:
 1. Candidates use a framework for planning decisions that encompass knowledge of how children develop and learn; knowledge of individual strengths, needs, and interests; and knowledge of the social and cultural contexts in which children live.
 2. Candidates write lesson plans to meet diversity within classrooms and they learn to assess the needs of the students they teach. In addition, self-assessment and self-reflection as a teacher comprises a significant component of both course work and field practica.
 3. Candidates learn to connect lesson plans to individual student needs and learning objectives as well as how to evaluate classroom and social behavior to determine whether learning objectives are accomplished. Pre-service teachers also learn how to structure their classroom environments in order to highlight key elements of learning for all students, thereby reducing distractions.
 4. Content area programs from other colleges across campus are brought to a more visible place within the teacher preparation curriculum. This serves to widen the potential diversity of students reached and to underscore a focus on both professional knowledge and research within content areas. An emphasis on both the mission and vision of the College of Education throughout the University makes our appeal to diverse groups more public and accessible.
 5. Pre-education studies (general education courses) and high admissions standards

raise the academic bar significantly for candidates and add to the perception of the College of Education as a place of high expectations and levels of learning.

- ◆ *Additional steps* are taken in order to enhance the efforts of our teacher candidates to teach to high levels of learning for students from diverse groups and to provide performance-based measures for assessment of candidates and our programs. These include:
 1. Examining program outcomes and, if needed, developing additional outcomes that focus on student learning;
 2. Developing products that illustrate student learning;
 3. Devising new assessment rubrics and applying more emphasis on student learning in existing rubrics;
 4. Communicating with P-12 colleagues both the value and impact of student assessment and its connection to future instruction;
 5. Working with liberal arts and sciences colleagues to develop and adopt assessment strategies appropriate for content-related courses offered in other colleges on campus;
 6. Collaborating with arts and sciences faculty to support improved instructional models in content/core curriculum and professional education courses;
 7. Bringing recent graduates who are now teaching into greater contact with teacher candidates as mentors.

- ◆ An array of *impacting student learning activities* is being developed that will further enable us to assess candidates' levels of accomplishment to effectively educate diverse students in a systematic way. Skills that we will be assuring our candidates develop include:
 1. Identifying what student learning looks like. Teacher candidates need to develop ways to determine this understanding both prior to and after instruction by using standards and clearly-delineated assessment criteria to evaluate student work.
 2. Reflecting on one's instructional practice and assessments of student learning to guide appropriate modifications. Teacher candidates need to develop instructional objectives that focus on student learning expectations, to select classroom strategies that help bring about high levels of learning for all, and to allow assessments of learning gains to inform future instructional decisions.
 3. Use of rubrics and a variety of assessment tools and strategies to help determine student learning.

These tenets identify key issues that are critical, in our opinion, to the development of teacher candidates who are accomplished in helping P-12 students from diverse groups learn at high levels. They will guide ongoing curriculum change and continue to inform each of our teacher preparation programs as program outcomes, course assignments, and assessment strategies and tools are refined.

Each teacher preparation program area has a performance-based assessment plan in place for evaluating teacher candidates. Program outcomes are developed, aligned with INTASC standards and linked to locally-developed Teacher Education Program standards (see <http://www2.gasou.edu/teac/teptestand.htm>). Program outcomes identify the expectation that teacher candidates will be able to help P-12 students from diverse groups learn at high levels, a central focus of the College's conceptual framework. Benchmarks

are established by each program with student evaluation components at each stage that include assessment tools such as performance rubrics, portfolios, work samples, and student conferences. Assessment pieces are also collected at the various benchmarks for program evaluation purposes. Field experience feedback and data are critical sources for both student assessments and program assessments. Capstone assessments are conducted at the end of each “block” or term and vary in approach by program. For example, Special Education incorporates the use of portfolio presentations at the end of each term; Early Childhood Education uses student conferences and debriefings by University and supervising teachers (Demonstration Teachers); Middle Grades and Secondary Education programs use well-developed rubrics and admission/retention check sheets to monitor progress. The attached diagram illustrates the overall model used for assessment of teacher candidates and the programs.

(See Attachment D: *Assessment of Teacher Candidates*)

Program and unit assessment systems are in place and serve as the context for the student (teacher candidate) assessment plans described above. Program assessment plans use data and other evaluative information provided from various sources for the purpose of assessing program effectiveness and bringing about continual program improvement. Program Action Teams (PATs—made up of program faculty, P-12 educators, and arts and sciences faculty) are key contributors of evaluative information. PATs play an additional key role in program assessment: they are responsible for reviewing the various evaluative information annually and recommending changes to support program improvement. PAT recommendations are submitted to the Department Chair or Program Coordinator, as appropriate, for implementation. Programs are encouraged to identify key indicators of program success and propose benchmarks upon which success can be measured. That information can help identify what types and sources of data should be collected for program assessment. Performance-based assessments of student success in meeting outcomes (based on standards and the conceptual framework) are primary components considered in program assessments.

The unit assessment system uses multiple information sources for the purpose of assessing the College’s effectiveness in preparing educators and fulfilling its expectations for students as stated in its conceptual framework. The Dean of the College of Education and the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) are primarily responsible for reviewing data on a regular basis and evaluating the unit. As performance-based assessments are used to evaluate teacher candidates’ effectiveness in helping P-12 students from diverse groups to learn at high levels, data is also generated for use in the program and unit assessment systems to inform continued changes.

(See Attachment E: *Program and Unit Assessment Systems*; also http://www2.gasou.edu/coe/evidence/Assessment_System.htm)

III. B. Experienced Teachers Completing Graduate Programs are Accomplished in all Five Principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

All of the M.Ed. teacher education programs have been aligned with NBPTS core principles. The programs are refining course assignments and assessments to reflect NBPTS expectations. The M.Ed. programs will be considered as foundational experiences for teacher success in attaining national certification. During the 2001-02

academic year, performance-based assessments will be incorporated into the M.Ed. teacher education programs and will provide feedback on how well graduates are prepared to meet the five core principles. In addition, a review of Ed.S. programs will be conducted and consideration will be given to NBPTS alignment at that level.

III. C. School Leader Candidates are Accomplished in Putting in Place Those Conditions Known to Support Teacher Success in Improving Student Learning

The General School Administrator/Educational Leadership program was redesigned during the Spring semester 2001 to address the unique characteristics of today's school leaders. The EDLD faculty developed course offerings and revisions based on the Georgia Education Administrators Standards, school improvement, technology, and learner-centered curriculum and instructions. Beginning Fall 2001, all educational leadership courses within the MEd., L-5 Add-on, EdS. and EdD programs will address both the ISLLC and Georgia Education Administrators Standards specific to the course. These standards will be included within the course syllabi and assessments will be practitioner-based addressing each of the listed standards as they pertain to school improvement, technology, learner-centered curriculum and instruction, and practitioner-based skill and knowledge required to lead a successful school.

Beginning Fall 2002, a redesigned program will be instituted to incorporate both entry and exit assessment courses. The entry course (General School Administration) will focus on assessing a student's ability to deal with the daily situations and interactions experienced by a practicing school administrator. Seminar topics will include administration of four inventories that will assess the student's ability to function in leading today's schools. Inventory types to be included are: Personality Inventory, Skill and Knowledge Inventory, Leadership Style Inventory, and Philosophy Inventory. An individual student profile will be developed that includes results of each assessment inventory. This profile will be used to conference with each student to discuss the results of each inventory and its implications of the student's abilities in becoming a successful school leader. Not all students are expected to be advised to continue the educational leadership program. Therefore, those who do not meet the qualifications will be provided alternative options for continuing advanced degree programs outside of educational leadership.

After completion of course work for degree and/or certification, the final nine hours of the program will consist of a one school year internship and the Principalship course. The Principalship course will run concurrently with the internship and meet throughout the school year. The course will consist of seminars that address specific practical topics that are pertinent to the practicing school leader and administrator. These two courses (Principalship and Internship) are designed to provide the student with school experiences from with opening the school to closing the school for the year. These experiences will address the daily life of the school leader dealing with school improvement and accountability. The evaluation pieces will include a professional portfolio, a contact log with descriptions of experiences addressing the Georgia Education Administrator Standards, understanding effective teaching, learner-centered curriculum and instruction, parent and community relations, technology, budgets, facilities, professional development, and all aspects of school improvement.

By Fall 2003, Educational Leadership programs will assure the practitioner-based assessment that potential school administrators require to be a successful leader in today's society and to address every aspect of school improvement for accountability based on learner-centered curriculum and instruction.

With the planned program revision implemented for two years in Fall 2004, the guaranty provision will be addressed through practitioner-based assessments specific to school improvement, technology, Georgia Education Administrator and ISLLC Standards, and learner-centered curriculum and instruction, as experienced by students through the course work and year-long internship. To ensure that course and experience offerings remain pertinent to school leaders' needs in consideration of evolving roles and changing demands, educational leadership faculty will continue their collaboration with practicing district and school administrators in the region.

III. D. School Counselor Candidates are Accomplished in Putting in Place Those Conditions to Support Teacher Success in Improving Student Learning

Following are activities that occurred are subsequent to and in supplement of the actions and data described in the May 2000 report in fulfillment of the BOR Principle for School Counselor preparation programs:

1. In July, 2000 Drs. Bergin, Jackson, and Spencer participated in the national "Transforming School Counseling" conference conducted by the Education Trust in Fort Worth, Texas. Assessment and program evaluation were key issues addressed by this conference.
2. In October, 2000 the faculty initiated a new comprehensive exam procedure, assessing program graduates knowledge using a nationally based standardized test, the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE). The results of the initial administrations of the CPCE are being analyzed and will provide data for future revisions of the program.
3. In November, 2000 the faculty conducted an evaluation of the program by surveying recent graduates who are practicing school counselors or community counselors who work with schools. The results of this evaluation indicate that graduates agree they were well prepared in most areas of counselor knowledge and skill, but that they were unsure of the adequacy of their preparation to use technology and address issues of advocacy and diversity. The faculty have already begun addressing these needs by revising the EdS program requirements (as described in the Spring 2000 report) and by merging the MEd program with the masters degree program in Higher Education Student Services.
4. The faculty plan to conduct a survey of the employers of program alumni in FY '02 to ascertain the employers' evaluation of counselor education graduates based on their level of preparedness and competency.
5. The faculty have participated in national and state conferences and workshops which featured sessions on counselor assessment and evaluation.
6. In FY '02 the faculty plan to participate in the Education Trust conferences on

transforming school counseling. The faculty also plans to seek participation upon the Board of Regents advisory panel being formed by Dr. Jan Kettlewell to create specific BOR principles for school counselors. The development and adoption of these principles will serve to provide direction and focus for the faculty in planning future changes in the Counselor Education programs.

III. E. Through Partner Schools P-12 Students from Diverse Groups are Learning at High Levels

A network of 13 Partner Schools is in place that focuses specifically on three areas: (a) initial teacher preparation, (b) professional development, and (c) mutual renewal. All aspects of the Partner School work is designed to offer continued improvement of teacher preparation programs and school improvement. Each component focuses on student learning goals, assessment of learning, and provides feedback into school and teacher preparation improvements. (See May 2000 BOR report for full plans.)

Each of the Partner Schools has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Georgia Southern University. At least one University faculty Field Associate is assigned to each Partner School (19 faculty serve in this capacity), and each Partner School has a Clinical Associate who serves as liaison to the University and a cohort of Demonstration Teachers who host field experiences and are actively involved in the delivery and assessment of the teacher preparation programs. All teacher preparation candidates have at least one field placement in a Partner School and with a Demonstration Teacher.

Impacts of the Partner School initiative at Georgia Southern are documented using a Professional Development School Assessment Framework that was developed by Lee Teitel of the University of Massachusetts Boston (2000). Four levels of assessment are included in the framework:

- Level I: Organizational Innovations in Partnership Development
- Level II: Adaptations in Roles, Structures, and Culture
- Level III: Best Practices in Teaching, Learning, Leadership and Curriculum Development
- Level IV: Desired Outcomes - Improved Learning

Each level of assessment is further categorized by impacts on students, pre-service teachers, experienced teachers and other education personnel, Partner Schools, and University preparation programs. University faculty are encouraged and supported through mini-grants to conduct collaborative research with the P-12 partners and University graduate and undergraduate students. A website is used to promote the exchange of ideas and to facilitate the sharing of research resources and ideas. This electronic tool serves as a way to promote ongoing dialogue about research issues in the Partner Schools.

School Profile Forms have been developed to gather data on each Partner School, the diversity of their student population and their professional staff. This information is gathered to provide demographic and baseline data for continued assessment of impacts. In addition, each Partner School conducts research and gathers data based on specific

school improvement goals and initiatives that are supported by the partnership.
Preliminary data from Partner School assessments will be available by Fall 2001.
(See <http://www2.gasou.edu/coe/psschool.htm>)