

## **SECTION I: TEACHER PREPARATION**

### **I. Inputs**

#### **I A. Responsibility for teacher preparation vested in a collaborative of education, arts and sciences, and school faculty (1998)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Controlled by the college of education; arts and science and school roles at input level

2 = Equitable representation among education, arts and sciences and school faculty; advisory to education dean

3 = Equitable representation among 3 groups, responsible for aspects of teacher preparation, but no authority over programs

**4 = Equitable representation, responsibility, and authority for the preparation of teachers among education, arts and science, and school partners, and other academic units as appropriate <sup>1</sup>**

**The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) is the functional unit charged with developing, reviewing, and revising all aspects of educator preparation programs. The Council serves as the major decision-making and coordinating committee for undergraduate teacher preparation programs, graduate programs for teacher education and school support personnel preparation, and for other educational certification programs at the University. The Council is authorized to recommend revisions to programs related to teacher education. They consider issues related to overall operating policies and procedures rather than individual courses. The Council is responsible for coordinated governance of educator preparation throughout the College and University. It serves a strong communication function in keeping various and diverse groups involved with teacher education and aware of changes at the local, state, regional and national levels in educator preparation and certification.**

**Membership includes a representative of each department involved in teacher preparation from the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS), the College of Science and Technology (COST), the College of Health and Professional Studies (CHPS), and the College of Business Administration (COBA), a representative from each program area from the College of Education, and six Demonstration Teachers from Partner Schools. Total membership is 30 voting members. A TEAC Executive Committee serves to coordinate and lead the work of TEAC. This Committee includes four arts and sciences representatives (voted upon by TEAC arts and sciences members), four College of Education representatives (voted upon by COE members) and four Demonstration Teacher representatives.**

**Examples of recent impacts of TEAC include:**

- **Raised admissions and retention policies that resulted in higher caliber of teacher candidate.**
- **STEP program analyses resulting in better content preparation in teacher preparation programs.**
- **Revised M.Ed. core and exit requirements to reflect national standards (e.g. NBPTS) and incorporate more performance-based assessments.**

**See: <http://www2.gasou.edu/teac/teacmain.htm>.**

### **I B. Stronger content preparation—early childhood teachers (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Program contains less than 12 semester hour concentration in either the academic content field of reading or mathematics

2 = Program contains two 12 semester hour concentrations in the academic content fields of reading and mathematics outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum (mathematics); less than 9 hours at junior-senior level

3 = Program contains two 12 semester hour concentrations in the academic content fields of reading and mathematics outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum (mathematics); 9 hours at junior-senior level; some mathematics courses taught by mathematics faculty

**4 = Program contains two 12 semester hour concentrations in the academic content fields of reading and mathematics outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum (mathematics); 9 hours at junior-senior level; math courses taught by mathematics faculty; reading courses taught by reading faculty**

**The mathematics concentration consists of 12 semester hours: MATH 2031 (3), MATH 3032 (3), MATH 5130 (3), and either MATH 5134 or MATH 5135 (3). The courses were collaboratively developed by faculty in the mathematics and early childhood departments. The courses are taught by faculty in the Department of Math and Computer Science.**

**The reading concentration consists of 12 semester hours: ECED 2230 (3), ECED 3262 (6), and ECED 4233 (3). The courses were developed by literacy faculty in the early childhood department are taught by this faculty.**

See [http://www2.gasou.edu/Early\\_Child\\_Ed\\_and\\_Reading/BSProgramofStudy.html](http://www2.gasou.edu/Early_Child_Ed_and_Reading/BSProgramofStudy.html).

### **I C. Stronger content preparation—middle grades teachers (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Program contains less than two 12 semester hour concentrations outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum from among the academic content fields of English, mathematics, science, and social science

2 = Program contains at least two 12 semester hour concentrations with all hours in the academic content fields outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum, one has at least 6 hours at junior-senior level, the other does not

3 = Program contains at least two 12 semester hour concentrations with all hours in the academic content fields outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum, at least 6 hours at junior-senior level

**4 = Program contains at least two 12 semester hour concentrations with all hours in the academic content fields outside of areas A-E of the core curriculum, at least 6 hours at junior-senior level, courses taught by arts & sciences faculty; students also capable of teaching reading**

**The B.S.Ed. in Middle Grades Education includes 12 semester hours in each of two concentrations, with all 12 hours outside of areas A-E. Nine semester hours of upper division (3000 level and up) are required in each of the two concentrations. Each of these courses is taught by faculty in the various academic departments. The teaching of reading is included in the language arts/reading methods course and requires performance assessments.**

See <http://www2.gasou.edu/middlegrades/> for program information; see <http://www.collegesource.org/displayinfo/catalink.asp> for catalog information on the program of study.

**ID (1). Stronger content preparation—high school teachers and those teaching all grades (for students graduating in May 2002) (1998)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Programs do not meet requirements for an academic major in any single discipline or broad-field certification program

2 = Programs meet requirements for an academic major in some single discipline certification fields, and/or broad-fields

3 = Programs meet requirements for an academic major in each single discipline certification fields, and if broad-field science and/or social studies is offered, they meet requirements for one academic major, but do not have at least a 12-15 semester hour concentration in other fields to be taught

**4 = Programs meet requirements for an academic major in each single discipline certification fields, and if broad-field science and/or social studies is offered, they meet requirements for a major in one academic (content) discipline and at least a 12-15 semester hour concentration in each of the three other fields included under broad field certification**

Broad-fields programs were eliminated and replaced in Fall 1998 by single discipline programs in each of the secondary teaching fields for high school teachers and those teaching all grades. All majors have been changed to single discipline teaching fields. Those graduating in the Spring of 2002 have majors in one of these teaching fields. Broad fields degree programs have been eliminated. Content hours have been increased in each program. The number of content hours is equivalent—or exceeds—the content hours required for an academic major.

See <http://www2.gasou.edu/middlegrades/> for program information; see <http://www.collegesource.org/displayinfo/catalink.asp> for catalog information on the programs of study.

**ID (2). Stronger content preparation—high school teachers and those teaching all grades (for students entering program in fall 2002) (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Programs do not meet requirements for an academic major in any single discipline or broad-field certification program

2 = Programs meet requirements for an academic major in some single discipline certification fields, and/or broad-fields

**3 = Programs meet requirements for an academic major in each single discipline certification fields, and if broad-field science and/or social studies is offered, they meet requirements for a major in one academic (content) discipline and at least a 12-15 semester hour concentration in each of the three other fields included under broad field certification**

4 = Programs lead to a BS or BA degree with a major in an academic (content) discipline in each single discipline certification field offered plus teacher certification, and if broad-field science and/or social studies is offered, they lead to a BS or BA degree with a major in one academic (content) discipline for broad-field certification, and have at least a minor in each subject included under broad-field certification

Each secondary and P-12 certification program meets requirements for an academic major in each single discipline certification field. Broad-fields certification programs in science and social science have been eliminated. In most programs, the number of credit hours in the teaching field exceeds the requirements for BA or BS degree. The B.S.Ed. secondary and P-12 programs are developed and annually reviewed by collaborative Program Action Teams (COE, A&S, and P-12 representation) and are carefully designed to

meet all national and state standards for content preparation. Additionally, the rigor of content preparation provided by the B.S.Ed. programs is appraised by the PATs to be equal to that of the B.A. and B.S. degree programs.

See <http://www2.gasou.edu/middlegrades/> for program information; see <http://www.collegesource.org/displayinfo/catalink.asp> for catalog information on the programs of study.

### **I E. Stronger content preparation—graduate programs for teachers (effective only for all new programs approved since April 2001) (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Some, but not all, graduate programs for certified teachers emphasize the five core propositions of accomplished teaching set by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)
- 2 = All graduate programs for certified teachers emphasize the five core propositions of accomplished teaching set by the NBPTS
- 3 = All graduate programs for certified teachers emphasize the five core propositions of accomplished teaching set by the NBPTS and the programs are collaborative between the arts and sciences and education
- 4 = All graduate programs for certified teachers emphasize the five core propositions of accomplished teaching set by the NBPTS; programs are collaborative between the arts and sciences and education; arts and sciences and education courses are distributed equitably**

The M.Ed. and Ed.S. programs designed for certified teachers emphasize the NBPTS core propositions and incorporate assignments and assessments that prepare teachers for the national board certification process. The programs are developed, coordinated and reviewed annually by their Program Action Teams made up of COE, A&S, and P-12 representatives. The secondary and P-12 programs have completely equitable distribution between education and arts and sciences courses. Middle grades and early childhood education have equitable distribution of courses, incorporating two concentrations. Each of these programs requires at least 18 hours of content course work that is not taught by COE faculty. Special education is the only program area that does not have such a distribution between arts and sciences and education courses.

### **I F. Field-experiences—equivalent to one-full academic year—early childhood teachers (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Students complete less than 700 clock hours of field experiences in schools
- 2 = Students complete more than 700 but less than 800 clock hours of field experiences in schools
- 3 = Students complete more than 800 but less than 900 clock hours of field experiences in schools
- 4 = Students complete at least 900 (full academic year) clock hours of field experiences in schools**

Starting the sophomore year, early childhood majors are involved in the following field experiences: COED 2210 Pre-Professional Block Practicum (50 contact hours), CHFD 2135 Child Development (30 contact hours), ECED 3131 P-5 Curriculum (10 contact hours), ECED 3732 Methods I Practicum (65 contact hours), ECED 4733 Methods II Practicum (190 contact hours), and ECED 4799 Student Teaching (600 contact hours). An early childhood major will have at least 945 hours of field experiences in schools.

See <http://www2.gasou.edu/coe/crsech.htm#anchor687997>.

**I G. Field-experiences—equivalent to one-full academic year—middle grades teachers (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Students complete less than 700 clock hours of field experiences in schools
- 2 = Students complete more than 700 but less than 800 clock hours of field experiences in schools
- 3 = Students complete more than 800 but less than 900 clock hours of field experiences in schools
- 4 = Students complete at least 900 (full academic year) clock hours of field experiences in schools

All middle grades majors are required to complete a minimum of 1000 contact hours of field experiences in order to complete the program. Starting the sophomore year, middle grades majors are involved in the following field experiences: COED 2110 Pre-Professional Block Practicum (50 contact hours), MGED 3131 The Middle School (30 contact hours), Middle School Methods Block I–MGED 3432, 3332, 3721 (250 contact hours), Middle School Methods Block II–MGED 3232, 3532, 3722, EDUF 3233 (250 contact hours), and MGED 4799 Student Teaching (600 contact hours).

**I H. Field-experiences—equivalent to one-full academic year—high school teachers and those teaching all grades (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Students complete less than 700 clock hours of field experiences in schools in one or more programs
- 2 = Students complete more than 700 but less than 800 clock hours of field experiences in schools in one or more programs
- 3 = Students complete more than 800 but less than 900 clock hours of field experiences in schools in one or more programs
- 4 = Students complete at least 900 (full academic year) clock hours of field experiences in schools in all programs

Secondary and P-12 education majors are required to complete at least 900 clock hours of field experiences in schools. After COED 2110 Pre-Professional Block Practicum (50 contact hours) taken during the sophomore or early junior year, the secondary education majors enroll in the Secondary Education Professional Block (250-275 contact hours) and then SCED/ESED 4799 Student Teaching (600 contact hours). The P-12 programs offer curriculum and methods courses (at least 6 credit hours offered by the academic department) that provide approximately 250 contact hours of field experience prior to student teaching. The Art, Music, Foreign Languages, and Health and Physical Education teacher candidates complete an equivalent number of hours in field experiences in schools under the supervision of arts and sciences faculty.

See <http://www.collegesource.org> <http://rg/displayinfo/catalink.asp> for catalog information on these programs of study; also see attached program materials.

**I I. Higher admission requirements (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

- 1 = Students admitted meet none of the following criteria: Have at least a cumulative GPA of 2.5 on all attempted hours in the System core curriculum in areas A-F as required for teacher preparation; have passed the Regents' Test; have passed or tested out of PRAXIS I
- 2 = Students admitted meet one of the following criteria: Have at least a cumulative GPA of 2.5 on all attempted hours in the System core curriculum in areas A-F as required for teacher preparation; have passed the Regents' Test; have passed or tested out of PRAXIS I
- 3 = Students admitted meet two of the following criteria: Have at least a cumulative GPA of 2.5 on all attempted hours in the System core curriculum in areas A-F as required for teacher preparation; have passed the Regents' Test; have passed or tested out of PRAXIS I
- 4 = Students admitted meet or exceed all of the following criteria: Have cumulative GPA of 2.5 on all attempted hours in the System core curriculum in areas A-F as required for teacher preparation; have passed the Regents' Test; have passed or tested out of PRAXIS I**

Teacher Education Program admission requirements are:

1. **A cumulative GPA of 2.50 or better on all attempted hours in the Core Curriculum in Areas A-F. Those students who hold a B.A. or B.S. degree must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.50 on all course work.**
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 40 semester credit 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.**

These standards must continue to be met for retention in the Teacher Education Program and additionally must successfully complete all field experiences, not violate the Georgia Southern Student Conduct Code or the Georgia PSC Code of Ethics for Professional Educators, and make satisfactory progress toward meeting all program objectives. A personalized advisement process and well-developed assessment system monitor admissions and retention to make sure that all criteria are met by each student admitted into the program.

See Education Advisement Center web site: <http://www2.gasou.edu/edadvctr/>.

## **II A. Performance—Institutions**

**II A (1). Institutions guarantee that their graduates meet all expectations listed under performance and results, and provide additional training for any graduate identified by a school system as not meeting expectations (1998)**

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

Georgia Southern’s Program for Assuring Quality for Educator Preparation Programs (PAQ) plan was revised by the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC). A subcommittee was formed and met during Spring 2002 to provide any recommendations for revising the plan (since it was developed in 1998) or for implementing the plan Fall 2002. The subcommittee including faculty/administrators representing the following college: the College of Education, the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the College of Science and Technology, and the College of Health and Professional Studies. A P-12 central office coordinator of induction/mentoring served on the subcommittee as well as the P-12 Coordinator. An implementation plan was developed which included communication, coordination, and assessment components.

Faculty/chair contacts in the various departments across campus are identified as PAQ Departmental Coordinators. The P-16 Coordinator will serve as the Quality Assurance Coordinator and serve as the contact person for school system personnel who wish to initiate the program in support of a teacher/graduate in need of additional preparation and assistance. After planned communications are made in Summer 2002, the program will be in place. Note: Coordination with other USG colleges and universities will be made as assistance is needed to meet statewide needs.

See attached PAQ document.

**II A (2). Institutions increase the number of high quality applicants, individuals from minority groups, and those desiring to teach in shortage fields through programs in shortage fields, strong academic support and advisement to pre-education majors including readiness for PRAXIS I, and other strategies (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Partial recruitment plan in place

2 = Plan implemented that includes baseline data, recruitment goals, timeline, strategies, and assessments for increasing the numbers of: students passing PRAXIS I, high achieving freshmen and sophomores, minorities, and students choosing shortage fields

3 = Evidence of progress toward reaching recruitment goals set for some but not all targeted groups of students

4 = Evidence of progress toward meeting recruitment goals set for all targeted groups of students

Targets Groups	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001
SAT 1000+ Students Enrolled / Average SAT	449/1085	460/1087	417/1095	592/1097
HOPE Promise Scholars	29	38	61	144
Traditional Program Students Enrolled	1642	1527	1646	1209
Alternative/Non-Degree Students Enrolled	55	54	72	119
Minorities–African-American Students Enrolled	470	399	278	281
Transfer Students Enrolled	601	551	438	469

Target Critical Fields	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001
Business	46	54	22	39
English	70	80	54	54
Foreign Language	29	23	19	23
Math	61	58	52	64
Middle Grades	193	173	102	143
Science	67	50	42	49
Special Education	192	156	117	123
Technology	43	37	30	39

Georgia Southern has been very successful over the past year in recruiting high quality candidates; the major gains in number of HOPE Promise scholars and candidates who scored over 1000 on the SAT. A slight gain in the number of minority students we have enrolled in our teacher preparation programs is evident, but we have had a significant drop in our undergraduate enrollments. The recruitment plans that were developed in 2000-01 were successfully implemented during the 2001-02 academic year and the impact of these efforts should be witnessed in time. Increased enrollments are visible in almost all of the targeted critical needs program areas, as shown on the above chart.

The University provides strong academic support through the Education Advisement Center and by incorporating a co-advisement model with education and arts and sciences faculty. Academic support includes providing close monitoring each semester, offering activities to promote retention (such as ice cream social/information sessions and department-hosted orientation meetings, and arranging for additional learning opportunities to promote professionalism and readiness for required tests such as PRAXIS I. Learning Plus, and now Plato, are readily available to pre-education majors.

**II A (3). Institutions increase by 10% the number of teacher candidates with HOPE Promise Scholarships (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Partial plan in place
- 2 = Plan implemented that includes baseline data, recruitment goals, timeline, milestones as to numbers targeted, strategies for reaching goals, and how progress is to be evaluated
- 3 = Less than 10% increase in the number of students with HOPE Promise Scholarships
- 4 = At least a 10% increase achieved since 1999

Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Increase 2000-01	Increase 1999-2001

29	38	61	144	236%	379%
----	----	----	-----	------	------

The number of HOPE Promise scholars has increased dramatically over the past year and since 1999.

**II A (4). Institutions provide dual certification programs in early childhood and special education to meet state need and to increase student learning and achievement in Georgia’s public schools (this Principle is optional) (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Dual certification program in early childhood and special education under development**
- 2 = Dual certification program in early childhood and special education approved at institutional level
- 3 = Dual certification program in early childhood and special education approved at Board level
- 4 = Dual certification program has declared majors

**The Special Education and Early Childhood Education programs are working together on a project at one of the University’s Partner Schools. The project will provide collaborative teaming training and mentor training with co-teaching teams involving Portal Elementary School teacher, University faculty and pre-service teachers. A University teaching team will co-teach the special education introductory course with a collaborative focus and will provide a field-based experience. This project is expected to provide a first step toward a dual certification program. Initial planning is also underway to develop a dual certification program in Middle Grades Education and Early Childhood Education.**

**II A (5). In collaboration with the schools, institutions mentor graduates during their first two-years of teaching on all dimensions of the guarantee (1998)**

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

**A collaborative induction plan is in place with the four school systems in our region where our Partner Schools are located. Support, assistance and professional development activities have begun. The degree to which the plan is in place is dependent upon the mentoring and induction programs provided by the individual schools/systems and the roles they believe the University can play in conjunction with their programs. Field associates (University faculty liaisons) meet with beginning teachers/ graduates and, when requested, observe and provide feedback on their teaching. Workshops are also made available to beginning**

teachers to support their success. This mentoring assistance is provided to all beginning teachers within the Partner Schools. One of several examples of the ongoing mentoring activity is the work of three field associates who are working with two elementary partner schools and a high school. These University faculty members have been actively engaged in induction with the school induction coordinators, and they have planned and implemented monthly meetings for beginning teachers and mentors.

**II A (6). Institutions focus partner schools (or approved alternative) on:**

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

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Partner school (or approved alternative) model under development that focuses on all dimensions stated in the Principle

2 = Partner school (or approved alternative) model that focuses on all dimensions stated in the Principle implemented in some schools

**3 = Full network of partner schools (or approved alternative) in place that focuses on all dimensions stated in the Principle; all field experiences confined to partner schools; all have contractual agreements**

4 = Evidence of impact of partner schools (or approved alternative) on P-12 students, pre-service and in-service teachers

**A full network of partner schools is in place that involves 14 elementary, middle and secondary schools in four school systems. This network of partner schools has just completed its third year of implementation. Georgia Southern has received membership into the National Network for Educational Renewal based on its commitment to school partnerships and simultaneous renewal. The University is applying for membership into The Holmes Partnership, as well, in an effort to promote its work with schools.**

**The partner schools engage in annual goal setting and develop action plans based on all five of the dimensions. All of the partner schools have contractual agreements and are involved in mutual renewal, initial teacher preparation, and professional development. The vast majority of field placements are made in partner schools; however, due to the enrollments in teacher preparation programs and the extent of field experiences required in those programs, some field placements by necessity extend beyond the 14 partner schools. Documentation of the partnership's impact on P-12 students and pre-service teachers is collected annually from each partner school and provides some initial positive evidence.**

**A Professional Development District (PDD) is being developed in collaboration with Screven County Schools. All three of its schools are currently partner schools. The PDD will also involve a privately-operated alternative school and will involve the University's school counseling and educational leadership preparation**

programs. The focus of the PDD work will be on closing the achievement gap between various groups of learners (based on race, gender, and socio-economic status).

During the past year, a pilot was conducted of the Intensive School Assistance model at Langston Chapel Elementary School. This program is a collaborative effort between Georgia Southern University and P-12 schools where externally-conducted “snapshots” are gathered to assist in school improvement efforts.

**II A (7). Institutions have at least an 80% annual pass rate on PRAXIS II for each reportable demographic group of teacher candidates by 2006,<sup>2</sup> while maintaining or increasing the number of minority teachers prepared; institutions set annual goals toward the 80% threshold between 2002-2006 (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Partial plan in place

2 = Plan in place for each program that includes baseline data, annual goals, timeline, milestones as to numbers targeted, strategies for reaching goals, and how progress is to be evaluated

3 = Less than an 80% annual pass rates on PRAXIS II for all reportable demographic groups within each field in which the institution prepares teachers, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority teachers prepared

**4 = At least an 80% annual pass rate on PRAXIS II for all reportable demographic groups within each field in which the institution prepares teachers, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority teachers prepared**

For all reportable demographic groups (with at least 10 test takers), there is at least an 80% pass rate (see below). For program areas with fewer than 10 test takers that did not reach this goal (e.g. Secondary Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Language), plans are in place within departments to provide assistance to students to help ensure success on the teacher certification examination and at the same time recruit and retain minority candidates. Systems are in place to monitor pass rates and enrollments.

**PRAXIS II Pass Rates by Ethnic Group (where all groups have at least 10 test takers)  
April 15, 2001 – April 15, 2002**

Test Name	Attempted	Passed	Percent Passing
Elem Ed: Content Area Exercises			
Black	11	11	100%
White	66	64	97%
Elem Ed: CIA			
Black	13	11	85%
White	70	64	91%
Special Educ: Knowledge Based Core			
Black	12	10	83%
White	24	23	96%

**II A (8). Institutions support and recognize faculty for participation in teacher preparation and in school improvement efforts through decisions in such areas as promotion and tenure, salary increases, workload, and allocation of resources (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Faculty reward system under study for teacher preparation faculty in education

2 = Faculty reward system under study for teacher preparation faculty in education and the arts and sciences

3 = Teacher preparation faculty in education and the arts and sciences supported and recognized in reward system

**4 = Evidence that the success of teacher preparation faculty in promotion, tenure, merit salary increases, and post-tenure review is comparable to that of non-teacher preparation faculty**

The University and College of Education policies support faculty participation in teacher preparation and school improvement efforts and these activities are recognized in promotion, tenure, merit increase, and post-tenure review processes. Faculty who serve as field associates in partner schools have workload assignments that take into account their involvement in the schools to support teacher preparation and school improvement efforts. Of the five COE faculty who applied for tenure to be effective fall 2002, four are teacher education faculty and were granted for tenure. Of the three COE faculty who applied for tenure effective fall 2001, two are tenure education faculty and were approved. Of the three COE faculty who applied for a promotion to be effective fall 2002, two are teacher education faculty and were granted promotion. Of the six COE faculty who applied for a promotion effective fall 2001, three are teacher education faculty and two were granted promotion (the application for the third person was considered early and the denial did not reflect a lack of recognition for her participation in teacher preparation and school improvement efforts). All teacher education faculty who participated in post-tenure reviews during the 2000-01 and 2001-02 academic years were successful. Of the seven faculty who went through this review, three were teacher education faculty. For teacher education faculty outside the COE, similar success in tenure and promotion has been experienced. Teacher education faculty also receive comparable merit salary increases and their work in schools is considered during the annual review process when the increases are proposed.

**II B. Performance—Teacher Candidates**

**II B (1). Teacher candidates demonstrate sufficient depth in all content fields included on teacher certificate to bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning (1998)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes content required to pass PRAXI II and content teachers will be expected to teach in schools

2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates content knowledge is sufficient to bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning

3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they have sufficient content knowledge to bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning

**4 = Evidence that teacher candidates recommended for certification have sufficient content knowledge in all content fields included on teacher certificates to bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning**

Teacher preparation programs in early childhood, middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teaching fields include required content courses that have been aligned with the Georgia Quality Core Curriculum, Praxis II objectives, and the appropriate national professional organization standards. Included in each of these programs are required content courses that address each of these objectives and standards. Program performance outcomes and course syllabi include numerous opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their content knowledge, including field experiences linked to the courses in curriculum and methods and student teaching. In addition, programs include a systematic process for monitoring the progress of candidates, including GPA and demonstrated performances within courses and field experiences. Programs have in place a program retention policy that requires that candidates demonstrate content preparation appropriate for diverse groups, including field experience rubrics that include performance outcomes that address evidence that candidates can demonstrate multiple strategies for teaching content to diverse groups and strategies that promote high levels of learning. This year the early childhood education program adopted a unit/work sample format that emphasizes assessment of student learning and addresses the diverse groups of learners in the classroom. Georgia Southern's May 2001 report provided copies of the program performance outcomes and assessments that are used; additional copies are available.

## **II B (2). Teacher candidates set high learning standards for all students and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes strategies for teaching in standards-based schools

2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which teacher candidates set high learning standards for all students and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards

3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can set high learning standards for all students and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards

**4 = Teacher candidates are assessed on their performance in using high learning standards for all students and organizing curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the standards**

Teacher preparation programs in early childhood education, middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teaching fields include program performance outcomes that are aligned with INTASC, NBPTS, and the standards from the various learned societies. Teacher candidates are required to demonstrate that they can organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around these standards within each of the pedagogy courses and field experiences in the program. Performance outcomes within the programs have been developed in order to monitor student progress throughout the programs, as well as in student teaching. These performance outcomes are assessed in each of the courses in curriculum and methods, course content, and each of the field experiences. Candidates must be successful in these areas of competency during the required field experiences and methods courses in order to be retained in the program. The early childhood program has developed a unit format that emphasizes organizing curriculum, instruction, and assessment around national and state standards. The unit format is introduced as candidates enter the program and it is integrated throughout course work and field experiences. Examples of these materials were submitted as evidence in the May 2001 report.

## **II B (3). Teacher candidates customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes strategies for customizing instruction
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which teacher candidates customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
- 3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
- 4 = Teacher candidates are assessed on their performance in customizing instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs**

**Program performance outcomes, course syllabi, and field experience rubrics in the teacher preparation programs include opportunities for candidates to demonstrate that they can customize instruction for individual students or groups of students, reflecting the students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs. These competencies are demonstrated within the context of curriculum and methods courses as well as each field experience. The early childhood unit format requires candidates to analyze the learners with whom they work in order to effectively plan instruction. The unit format is introduced as candidates enter the program and is integrated in all of the program's required courses and field experiences. Candidates must be successful in customizing instruction based on learner needs in required field experience in order to be retained in the program. Examples of these materials were submitted as evidence in the May 2001 report.**

#### **II B (4). Teacher candidates in early childhood education diagnose difficulties in reading and mathematics and know what to do about them (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes strategies for diagnosis and remediation of difficulties in reading and mathematics
- 2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates are able to diagnose and remediate difficulties in reading and mathematics
- 3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can diagnose difficulties in reading and mathematics and implement intervention strategies
- 4 = Evidence that teacher candidates recommended for certification are successful in diagnosing difficulties in reading and mathematics and implementing appropriate intervention strategies**

**Teacher candidates in early childhood education use the knowledge and skills learned in methodology courses ECED 4233 and ECED 4333 in order to evaluate students in the areas of reading and mathematics. Based on the data gathered, candidates diagnose the difficulty, determine a course of action, and implement appropriate instruction as part of the field component to those methods courses. Candidates must be successful in diagnosing reading and mathematics difficulties and in the required field experience in order to pass the courses and be retained in the program.**

**II B (5). Teacher candidates use data on student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward continuous improvement (2001)**

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

Well-designed assignments are given in the teacher preparation program that are coordinated throughout courses and experiences from program entry to exit. These assignments include units of instruction (student work samples) and learning plans that require candidates to collect assessment data, analyze the data, and reflect upon student learning. Candidates are required to demonstrate how they assess student learning using pre-post test information, student products, reflections on student learning and how instruction is modified to address learning needs, and how resources are selected to enhance student learning. Benchmarking is a critical component of the planning-teaching-reflecting-planning process. To better support evaluation of the assignments, rubrics and other assessment tools used by faculty have been restructured to include how teacher candidates show evidence of student learning.

**II B (6). Teacher candidates use telecommunication and information technologies as tools for learning and they meet the Georgia Technology Standards for Educators (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes the use of telecommunication and information technologies that meet the Georgia Technology Standards for Educators
- 2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates use telecommunication and information technologies as tools for learning and meet the Georgia Technology Standards for Educators
- 3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use technologies effectively as tools for learning and that they meet the Georgia's Technology Standards for Educators
- 4 = Evidence that teacher candidates recommended for certification use technologies effectively as tools for learning and that they meet Georgia's Technology Standards for Educators**

Each teacher candidates must demonstrate that he/she can use technologies effectively as tools for learning and that they meet Georgia's Technology Standards for Educators. Technology standards have been integrated within the context of each program—from Pre-Professional Block in Area F through Student Teaching. The performance outcomes are reflected in the program outcomes, course syllabi, and all of the field experiences. A matrix has been developed by each program area indicating where each technology competency is introduced, practiced, and assessed to assist in tracking progress and mastery of the competencies. Candidates must demonstrate their competency with using the technologies as tools for learning in order to be recommended for certification.

## **II B (7). Teacher candidates manage classrooms effectively (1998)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes classroom management strategies
- 2 = Assessments in place to monitor the extent to which teacher candidates manage classrooms effectively
- 3 = Teacher candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can manage classrooms effectively
- 4 = Evidence that teacher candidates recommended for certification manage classrooms effectively

**The early childhood, middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teacher preparation programs all include multiple performance outcomes within pedagogy courses and field experiences that assess candidates' performance in managing classrooms effectively. Candidates must demonstrate their competency in classroom management in order to successfully complete student teaching, as evidenced by assessment rubrics and checklists used.**

## **III. Results**

### **III A. Teacher candidates are accomplished in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement at point of initial recommendation for certification (1998)**

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

**Each teacher preparation program in early childhood, middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teaching fields includes opportunities during field-placements for teacher candidates to demonstrate that they are accomplished in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement. Each program includes performance outcomes that assess the candidate's ability to assess and promote student learning for diverse groups. However, a systematic process for monitoring progress of teacher candidates needs to be refined for the middle grades, secondary, and P-12 programs. Program performance outcomes, course content in curriculum and methods courses, and field-experience rubrics are currently being refined to reflect a stronger process for systematically monitoring the progress of candidates in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement. As part of this refinement, faculty members are refining program requirements that will require candidates to use work samples and multiple assessment strategies to determine whether or not candidates are able to demonstrate that they can bring P-12 students to high levels of learning and achievement. These refined performance outcomes will be completed and implemented in 2002-2003. These competencies will become a major part of the program retention policy and will become a part of student teaching in order to determine the level of proficiency prior to making a recommendation for certification.**

The early childhood education program fully meets this standard set by this Principle.. The early childhood teacher candidates demonstrate their ability to bring about student learning through the data collected and submitted as part of the early childhood unit. Also, the candidates provide evidence of bringing about student learning through a portfolio and capstone interview that has been incorporated into the course ECED 4633 P-5 Senior Seminar.

**III B. After two years of teaching, program graduates show advanced levels of accomplishment in bringing P-12 students from diverse groups to high levels of learning and achievement (2001)**

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

Planning has occurred related to tracking teacher graduates, collecting data on their success in impacting student learning, and providing induction and mentoring support for them during their first two years of teaching. Barriers still exist, however. Employment self-reporting is inadequate and data on student learning and achievement in Georgia schools by teacher is not easily available. However, we are poised to assist our graduates through their first two years as beginning teachers, especially those who accept teaching positions in our partner schools.

**III C. Experienced teachers completing graduate programs are accomplished in the five core principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (1998)**

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

Teachers completing graduate programs in early childhood, middle grades, secondary, and P-12 teaching fields have opportunities as part of their programs to demonstrate that they can meet the National Board Standards. Program performance outcomes for each of the graduate programs are aligned with the National Board Standards. Candidates are provided opportunities to demonstrate each standard within the context of required

courses, school-based projects, action research projects, and the comprehensive exit exams.

During Spring 2002, NBPTS Facilitator Institute I training was provided on the Georgia Southern campus to approximately 30 local NBCTs, key p-12 central office personnel, and Georgia Southern faculty members. The remaining PSC-approved training will be provided on the campus in late June 2002. Georgia Southern will offer 304 sections of The Knowledgeable Teacher 20-hour course during July 2002 to about 100 teachers who are interested in pursuing national board certification. The second and third facilitation courses will be offered as graduate courses during the 2002-03 academic year. This intensive involvement in NBPTS is strengthening local efforts to support national board certification and the integration of NBPTS core principles in the M.Ed. and Ed.S. graduate programs.

### **III D. Through partner schools (or approved alternative) P-12 students from diverse groups are learning and achieving at high levels (1998)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Plan in place to measure extent to which P-12 students from diverse groups who attend partner schools (or approved alternative) are learning and achieving at high levels

2 = Plan implemented in some partner schools (or approved alternative)

**3 = Plan implemented in all partner schools (or approved alternative)**

4 = Evidence that P-12 students from diverse groups who attend partner schools (or approved alternative) are learning and achieving at high levels

An assessment plan is developed for partner schools and P-12 student learning from diverse groups is documented in certain schools. Assessment is focused on specific partnership goals, such as reading scores for students identified with special needs at an elementary partner school, instead of overall achievement for groups of learners at the school. Since many factors impact student learning and our partner schools are focusing on specific improvement areas, our assessments are designed to monitor progress based on those specific areas. The Screven County Professional Development District, in its development as an innovative model and including the three partner schools in that school system, will be focusing on closing the achievement gap and tracking students from elementary to middle and high school.

## **SECTION II: EDUCATIONAL LEADERS**

### **I. Inputs**

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

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Controlled by the college of education; roles of other colleges and school partners at input level

- 2 = Equitable representation among college of education, other colleges, and school partners; advisory to education dean**
- 3 = Equitable representation among 3 groups, responsible for aspects of leader preparation, but no authority over programs
- 4 = Equitable representation, responsibility, and authority for the preparation of leaders among education, other academic units, and school partners

**The Teacher Education Advisory Council (with equitable representation of COE, A&S and P-12 educators) is responsible for all educator preparation programs; however, the primary focus of TEAC has been on teacher preparation. The Educational Leadership program has a seat on the Teacher Education Advisory Committee and it is also involved in Georgia Southern's P-16 Initiative. The Council recommends revisions to programs related to teacher education and leader preparation. They consider issues related to overall operating policies and procedures. The Council coordinates governance of educator and leader preparation throughout the College of Education and university. It provides a strong communication function by keeping various and diverse groups involved with leader preparation and focused on the ever-changing field of educational administration**

The College of Education Dean's Advisory Council is composed of faculty representatives from each of the program areas of the College. A faculty member from Educational Leadership is a member of the Council and provides two-way communication from the Council and from the Educational Leadership program. This Council links the College and the Educational Leadership program in disseminating, communicating, and recommending revisions for programs offerings associated with the preparation of school and system leaders that address school improvement, student achievement, high expectations for all students, school based decision making, school based research, P-16 initiatives, Partner Schools, and results based standards (ISLLC).

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

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Advisory committee meets infrequently and gives feedback on program redesign presented by the college faculty
- 2 = Advisory committee meets regularly and relies on surveys of graduates and their supervisors as measures of success**
- 3 = Advisory committee meets regularly and relies on extent to which graduates meet the performance and results outcomes of the guarantee as measures of success
- 4 = Advisory committee meets regularly and relies on extent to which graduates meet the performance and results outcomes of the guarantee as measures of success; advisory committee recommends strategies for continuous improvement of the program based upon the data

**An Educational Leadership Program Action Team (PAT) meets twice a year (Fall/Spring). This 24-member body is made up of representatives from P-12 school systems, technical colleges, RESA, other 4 year institutions, program faculty, and the Dean of the College of Education. This advisory committee reviews enrollment data, program offerings, survey data on school improvement, alignment of course content with ISLLC Standards, data on regional program opportunities for off campus cohorts,**

The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) also serves as an advisory committee for the program by providing recommendations for revisions to the Educational Leadership program related to school and system leaders preparation and certification. See IA. In Teacher Preparation section.

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

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

**Beginning Fall 2002 all educational leadership courses will require 25 contact hours in schools. This will ensure that students complete a minimum of 100 clock hours prior to a more intensive experience at the end of the program. Three course (9 credit hours) at the end of the program will consist of a minimum of 150 contact hours designed for each student to experience the opening and closing of school. These three courses are offered as a culminating experience for Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters. These experiences will be based on the ISLLC standards (knowledge, dispositions, and performance).**

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

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

**Admission requirements into the initial preparation program (the M.Ed. Educational Leadership program) include that students must present a GPA of 2.50 or higher on all undergraduate course work and present a score of no less than 450 on the verbal subtest and a score of no less than 450 on either the quantitative or analytical subtest of the GRE, or a score of no less than 44 on the MAT. Provisional admission criteria are also identified. The Ed.S. program requires an MAT of 49 and a minimum GPA of 3.25 as well as a minimum of two years experience in school work. The admissions review process ensures that those admitted into the Educational Leadership programs meet the criteria. The admission criteria is comparable, if not higher, than those for other graduate programs at the University and are within the institution's range of GPAs and test scores for graduate students admitted.**

**II A. Performance—Institutions**

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

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

Georgia Southern’s Program for Assuring Quality for Educator Preparation Programs (PAQ) plan provides a guaranty that includes *all* educators prepared by the institution, including school leaders. Implementation of the plan is set for Fall 2002. See II.A.(1) in Teacher Preparation section.

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

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

Active recruitment is underway serving a large region of the state. Recruitment has focused on high quality candidates from various racial and cultural backgrounds. The existing recruitment plan involves working collaboratively with school systems and with other universities in the system (Armstrong Atlantic State University and Augusta State University) to form cohort groups to deliver Educational Leadership programs at off-campus sites that are more convenient to students. During Fall, 01 the College of Education approved a half time recruitment position providing recruitment opportunities for the College.

The College of Education reorganization plan includes an Associate Dean for Graduate programs and a Coordinator with job specific duties for recruitment and retention. These two positions will positively impact the Educational Leadership programs in seeking high quality applicants from majority and minority groups.

**II A (3). In collaboration with the schools, institutions mentor graduates on all dimensions of the guarantee during their first two-years of practice as newly certified educational leaders in Georgia (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

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

**The Mentoring Administrators Program (MAP) provides two years of support, assistance, and professional development for newly certified leaders. The MAP program has been serving eight school systems in the region with Educational Leadership faculty meeting monthly with new administrators. This program offers on-site in-service opportunities that are specifically pertinent to the participants, school and personal needs in impacting school improvement and student success.**

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

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

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

**Educational leadership faculty are involved in the development of the PDD in Screven County. Screven County schools was the initial partner with Educational Leadership in the MAP mentoring program. The model for this partnership will addresses the dimensions stated in the Principle and will be a natural**

extension of the work to date with Educational Leadership and Georgia Southern’s partner school initiative. From this PDD in Screven County model other PDD districts will be established to further address the components of the Principle.

The Educational Leadership faculty provide extensive in-depth diagnosis for individual schools through the Intensive Assistance for School Improvement program. During the 2001-2002 school year, the faculty worked with six regional P-12 schools, diagnosing school practices for student achievement, teacher and administrator practices for school improvement, teacher instructional practices, and provided recommendations for addressing specific objectives for student learning and teacher practices to assure appropriate student learning. This process provided the school leader with a snapshot of the school from a team of university faculty from content areas, school leadership, and research, plus a district Curriculum Director that observed each classroom in the school for 5 minute intervals on three separate visits. The results of the data from the snapshot instruments and a Site Review document were compiled and shared with the principal of the school to assist the School Improvement Team to focus in developing the school’s action plans for improved student achievement, climate, best practices for instruction, high expectations for students and faculty, and involvement of all stakeholders in the school improvement process.

During the Fall, 02 the Educational Leadership faculty will be reorganizing, examining, modifying, and aligning courses to address each of the components within this Principle. This process is an ongoing procedure so course content is built on school improvement, ISLLC Standards, and student achievement.

**II A (5). Institutions have at least an annual 80% pass rate on certification exam(s) for each reportable demographic group of leader candidates by 2006,<sup>3</sup> while maintaining or increasing the number of minority leaders prepared; institutions set annual goals toward the 80% threshold between 2002-2006 (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Partial plan in place
- 2 = Plan in place that includes baseline data, annual goals, timeline, milestones as to numbers targeted, strategies for reaching goals, and how progress is to be evaluated
- 3 = Less than an 80% annual pass rates on certification exam(s) for all reportable demographic groups, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority leaders prepared
- 4 = At least an 80% annual pass rate on certification exam(s) for all reportable demographic groups, while maintaining or increasing the number of minority leaders prepared**

Pass rates on Praxis II for Educational Leadership graduates exceeds the 80% annual rate goal (see below).

Test Name	Attempted	Passed	Percent Passing
<b>Educational Leadership</b>			
Black	11	11	100%
White	41	38	93%

**II A (6). Institutions support and recognize faculty for participation in leader preparation and in school improvement efforts through decisions in such areas**

**as promotion and tenure, salary increases, workload, and allocation of resources  
(2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Faculty reward system under study for leader preparation faculty in education
- 2 = Faculty reward system under study for leader preparation faculty in the college of education and other colleges vested in the collaborative that prepares educational leaders
- 3 = Leader preparation faculty in the college of education and other colleges vested in the collaborative are supported and recognized in reward system
- 4 = Evidence that the success of leader preparation faculty in promotion, tenure, merit salary increases, and post-tenure review is comparable to that of non-leader preparation faculty**

The University and College of Education policies support faculty participation in teacher preparation and school improvement efforts and these activities are recognized in promotion, tenure, merit increase, and post-tenure review processes. During the Program Review process, the Educational Leadership programs were recommended for enhancement by the University.

Due to the extensive work in schools by Educational Leadership faculty and program enhancement, faculty lines in the program have been expanded substantially. In the Fall, 02, a faculty line will be specific to clinical supervision for the practicum that has increased from three semester hours to nine semester hours. This faculty member will be responsible to provide the culminating experience for school leaders that addresses all areas of the BOR principles and the ISLLC Standards. The faculty member will build on the individual course field-experiences of students ascertaining that ISLLC or BOR principles that have not been addressed will be met and included in the student's culminating portfolio. This faculty member will work in conjunction with all other Educational Leadership faculty and other College faculty necessary for the student to meet all qualifications to attain certification and impact school improvement at his/her individual school.

In the past year there have been no applications for tenure or promotion by Educational Leadership faculty. The one post-tenure review which has occurred was successful. Educational leadership faculty receive comparable merit salary increases and their work in schools is considered during the annual review process when the increases are recommended.

**II B. Performance—Leader Candidates**

**II B (1). Leader candidates set high expectations for all students in the school or system and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes strategies for leading standards-based schools
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates set high expectations for all students and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities in field-placements to demonstrate that they can set high expectations for all students in the school or system and organize curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations**

4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in setting high expectations for all students in the school or system and organizing curriculum, instruction, and assessment around the high expectations

**Courses leading to the culminating 12 month field-experience are designed based on the ISLLC Standards (at all levels) and the BOR principles. The field-experience include modules on setting high expectations for all students; development, organization, and implementation of strategies for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and the relationship of curriculum, instruction, and assessment and student success. Each candidate will be required to provide documented activities that he/she experienced in this BOR principle providing assessment on performance of the principle and ISLLC Standards.**

**II B (2). Leader candidates use data on student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward continuous improvement (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes strategies for using data on student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress

2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates use data on student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks

**3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use data on student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks**

4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in using data on student learning and achievement to set benchmarks and to monitor student progress toward meeting benchmarks

**All Educational Leadership courses include competencies related to the development of school improvement plans addressed in the ISLLC Standards. Building from prerequisite course content, field-experience modules will contain content for assessing, developing, and implementing an in depth school improvement plan addressing student learning. The candidate will have experiences in the use of student data on achievement and the setting of benchmarks for student improvement. The candidate will be required to develop a school improvement plan that addresses all aspects of continuous improvement of a school. A school leader must have the capability to develop and implement a school improvement plan that is based on school data that is viewed realistically and openly. It is the goal of the Educational Leadership faculty that candidates must be capable of developing a school improvement plan that addresses the true needs of all students to achieve at a high level. To do that, the candidate must be able to understand and use student achievement data and set appropriate benchmarks for reaching goals. This must be done not just by the school leader, but by all members of the learning community so that continuous improvement for student achievement will be realized. This monitoring of student progress must be understood by the candidate and he/she must have the ability to choose strategies that will be appropriate to address the individual needs of students and stakeholders.**

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

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes use of technology to meet individual learning needs of students, teachers, and administrators
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates use technology effectively to meet individual learning needs of students, teachers, and administrators
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use technology effectively to meet individual learning needs of students, teachers, and administrators**
- 4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in using technology effectively to meet individual learning needs of students, teachers, and administrators

**A technology course is required in each of the educational leadership programs. These courses are based on the new Georgia Technology Standards for Educators, using the Performance Descriptors for Certified School Leaders and delivered by Instructional Technology faculty.**

**In each of the courses leading to the field-experience culminating work, Educational Leadership faculty require 25% of each course devoted to the use of technology as a component of the course. This requirement prepares the candidate in the use of the internet for research, networking, and improving their technical skills in technology. This preliminary use of technology provides the foundation for the in depth use of technology and its usefulness as a tool for the practicing school leader. The field-experience components expand technology use to include data analysis, research of programs, curriculum, and instruction; issues and trends in leadership; resource opportunities; technical applications; and various other important uses that technology provides for the school leader. It is important that candidates understand the multitude of uses that technology plays in the daily operations of today's school and system. The field-experience will be designed to address technology use, the ISLLC Standards, and the Georgia Technology Standards for Educators.**

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

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes strategies for leading schools using standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates use standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement**
- 4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in leading schools using standards-based objectives, results-based performance management, and continuous improvement

**Course work is designed for students to use strategies for leading standard-based schools through development and the implementation of in depth school improvement plans focused on student learning and achievement. During field-experiences candidates will demonstrate that they can use standards based objectives by performing a in depth needs assessment of their school, addressing student data, climate data, demographic data, teacher performance, and any other data that is pertinent to developing a results-based school improvement plan. Candidates will include in the development and implementation of this plan all applicable stakeholders. They will understand the individual components of the plan and relationship to one**

an other and that the plan is a living breathing document that addresses continuous improvement of the school. Assessment will be based on documentation of the use of ISLLC Standards.

**II B (5). Leader candidates raise perceptions of all parties that the school or system can do better (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes strategies for raising perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better

2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates raise perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better

**3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can raise perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better**

4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in raising perceptions of all parties that a school or system can do better

Course work leading to the culminating field-experience is designed to develop an in depth needs assessment addressing all areas of school improvement including all stakeholders within the learning community. Modules within the field-experience will address the appropriate use of stakeholders in development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Each candidate will understand the power of empowering the learning community as it relates to high expectations, and student achievement. The goal is that school leaders have the ability to work with all constituents and understand how to include all stakeholders in attaining school improvement through high expectations for all the learning community and that all students can learn. As the school leader, candidates will understand that as the leader, he/she sets the tone for school improvement. Components of the modules will be based in the ISLLC Standards and assessed by portfolio entries and documented field-experiences.

**II B (6). Leader candidates develop a school or system plan for improvement (2001)**

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes strategies for developing school and system plans for improvement

2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates develop a school or system plan for improvement

**3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can develop a school or system plan for improvement**

4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in developing a school or system plan for improvement

Courses prior to the field-experience involve students in the designing, researching, writing, and implementing and evaluating a school improvement plan for their schools. Modules within the field-experience will focus on opportunities to demonstrate that the candidates can perform an in dept needs assessment of a school listing the strengths and weaknesses of the school through the use of researched data on student progress, climate, school demographics, etc.; development of a vision and mission of the school; using data to develop a school action plan that includes measurable goals and objectives based on the needs assessment; action plans including resource allocation and timelines; professional development needs of the faculty aligned with the needs assessment and research data; inclusion of all programs within the school that are related to student achievement; school budget; and evaluation of the school improvement plan components. The goal is that upon completion of the field-experience, the candidate will be appropriately prepared to enter any school assessing needs and developing and implementing a school improvement plan

that is focused on that school's student achievement and continuous improvement. Components of the modules will have as a foundation research based development of school improvement and the ISLLC Standards.

**II B (7). Leader candidates help teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes strategies for customizing instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates help teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can help teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs**
- 4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in helping teachers customize instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs

During field-experience, candidates receive module content that addresses the curriculum issues involved in customizing instruction for individual students or groups of students that reflect students' own experiences, learning styles, interests, cultures, and special needs. Individual modules will address special education requirements, law, and procedures that school leaders must possess to be knowledgeable about special education practices and placement. Specific modules addressing student learning styles, interests, cultural diversity, and customization of instruction for students will be an integral part of the 12-month field-experience. The goal is to develop school leaders who are instructional leaders of a diverse student and faculty organization. Components of the modules will be based in the ISLLC Standards.

**II B (8). Leader candidates provide students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services (2001)**

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes the study of a comprehensive program of student support services for standards-based schools
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates provide students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can provide students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services**
- 4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in providing students with the resources they need to achieve high learning standards through a comprehensive program of student support services

As part of the modules of the field-experience, candidates will gain an understanding of the resources (time, money, and materials) and the varied support services available to them in leading their school to continuous improvement. The candidates will be knowledgeable of what constitutes high learning standards, appropriate selection of student support services, and their relationship to a comprehensive program of student achievement. Components of the modules will be based in the ISLLC Standards and assessed through portfolio artifacts and field-experience documentation.

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

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes strategies for increasing student learning-time through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates increase student learning-time as needed through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can increase student learning-time as needed through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology**
- 4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in increasing student learning-time as needed through use of flexible schedules, structures, and technology

During field experiences and module seminars, candidates will address the use, development, and implementation of flexible schedules, learning structures, building structures, classroom placement, student movement patterns, and building use for improved and sustained student achievement. Candidates will be required to assess, develop, and implement a school technology plan that addresses technology needs, budgets, resources necessary for implementation and projection for future needs and use. This inclusive plan will be used as a component of the school improvement plan addressing student achievement and learner centered objectives. The ISLLC Standards and Georgia Technology Standards will be used as the foundation of the modules.

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

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Curriculum includes study of the importance of and strategies for establishing a safe and orderly environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement
- 2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates establish a safe and orderly environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement plan
- 3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can establish a safe and orderly environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement plan**
- 4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in establishing a safe and orderly environment that supports reaching goals of the school or system improvement plan

During field-experiences, candidates will be responsible for assessing, developing, and implementing a safe and orderly environment plan that is a part of the school improvement plan. Candidates will research

various options to safe school environment that include legal requirements and ramifications. Candidates will base their activities on the ISLLC Standards and Georgia regulations.

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

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes the study of school law and professional ethics

2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates lead a school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics

**3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can lead a school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics**

4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in leading a school or system in accordance with school law and professional ethics

**Based on a foundation from course content of previous course work, candidates will demonstrate during field-experiences an understanding of school law that impacts all aspects of the school and their actions. Candidates will address the ethical issues that are an integral part of the operations and culture of the school. These activities will be based in the ISLLC Standards and the Georgia Code of Ethics.**

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

0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment

1 = Curriculum includes the study of state-of-the-art technology practices in planning, managing, record keeping, and evaluating schools or systems

2 = Plan in place to assess the extent to which leader candidates implement state-of-the-art technology practices to effectively and efficiently manage resources, planning, record keeping, and evaluations of schools or systems

**3 = Leader candidates have opportunities during field-placements to demonstrate that they can use state-of-the-art technology practices to plan, manage, keep records, and evaluate schools or systems**

4 = Leader candidates are assessed on their performance in using state-of-the-art technology practices in planning, managing, record keeping, and evaluating schools or systems

**In conjunction with the Instructional Technology faculty, the Educational Leadership faculty will provide during field-experiences activities that demonstrate that candidates can use technology to plan, manage, keep records, and evaluate schools or systems. The technology module will be based on the Georgia Technology Standards and ISLLC Standards. Through this module and field-experiences, candidates will demonstrate their ability to effectively and properly use technology for managerial and instructional practice for school improvement.**

## **III. Results**

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

- 0 = Insufficient evidence provided to make a judgment
- 1 = Plans in place to track graduates who move into leadership positions in Georgia schools within two years of graduation
- 2 = Plan in to gather baseline data on student learning and achievement in Georgia schools where new graduates serve
- 3 = Plan in place for induction and mentoring of leaders during their first two years**
- 4 = Evidence that graduates increase student learning and achievement during their first two years as educational leaders

**The Educational leadership program tracks graduates through the Mentoring Administrators Program which provides two years of support and professional development for eight school districts' new administrators. A plan is being developed Summer 2002 to expand the MAP program to include all graduates of the program.**

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

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

**The Educational leadership faculty performed Intensive Assistance for School Improvement diagnosis for six schools during the 2001 – 2002 school year. These six schools include Georgia Southern partner schools as well as schools identified a schools in need of improvement. This diagnosis is the first step in assisting schools in addressing their specific needs for improving student achievement. The Intensive Assistance for School Improvement is a six step process in guiding school leaders, faculties, and stakeholders in developing and implementing a data driven, learner centered school improvement plan that addresses student achievement and high expectations for all students.**

**The Mentoring Administrators Program provides new administrators with professional development and support to address in depth school assessment and improvement. Educational Leadership faculty provide workshops and consulting at the district or school; instead of new administrators traveling to campus. This on site delivery allows participants the opportunity to gain pertinent information and knowledge within their own district. Participants are a part of the selection process for workshops they actually can use in their daily school leadership roles.**