

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**FY 2003 Institutional Report of Progress Toward Meeting the**  
***Regents' Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools***  
**June 2003**

**Part I: TEACHERS**

**I. Inputs**

**I D. Stronger content preparation – high school teachers and those teaching all grades (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 of the BSEd programs in secondary and P-12 education teaching fields continue to offer a content preparation that is equal to an academic major in the various academic departments. Over the past two years, various committees (STEP) have been formed to align the content with PRAXIS II objectives and national content standards. Faculty from the College of Education and faculty from the various academic departments have worked collaboratively to accomplish this goal. As a result, numerous modifications have been made to align course objectives in the various content courses with these standards. In addition, secondary programs in broad fields science and broad fields social science have been deleted and replaced by discipline-specific teaching fields, including history, political science, geography, physics, chemistry, and biology. This change has led to an increase number of content courses in each of these fields, with programs that equal the number of semester hours in an academic major.

**Part 2: TEACHERS**

**II: Performance - Institutions**

**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 = Evidence confirms that 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. See evidence materials attached to 2000-01 report.

Georgia Southern has also developed a performance assessment framework that is based on a revision of the COE Teacher Education Program (TEP) Standards. This assessment framework is grounded in the conceptual framework and aligned with INTASC principles and articulated knowledge, skills and dispositions. This will provide a framework for a revised TEP performance assessment system that will be used by all of the teacher preparation programs. See attached draft.

**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 programs' 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. See evidence materials attached to 2000-01 report.

## **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.

## **III: Results**

### **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. In our Partner Schools, we are supporting beginning teachers (Georgia Southern graduates and any other new teachers in those schools) through collaborative induction activities.

### **Part III: TEACHERS**

See attached Recruitment Plan - 2003

### **Part IV: 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 (2002)**

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, and 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 I.A. in Teacher Preparation section.

The Educational Leadership program is currently conducting an evaluation of its graduates.

**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

All educational leadership courses require 20 contact hours in schools. This ensures that students complete a minimum of 100 clock hours prior to a more intensive experience at the end of the program. Three courses (9 credit hours) at the end of the program consist of a minimum of 200 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 are based on the ISLLC standards (knowledge, dispositions, and performance).

**I D. Admission requirements comparable to those of other graduate programs within the institution (2002)**

- 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: Performance – Institutions and Individual Leadership Candidates**

**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 was implemented in Fall 2002 to assure that Spring 2004 graduates meet all expectations. PAQ provides a guarantee that includes *all* educators prepared by the institution, including school leaders. 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.

The College of Education reorganization plan includes an Associate Dean for Graduate programs whose duties include recruitment and retention. This position positively impacts the Educational Leadership programs by recruitment of 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 School System was the initial partner with Educational Leadership in the MAP mentoring program. The model for this partnership will address 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. The faculty worked with 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.

The process of monitoring and adjusting the program 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>1</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). The number of minority leaders both attempting and passing the PRAXIS II increased from the previous year.

---

Test Name	Attempted	Passed	Percent Passing
Educational Leadership	52	47	90%
Black	15	12	80%
White	37	35	95%

**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 University recommended the Educational Leadership programs for enhancement.

In Fall 2003, a faculty line will be specific to clinical supervision for the practicum that has increased from 3 semester hours to 9 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. 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), the ELCC Standards, and the BOR principles. The field experience includes 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, ISLLC Standards, and ELCC 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, courses contain content for assessing, developing, and implementing an in depth school improvement plan addressing student learning. The candidate has multiple experiences in the use of student data on achievement and the setting of benchmarks for student improvement. The candidate is 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. The Educational Leadership faculty emphasizes that candidates 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 also by all members of the learning community so that continuous improvement for student achievement will be realized. The candidate must understand this monitoring of student progress 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 20% of each course devoted to the use of technology as a component of the course. This requirement prepares the candidate to use 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. All courses are 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 (2002)**

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. Candidates 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 include in the development and implementation of this plan all applicable stakeholders. They understand the individual components of the plan and relationship to one another 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 is designed to develop an in depth needs assessment addressing all areas of school improvement including all stakeholders within the learning community. Within each course, the appropriate use of stakeholders in development and implementation of the school improvement plan is addressed. Each candidate understands the power of empowering the learning community as it relates to high expectations, and student achievement. Coursework emphasizes 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 understand that as the leader, he/she sets the tone for school improvement. Course components are based on the ISLLC Standards and field experiences are assessed by portfolio entries.

## **II B (6). Leader candidates develop a school or system plan for improvement (2002)**

- 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, implementing, and evaluating a school improvement plan for their schools. Within each course candidates demonstrate that they can perform an in depth 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. Upon completion of the program, the candidate is appropriately prepared to develop and implement a school improvement plan focused on that

school's student achievement and continuous improvement. All courses have a research based focus on 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 (2002)**

- 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

Candidates receive course 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 course content addresses special education requirements, law, and procedures that school leaders must possess to be knowledgeable about special education practices and placement. Course content also addresses student learning styles, interests, cultural diversity, and customization of instruction for students. The emphasis is on preparing school leaders who are instructional leaders of a diverse student and faculty organization. Components of all courses are based on ISLLC Standards and emphasize the needs of all learners.

**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

In each course, candidates 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 are 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 all courses are based on 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 (2002)**

- 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

Candidates 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 are 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 are 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

Candidates are responsible for assessing, developing, and implementing a safe and orderly environment plan that is a part of the school improvement plan. Candidates research various options to safe school environment that include legal requirements and ramifications. Candidates develop a plan based on the research and this plan is used as a component of the school improvement plan. Candidates 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 (2002)**

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

Candidates demonstrate during field experiences an understanding of school law that impacts all aspects of the school and their actions. Candidates address the ethical issues that are an integral part of the operations and culture of the school. These activities are 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 (2002)**

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 provide activities that demonstrate that candidates can use technology to plan, manage, keep records, and evaluate schools or systems. The technology use in each course is based on the Georgia Technology Standards and ISLLC Standards. Candidates 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 that provides two years of support and professional development for eight school districts' new administrators.

### **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 is involved through the Professional Development District partnership program with Screven County Schools central office, its three schools, and the Savannah River Challenge Program. Currently the leadership faculty are actively assisting the Screven County Elementary School leadership team in developing, implementing, and evaluating student, faculty, and community surveys to assess strengths, weaknesses, and future needs. The faculty continues to explore other opportunities.

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.