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Introduction

Welcome to Armstrong State University
College of Education and Educator Preparation Program!

The purpose of the Quality Assurance and Assessment Manual is to describe in writing the EPP’s assessment system so that all professional education faculty members in the EPP are aware of and understand the system. The Quality Assurance and Assessment Manual describes how our EPP assessment system supports the accreditation process; how we are organized, and the processes by which we assess ourselves for continuous improvement. Continuous improvement is essential to maintaining and improving the quality of our programs. Improving the quality of our programs helps our candidates to become prepared effective decision makers who are committed to teaching diverse learners.

In 1987, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) organized to promote cooperation among states to develop teacher preparation standards. This resulted in the creation of a national, common core of skills and dispositions that should be acquired by all new teachers. As a result, many state departments of education have partnered with CAEP (NCATE) to meet joint accreditation needs. Georgia has its own set of teacher education preparation standards, some of which relate directly to state legislation. All Georgia standards align with CAEP (NCATE) standards. Currently, a two-way partnership exists between the GA Professional Standards Council (GaPSC) and CAEP (NCATE). Since both have a common core of accreditation requirements, CAEP (NCATE) defers program review to GaPSC that makes program accreditation recommendations to CAEP (NCATE).

Each member of our faculty and staff should be familiar with these descriptions, systems, and processes. The Quality Assurance and Assessment Manual is a living document that captures the constant reflection and revision of a dynamic process supporting the development of our teacher candidates into successful teachers and assessing how well we accomplish that goal. Therefore, these structures are subject to modification based on data-driven improvements from systematic and continuous assessment.

The assessment system was formally adopted by the faculty and implemented beginning in fall 2008, updated annually, and revised and approved by the College of Education (COE) and Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) in November 2008. Since then, the EPP Assessment System and Handbook was updated, revised and approved in January 2013. The Educator Preparation Program Assessment Manual was renamed in October 2013 and revised to update timeline information and changes made to the assessment system based on review of the data. The latest review and revision occurred in June 2015 in preparation for the new GaPSC EPP and Certification rules, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards and review of evidence, and the Teacher Performance Data System – a new state-wide electronic system that will collect data on all teacher candidates and cooperating teacher performance indicators.

Please address any questions, comments, or suggestions about the Educator Preparation Program Assessment Handbook to:

Cynthia Bolton-Gary, Ph. D.
Associate Dean & Assessment/Accreditation Director
College of Education
Armstrong State University
I. COLLEGE AND EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND EPP PROGRAMS

A. Organization of the University
Armstrong State University was established as Armstrong Junior College in 1935 to expand post-secondary educational opportunities in the City of Savannah and in Chatham County. The mayor and alderman of the city accepted the gift of the Armstrong House from the family of George F. Armstrong and used the fine Italian Renaissance structure to house the young college. Over time, six additional buildings in the vicinities of Forsyth Park and Monterey Square were added.

In 1959, Armstrong College of Savannah, as it was known at that time, became a EPP of the University System of Georgia. In 1964, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (BOR) conferred four-year college status on Armstrong and in 1966, moved the campus to its present location on the south side of Savannah.

On June 10, 1996, the growing college changed its name to Armstrong State University (Armstrong) by virtue of BOR action and became one of the university system’s 35 universities that include four research universities, two regional universities, thirteen state universities, eight state colleges, and eight two-year colleges. In 2004, Armstrong secured an 18-acre addition to help meet the needs of its growing student body. This new addition includes the Armstrong Center for Continuing Education and Community Engagement, which opened in 2006. Additional classrooms, laboratories, and meeting/banquet facilities are part of the Armstrong Center.

The University is organized into four colleges each headed by a dean and reporting to the Provost of the University. A department head that reports to the respective dean heads each department with divisions. See the Armstrong College of Education website for academic programs, degrees, minors, concentrations, academic special programs, as well as other important resources. The Armstrong faculty webpage (http://www.armstrong.edu/site/faculty_and_staff/homepage_facstaff_welcome) has links for the policies and procedures including Faculty Handbook describing the organization of the University System of Georgia (USG) as well as faculty policies and procedures. The four college divisions at the university include:

- College of Education
- College of Health Professions
- College of Liberal Arts
- College of Science and Technology

As a comprehensive suburban institution, Armstrong is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and awards associate, baccalaureate, and master’s degrees. Several of its departments maintain accreditation through specific state and national agencies and professional organizations/societies. Currently, Armstrong offers over 100 certificates, undergraduate degrees, and graduate degrees in the arts, sciences, humanities, social sciences, education, health professions, computer science, and information technology. The university serves nearly 7100 students of whom 72% are from the university’s geographic service area. An additional 15% of the student body comes from all corners of the state of Georgia with the final 12.5% representing other states and nearly 72 other countries. Source: Armstrong’s Fact book 2014.

In addition to the main campus, Armstrong offers programs at the Liberty Center in Hinesville (Liberty County). Armstrong offers day and evening classes for learning support, the core curriculum, and other courses leading to associate, baccalaureate, and master’s degrees through the Liberty Center.

The organizational chart for Armstrong is located in Appendix A.
B. Organization of the College of Education

The College of Education (COE) is divided into two departments: The Department of Childhood and Exceptional Student Education (CESE); and The Department of Secondary, Adult and Physical Education (SAPE). See Appendix B for an organizational chart of the EPP, departments, and related offices. Visit http://www.Armstrong.edu/Education/coe_deans_office/coe_education_welcome for links to COE academic departments, degrees and programs of student, faculty and staff directories, student resources, and current news and events related to the school. The Teacher Advisory Council, Initial and Advanced Teacher Certification Programs, and certification only (post baccalaureate programs) complete the organization of the Educator Preparation Programs – EPP (see below for description). In addition, the College of Education also houses two non-certification programs: Child and Family Studies in CESE and Coaching and Recreation in SAPE.

The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) consists of the COE and Teacher Education Programs located in the following divisions and respective departments:

- College of Science and Technology: Mathematics
- College of Liberal Arts: Art and Music
- College of Health Professions: Communication Sciences and Disorders

All of these programs are responsible for the education, development, and training of teacher candidates. It is through successful completion of these programs that recommendations for candidates to the state of Georgia for an Induction Certificate or Certificate of Eligibility is attained. This recommendation is based on the evidence for the successful completion of: required curriculum, field experiences, key assessments, and professional dispositions.

In addition, relationships with the Departments of English, History, Biology and Chemistry are also critical to the Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education. Collaboration with these departments are on-going in order to continue the support to candidate in the respective content areas and continuing development of content specific courses.

*The organizational chart for the EPP is located in Appendix B.*

**Teacher Education Executive Council (TEEC)**

Administrative representatives from the EPP, area school Superintendents and/or their designee comprise the Teacher Education Executive Council (TEEC). The council is charged to advise educator preparation programs regarding issues related to EPP reports, internships, or issues relevant to the COE affecting curriculum, program development or changes. Its role ensures that teacher preparation programs receive direct feedback from their constituents in order to make the best decisions regarding program quality, efficacy, and viability.

The COE recommends candidates to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission for certification; therefore, it is essential that all departments involved in educator preparation work collaboratively when developing programs of study, placing candidates in field experiences and internships, and collecting and analyzing data for decision-making. Educator preparation programs outside the EPP receive placement services for internships through the Office of Field Experiences, Clinical Practice and Partnerships as well as support for induction teachers (0-3 yrs. experience) through the Teacher Induction Program.

**Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC)**

The Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC), chaired by the Dean, is comprised of faculty and staff members from the COE and from other departments and offices on campus, P-12 representatives, community members, and candidates. The mission of the TEAC is to: to review and monitor the Armstrong Educator Preparation Program (EPP) and the quality of its graduates; make suggestions for the improvement of the EPP and program(s); and issue a written report of its meeting through minutes and any special reports
deemed necessary to communicate with the faculty and administration for the improvement of the EPP and program(s).

**Initial Programs**
The following professional education programs are offered that lead to initial certification:

- Early Childhood Education
- Special Education
- Health and Physical Education
- Middle Grades Education (until Spring 2017)
- Art Education
- Music Education
- Spanish Education
- Math with Teacher Education
- Secondary Education: English, History, Science, and Mathematics (suspended until Fall 2018)

In addition, the following programs that lead to initial certification are offered to post baccalaureate candidates (those who have a degree in their respective fields):

- Art Education
- Music Education
- Health & Physical Education (in process, estimated Spring 2018)

The following programs award a Master’s of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree that leads to initial certification:

- Early Childhood Education
- Special Education
- Secondary Education: Math, English, History, Science

**Advanced Programs**
The following professional education programs lead to a Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree and advanced certification include:

- Early Childhood Education
- Special Education
- Curriculum and Instruction (Initial Service Certificate)

Finally, a Master’s of Science degree with the option of initial certification:

- Communication Sciences and Disorders (Initial Service Certificate)
Certification and/or Endorsements
The following professional education programs lead to certification endorsements through the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC):

- Transition Specialist Endorsement Certificate
- Reading Specialist Endorsement Certificate
- Teacher Leader Endorsement

C. Organizations and Programs Connecting the EPP with the College and Community

The EPP is an active part of the college and community with relationships maintained through initiatives and organizations that actively involve faculty, candidates, community member, school personnel, and students. See www.armstrong.edu for detailed description of the centers, services, and special programs offered by the EPP that are woven into the fabric of the community and its schools.

1. Early Childhood Education Advisory Board
2. Curriculum and Instruction Advisory Board
3. Special Education Advisory Board
4. Adult Education Advisory Board
5. Professional Development School Advisory Board
6. Savannah Chatham County School System Partnership
7. First District Regional Education Service Agency (RESA)
8. Coastal Savannah Writing Project
9. Teens for Literacy
10. NOYCE STEM Scholarship Grant
11. P12 Collaborative Initiative (GaPSC, DoE, IHEs)
12. Memorandums of Understanding with more than 50 school districts, private schools, and community partners.

II. EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM’S MISSION and CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The EPP’s conceptual framework is addressed in the College of Education’s vision and mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College of Education serves the community and beyond by preparing effective educators for the twenty-first century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“College of Education candidates who integrate knowledge, theory, practice and technology, who demonstrate professionalism, show respect for human diversity, and collaborate effectively, will function in their professional lives as prepared, reflective decision makers meeting the learning needs of diverse students.” (COE Conceptual Framework, p. 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We value the transformative power of education in human lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. We value the implementation of research-based teaching practices and professional development for ourselves and our candidates.
3. We value an environment that supports collaboration and collegiality among partners in the Educator Preparation Program (EPP), university constituents, and community stakeholders.
4. We value a transparent shared governance structure fostering the development of diverse, reflective leaders.
5. We value the belief that our faculty and candidates understand and respect human differences and are capable of meeting the emotional, social, and instructional needs of diverse learners.
6. We value our commitment to the highest qualities of character, ethics, and professional competence.
7. We value and respect our long standing partnerships with Savannah, its support agencies, and other coastal communities that provide rich and diverse opportunities for our faculty and candidates.

Strategic Goal 1

**The College of Education will build upon our history of producing prepared reflective educators.**

Many of our graduates have served as Teachers of the Year and in other leadership positions in their school systems.

Strategic Goal 2

**The College of Education will continue our commitment to the profession of teaching by ensuring that learning experiences are transformative for both the instructors and the candidates.**

We reinforce our commitment by offering a variety of learning experiences including classroom, field-based, and study abroad options. We begin with mentoring our pre-education majors and continue offering stimulating learning opportunities through the programs.

Strategic Goal 3

**The College of Education will strengthen our efforts to provide quality and diverse technology-based learning experiences.**

We will proactively research, forecast, secure and implement technological innovations.

Strategic Goal 4

**The College of Education will strengthen its financial stability by identifying external sources of revenues.**

We will enhance acquisition of grants and initiatives.

Strategic Goal 5

**The College of Education will increase its visibility through a greater use of technology and other outreach mechanisms.**

We will increase our efforts to secure a level of commitment from prospective students, current candidates, alumni, community constituents, and friends.

Strategic Initiatives

1. The College of Education will develop an annual publication to celebrate the achievements of candidates, graduates, faculty, and to publicize COE initiatives (Strategic Goals 1 and 5).
2. The College of Education will increase grant awards by 20% in 2011-12 (Strategic Goal 4).
3. The College of Education will expand learning opportunities by offering high quality learning experiences in a variety of environments, to appeal to a broad range of potential students in our region and elsewhere (Strategic Goals 2, 3, and 5).

Adopted: September 09, 2011

Conceptual Framework

The College of Education and those partners who compose the Educator Preparation Program share the vision established by the conceptual framework. It guides their efforts as they work collaboratively to develop highly qualified teachers who are prepared to educate diverse learners. The conceptual framework is based upon seven tenets:

- respect for diversity
- essentials of professionalism
- importance of collaboration
- value of authentic assessment
- merit of reflection
- role of technology
- essential pedagogical and content knowledge

The shared vision and seven tenets provide direction for programs of study, instruction, scholarship, and service. They require adherence to high standards of academic, professional, and ethical performance. Armstrong prepared educators exemplify the highest qualities of character and ethical behaviors while demonstrating the dispositions, knowledge, and skills required to succeed in the modern classroom.
| Diversity                  | 1.1 Demonstrate respect for cultural and individual differences. |
|                          | 1.2 Treat all learners equitable and fairly. |
|                          | 1.3 Hold high expectations for the success of all learners. |
| Professionalism          | 2.1 Demonstrate professional, ethical standards of behavior in all interactions with students, parents/guardians, colleagues, administrators, and other constituents. |
| Essentials of Professionalism | 2.2 Show dedication to life-long learning through professional development, involvement in professional organizations, and keeping current with research in one’s field. |
| Collaboration            | 3.1 Employ effective communication that makes families and community constituents true partners in the educational process |
| Importance of Collaboration | 3.2 Collaborate with other professionals to support and maintain high levels of learning for all students. |
| Assessment               | 4.1 Use multiple types of assessment techniques and instruments to measure student learning. |
| Value of Authentic Assessment | 4.2 Model data driven decision making based on assessment. |
|                          | 4.3 Evaluate alignment of instruction and assessment with learning goals. |
| Reflection               | 5.1 Demonstrate the ability to reflect upon and analyze data from observations and assessments. |
| Merit of Reflection       | 5.2 Demonstrate the ability to reflect on pedagogical decisions that affect student learning, the curriculum, and instructional strategies. |
| Technology               | 6.1 Model moral, ethical, and legal use of technology for teaching and learning. |
| Value of Technology       | 6.2 Enhance instruction by facilitating appropriate and effective use of modern technological resources. |
|                          | 6.3 Focus on educational technologies to actively engage in the assessment of learning. |
| Content                  | 7.1 Demonstrate appropriate content knowledge in their chosen field and grade level. |
| Essential Pedagogical and Content Knowledge | 7.2 Demonstrate effective pedagogical content knowledge through EPP and lesson planning, and classroom presentation. |
III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE EPP’S ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The initial design of the assessment system occurred in the spring 2001. A cross-departmental faculty team developed the assessment system rationale, decision points, relationship to the conceptual framework, and key data points for determining initial and advanced candidate progress. The EPP refined the preliminary design in the fall 2007. The assessment system, using internal and external assessment, aligns with professional, state, national, and institutional standards and spans both initial and advanced programs. Since its inception, the basic design of the assessment system has been modified, streamlined, and improved to provide the data necessary for program improvement. The assessment system continues to afford the EPP a structure around which effective programs can be built, maintained, and assessed. In 2013, the first Assessment Manual was written clarifying and organizing the required processes, procedures, and assessments used to assure program quality and candidate excellence. Since then, the Assessment Manual has been updated yearly to keep pace with the substantive changes and requirements in teacher preparation locally, state-wide, and nationally.

The EPP assessment system is multifaceted and receives important information from a number of data streams. To organize and manage the data streams, the EPP has selected LiveText as an electronic assessment and data management system of the candidate competency data and EPP program reports that support its educator preparation programs. Specific candidate demographic and transition data are also collected in databases at other sites.

This system has four broad themes:
1. Data collection to support assessment of competence for certification of candidates.
2. Data collection to support assessment of professional competence of candidates receiving advanced degrees.
3. Data collection to allow assessment of the quality and effectiveness of specific initial preparation programs and non-certification programs, including programs of study and curricula.
4. Data collection to allow the assessment of effectiveness of the College of Education and the Educator Preparation Program including advisement, field experiences, clinical preparation, partnerships.

Data are reviewed and analyzed on a regular basis to analyze and evaluate trends and to support data driven program improvement. To ensure that data are collected and posted in a timely manner, the LiveText coordinator has developed a key assessment blueprint for administrators, faculty, staff, and candidates that assure postings by clearly delineated deadlines, typically set up on a semester basis.

The Dean of the College of Education in conjunction with the Dean’s Advisory Council and Departmental Faculty are responsible for final decision making on proposed changes to EPP policies and procedures on candidate admission, response to changes in state standards and/or University System of Georgia Board of Regents (GaBOR) requirements, EPP operating procedures and policies, and other related decisions. The EPP Assessment Committee is responsible for proposing changes to candidate assessments. Proposed changes to the databases maintained outside LiveText are made by the Data Management Team. Departments are responsible for using posted data to evaluate programs of study and to propose any program or course changes that must be submitted, assessed, and approved through the university’s curriculum review process or the Assessment Committee.
EPP faculty and department heads, clinical faculty, cooperating teachers, and the Director of Field Experiences, Clinical Practice, and Partnerships (OFECPP) make decisions and recommendations based on candidate competency for recommendation to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) for initial certification. The EPP Certification Officer is responsible for maintaining a new statewide database, Teacher Performance Management System (TPMS), that pulls together all final data required for certification recommendations. The Director OFECPP is responsible for maintaining data on completers’ and employers’ surveys that track in-service beginning teachers two years into their professional careers. Department Heads, the EPP Assessment Committee, the Data Management Team, the Director of OFECPP, the Dean’s Advisory Council, and the Office of the Dean are responsible for submitting annual summary of activities reports that are placed in the LiveText Exhibit Center. These reports verify that assessments and evaluations are being conducted in a regular, systematic fashion and outline changes, improvements, and new developments in policies, procedures, assessment measures, courses and/or programs.
A. Armstrong College of Education Assessment Committee

The COE Assessment Committee was established in 2010 – 2011 in order to provide guidance and an organizational structure for assessment efforts within the EPP.

Currently the assessment committee consists of:

- A faculty member representing each program
- One clinical faculty (university supervisor) from each department (CESE & SAPE)
- Each department head, including partner programs (Art/Music, Mathematics)
- LiveText Coordinator
- Director of OFECPP
- Admissions/Certification Officer

The committee is charged with the responsibility to recommend, develop, and evaluate key assessment instruments and procedures used by the Educator Preparation Program to demonstrate accountability and to meet standards for continuing accreditation. The committee’s recommendations regarding EPP assessments, program key assessments, evaluation procedures, and assessment instruments must be approved by the Dean’s Advisory Council before they are implemented by the Educator Preparation Program. Any changes to EPP or program key assessments are considered a substantive change by GaPSC and must be submitted to the state agency.

B. Data Management Committee

The Data Management Committee was established as an ad hoc committee on December 2, 2010 and was made a standing committee of the College of Education on March 29, 2012.

The Data Management Committee is made up of individuals who come into contact with, process, and analyze critical student data. In the College of Education these positions include:

- Graduate Admissions Coordinator
- OFECPP Administrative Assistant
- Department Administrative Assistants
- LiveText Administrator
- Admissions/Certification Officer (Chair)
- Associate Dean (ex officio)

Data collected by College of Education offices is critical to decision making leading to the admission of candidates to programs of study, placement of candidates in field experiences and internships, recommending candidates for initial certification, tracking candidates’ success following certification, as well as for receipt of advanced degrees or endorsements.

The data collected is used to develop and support a variety of College and Educator Preparation Program reports including, but not limited to the following:

- University System of Georgia Board of Regents’ Report (USG-BOR)
- Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Annual Report
- Georgia Professional Standards Commission Preparation Approval Annual Report (Ga PSC-PAAR)
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education’s Professional Education Data System (AACTE-PEDS: currently suspended)
- Title II Report

(Please see Tables on pp. 26-27 for complete list and time tables.)

IV. TYPES OF ASSESSMENTS DEFINED

A. Course Assessments and Critical Assignments
A course assessment is an assessment of each individual student actively enrolled in a particular course. Course assessments are candidate or student assessments that are graded and affect each student’s GPA.

Course assessments are artifacts collected by each individual instructor. Some assessments are collected on LiveText and inform instructors regarding candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Instructors use this information to improve course content and pedagogy.

Critical assignments are those assessments that must be used in all courses with multiple sections. Critical assignments are often a higher percentage value than other assignments and affect student course grades. A course leader is responsible for aligning the course syllabus and critical assignments to institutional, state, and national standards. This review is done yearly, or when there are changes to the standards or course. Depending on the data, critical assignments can be considered for Key Program Assessments, or even Key EPP Assessments. These proposals are submitted to the EPP Assessment Committee whose task it is to weigh the merit as well as the reliability and validity of the new assessment tool, and evaluate the suitability of the instrument for the entire EPP.

B. Key Program Assessments
A Key Program Assessment is an assessment developed and utilized by a specific program to assess faculty, candidates, and/or cooperating teachers/university supervisors. Program assessments are aligned to the conceptual framework, InTASC, state, CAEP (NCATE) and SPA (when appropriate) standards and are used to collect data useful in completing required annual program reports. In the program assessments, the individual student evaluations are aggregated and shown in means, percentages, and graphs, then disaggregated by standard sets to reveal program strengths and areas for improvement. Key Program Assessments provide data needed for specific program improvement. Key Program Assessments are identified by the Department Heads in conjunction with program faculty. Candidates must pass or meet expectations on Key Program Assessments to continue through the program of study. In the case of a candidate not passing, feedback will be given with opportunities to master the developing elements of the assessment.

Key Program Assessment data is collected and stored within The COE’s LiveText Exhibit Center and is available to all College of Education faculty within their LiveText accounts. GACE test data are stored in a COE Database and maintained by the EPP’s Data Management Team.

C. Key EPP Assessments
Key EPP Assessments are comprehensive and provide data needed to see the strengths and weaknesses throughout EPP. They are aligned to the conceptual framework, InTASC, state, CAEP, NBPT standards. Candidates must pass or meet expectations on Key EPP Assessments to continue through the teacher preparation program. In the case of a candidate not passing, feedback will be given with opportunities to
master the developing elements of the assessment. The use of the Candidate Improvement Plan and edTPA feedback form assists in this feedback. EPP Key Assessments include Dispositions, Lesson Plans, and Intern Keys (clinical pedagogical observations), and edTPA. EPP key assessment data are collected and stored within EPP’s LiveText Exhibit Center and are available to all COE faculty within their LiveText accounts. Assessment data are also made available to TEAC, Armstrong Executive Administration, and the Community through a published Annual Assessment Report (beginning summer 2013), and to Georgia Professional Standards Committee through Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR).

D. Key Assessment Proposal, Pilot, Approval Process

After a faculty member or program develops a new Key Assessment, the sponsoring person or program submits the proposal to the Department Head. After a thorough review by the Department Head, the proposal is submitted to the EPP Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee will review the assessment using Rubrics for Evaluation of EPP Instruments Used as Accreditation Evidence (CAEP, 2015). The proposal will then either be approved for Pilot Study, or sent back for further development or clarity. After the pilot implementation, the Assessment Committee will review the data from the assessment, and recommend to approve the Key Assessment or not. Key Assessment Proposals for new assessments, as well as revisions or changes to existing assessments, must be submitted to the Assessment Committee no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled meetings each month. The proposal must be complete and submitted electronically using the Key Assessment Proposal Form located on the College of Education webpage. All documentation must be included and attached electronically for consideration.

V. TRANSITION POINTS, KEY COMMON ASSESSMENTS, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Candidates in the EPP are assessed at several points as they transition through their programs of study. Initial candidates are assessed at six different points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transition Point 1 Pre-Professional Open to all Bachelor degree seeking students meeting University entrance requirements. | 1. Acceptance to the University  
2. Completion of 30 hours & Area A Core  
3. Education majors must see academic advisor two times per year during the entire program of study.  
4. Establish MyPSC account (gapsc.com)  
5. Field Experience Application due during semester advisement for EDUC 2130 | 1. GPA ≥ 2.5  
2. GACE Program Admissions Assessment: ≥ 250, or SAT/ACT exemption  
3. Grades of “C” or better in English 1101 & 1102, Laboratory Science (4), Area A, EDUC 2110, 2120 & 2130 courses  
4. Disposition I Assessment  
5. Background Check (EDUC 2130)  
6. Verification of Tort Liability Insurance  
7. GaPSC Ethics Entry Assessment (#350) |
| Transition Point 2 | Admission Educator Preparation Program (Initial Candidacy) | 1. Professional Program Application deadline: October 15th, March 15th, & June 15th  
2. Completion of all Core and EDUC 2110, 2120, 2130  
3. GaPSC Pre-Service Certificate  
4. Field Experience Application due during advisement each semester | 1. GPA 2.5  
2. GACE Content Assessment (≥220 – Induction)  
3. Disposition II & III Assessment  
4. Lesson Plan EPP Assessment |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Transition Point 3 | Clinical Internship | 1. Completion of all Transition Point 2 requirements  
2. Approval of Internship Application by Advisor and OFECPF Director  
3. Internship Applications deadlines: March 1st and October 1st | 1. GPA ≥ 2.5  
2. CAP/Intern Keys Assessment  
3. Disposition IV Assessment  
4. edTPA submission |
| Transition Point 4 | Program Completion* | 1. Successful completion of Clinical Internship with “S” (Satisfactory)  
2. Recommendation for graduation by Department Head (Graduation Packet)  
3. Recommended for GaPSC Certificate of Eligibility (Certification Office) | 1. GPA ≥ 2.5  
2. Program Completers Survey  
3. University Exit Exam  
4. GaPSC Ethics Exit Assessment (#360)  
5. Passing score for edTPA |
| Transition Point 5 | Induction Teacher | 1. Employment in field  
2. Induction Certificate  
3. 0-3 years Professional Teaching | 1. Alumni Survey (GaPSC)  
2. Employer Survey (GaPSC)  
3. Teacher Evaluation Measure/TKES (GA DOE) |
| Transition Point 6 | Professional Educator | 1. Professional Certificate  
2. <3 years experience professional teaching | 1. GACE Content Assessment ≥250 (Professional) |

*Program completers have completed all requirements for the degree and certification recommendation.
## GRADUATE (Initial) CANDIDATE PROGRESSION AND PROFICIENCIES CHART *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transition Point 1  
Admission to Educator Preparation Program - Initial Candidacy (MAT and Post Bac) | 1. Acceptance to University  
2. Signed Program of Study  
3. Meet with program advisor  
4. GaPSC Pre-Service Certificate (one week after semester begins)  
5. Field Experience Application due during advisement each semester | 1. GPA ≥ 2.5 (last degree)  
2. Background check or verification of school employment  
3. Verification of Tort Liability Insurance  
4. Initial Disposition Assessment  
5. Professional Letter of Intent  
6. GACE Program Admission Assessment: ≥ 250 (or SAT/ACT/GRE/MAT/Praxis I)  
7. GACE Content* ≥ 220 – Induction (*except: ECE/SPED/Art/Music)  
8. GaPSC Ethics Entry Assessment (#350) |
| Transition Point 2  
Initial Candidacy Continuation | 1. No more than 1 ‘C’ in coursework  
2. Field Experience Application due during advisement each semester | 1. Maintain GPA ≥ 3.0  
2. GACE Content** ≥ 220 – Induction (**ECE/SPED/Art/Music)  
3. Lesson Plan EPP Assessment |
| Transition Point 3  
Clinical Internship  
*Open to candidates who have completed all requirements for Transition Point 2 and made the required score on the GACE Content exam.* | 4. Completion of all Transition Point 2 requirements  
5. Approval of Internship Application by OFECCP Director  
6. Internship Applications deadlines: January 15th and September 15th | 1. Maintain GPA ≥3.0  
2. Graduation Application signed by Advisor  
3. CAP/Intern Keys Assessment  
4. Dispositions III Assessment  
5. edTPA submission |
| Transition Point 4  
Program Completion  
*Program completers have completed all requirements for the degree and certification recommendation.* | 1. Successful completion of Clinical Internship with “S” (Satisfactory)  
2. Recommendation for GaPSC Certificate of Eligibility (Certification Office)  
3. Recommendation for graduation by Department Head | 1. Final GPA ≥ 3.0  
2. Program Completers Survey  
3. GaPSC Ethics Exit Assessment (#360)  
4. Passing Score edTPA |
| Transition Point 5  
Induction Teacher Experience  
*Required of all beginning teachers in Georgia with less than 3 years’ experience* | 1. Employment in field  
2. 0-3 years Professional Teaching  
3. Induction Certificate | 1. Completer Survey (GaPSC)  
2. Employer Survey (GaPSC)  
3. Teacher Keys (GA DOE)  
4. Teacher Evaluation Measure/TKES (GA DOE) |
| Transition Point 6  
Professional Educator  
*Open to all teachers who have completed their induction requirements.* | 3. Professional Certificate  
4. >3 years teaching experience | 1. GACE Content Assessment ≥ 250 (Professional) |

### Table 2: Graduate Initial Candidate Progression and Proficiencies  
*Revised June 2015*
**Advanced Programs: Master of Education (M.Ed.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission to Advanced Candidacy</td>
<td>1. Acceptance to the University</td>
<td>1. GPA 3.0 (last degree) or 1030 GRE, 400 MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Signed Program of Study</td>
<td>2. Background check or verification of school employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Induction or Professional Certificate, or Certificate of Eligibility*</td>
<td>3. Initial Disposition Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(*Noted: M.Ed. C&amp;I requires Professional Certificate; M.Ed. ECE and M.Ed. SPED requires initial certification in same field.)</td>
<td>4. Professional Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Candidacy Continuation</td>
<td>1. Action Research Plan approved by advisor</td>
<td>1. Maintain GPA 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No more than 1C in coursework</td>
<td>2. Disposition Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Completion</td>
<td>1. Successful completion Action Research Project/Portfolio</td>
<td>1. GPA 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recommendation for graduation by Department Head</td>
<td>2. Graduation Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Program Completers Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Level Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Alumni Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Employer Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised June 2015*
VI. PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING CANDIDATE’S PROGRESS

Candidates’ progress is formally monitored at each transition point as described in the Procedures for Monitoring Candidates’ Progress in the Professional Education Programs, which were approved by the School of Education faculty and by the Professional Education Board in January 2012.

The monitoring procedures are the following:

A. Procedures for Monitoring Candidates’ Progress in the Professional Education

Transition Point 1: Admission to Armstrong Pre-Education Major
1) The undergraduate candidate applies to the Armstrong Office of Admissions. Upon acceptance, the Office of the Registrar provides the College of Education (COE) with a list of students identifying themselves as pre-education majors.

2) Pre-Education majors are assigned an Armstrong Core Advisor who works with the College of Education who facilitates and monitors progression through the general education (Core) program. Pre-education majors must meet with their advisor at least twice each year and attend mandatory information and orientation sessions.

Transition Point 2: Admission to the Professional Education Program
1) Pre-professional majors submit a Professional Program Application prior to the semester they want to enter the program in conjunction with applying for a Georgia Pre-Service Certificate.

2) Pre-professional majors create a “My GaPSC” account in order to begin the process of applying for a Pre-Service Certificate which entails claiming Armstrong as their EPP and obtaining a background check. In addition, pre-professional majors must complete the Georgia Ethics Entry Assessment.

3) Pre-professional majors complete general education coursework (Areas A-E) and pre-professional education courses (Area F) with a minimum GPA of 2.5, and successfully pass the GACE Basic Skills Tests (#s 200, 201, 202) with a 250 or higher on each test or exempt by SAT, ACT or GRE approved scores.

4) The Pre-Education Advisor verifies the satisfactory completion of all requirements with the applicant and recommends the candidate to the Department Head for formal admission into the professional education program as an education major.

5) The Certification Officer verifies the Pre-Service Certificate for all candidate applications and sends each applicant a letter requiring them to claim enrollment in their MYPSC account through GaPSC and outlines the consequences if the pre-service certificate is not obtained.

6) If the pre-professional major has any issues that do not meet requirements, is borderline for dispositions, or fails to obtain the Pre-Service Certificate, the advisor then flags and forwards the packet to the appropriate Department Head for review.

7) Letters of Acceptance into the Professional Program are mailed to the candidates. Letters of denial are mailed to those who did not meet the requirements specifying which requirements need to be met.

8) Candidates are assigned then assigned to a Professional Education Advisor (program faculty member).

9) Candidate information is updated in their file and on Banner by the Education Advisor and the EPP Departmental Database by the Data Management Team assistant in the respective department.
10) The TPMS Database is updated with the Acceptance Date for each candidate meeting requirements by the Certification Officer.

**Transition Point 3: Admission to Internship**

1) The candidate submits a Clinical Internship Application to the Office of Field Experiences, Clinical Practice, and Partnerships (OFECPP) on or before March 1 for fall semester internship and October 1 for spring semester internship.

2) The Director of OFECPP reviews the application, including completed grade bands for each candidate, and begins the process of placing candidates for Clinical 2 (attention is given to continue Clinical 1 placement for year-long experience).

3) The OFECPP assistant verifies the completion of all requirements for admission to internship.

4) The OFECPP Director finalizes the internship placement and candidates are emailed internship details and dates. Placement information is shared prior to the beginning of the internship. Course holds are lifted by the Education Advisor to give permission for the undergraduate candidate to register for the 12-credit hour internship course when all requirements are met.

**Transition Point 4: Completion of Internship**

1) Candidate’s progress during the internship is continually monitored and assessed by the COE university supervisor and cooperating teacher for required completion of outcomes as assessed by Disposition Assessment, Intern Keys and edTPA submission.

2) The OFECPP Director verifies the completion of all requirements for the internship by auditing all intern files for required forms and assessment data. These files are maintained in the OFECPP database and forwarded to the Certification Officer.

**Transition Point 5: Program Completion and Recommendation for Certification**

1) The candidate submits a Graduation Application the semester prior to graduation. The Education Advisor reviews the form with the candidate and submits it to the Department Chair for final approval.

2) The Office of the Registrar audits the undergraduate candidate’s completion of program requirements.

3) The Certification Officer submits the names and evidence of the candidates’ successful completion of the program to the GaPSC to recommend the candidates for Certification of Eligibility.

4) The candidates’ completed application along with a signed Verification of Program Completion is submitted electronically to GaPSC Office of Certification and one copy retained in the candidate’s file in the COE Office. The original packet is retained in the office of the Certification Officer and then archived after all files for that semester are completed.
VII. ALIGNMENT OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS WITH CONCEPTUAL

A. Initial Programs

The EPP’s assessment system for the initial teacher preparation programs addresses the COE’s conceptual framework performance indicators. The assessment system also addresses the CAEP standards by gathering evidence of candidate selectivity, content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical skills, ethics and dispositions, and effects on student learning.

A curriculum map has been developed that aligns CAP/Intern Keys assessment with the COE’s conceptual framework and InTASC standards. During 2016-2017, departments will work with initial programs to curriculum map InTASC standards, conceptual framework standards, and, when appropriate, SPA standards. In addition, Georgia Common Core standards and the objectives from edTPA will also be analyzed using curriculum mapping.

B. Advanced Programs

Advanced program curriculum maps are being developed that align key assessments with the EPP’s conceptual framework, NBPTS, CAEP standards, and, when appropriate, SPA standards.

VIII. ASSESSMENT OF EPP OPERATIONS

EPP operations are activities undertaken by the COE and EPP partners pertaining to governance, planning, budget, personnel, facilities, services and procedures such as advising and admission, and resources that support the COE’s mission in preparing teachers and leaders.

Some of the ways in which EPP operations are assessed are the following:

A. The EPP ensures that the assessments are aligned to the COE’s conceptual framework and state, InTASC, NBPTS, and SPAS (as appropriate) standards demonstrated in alignment matrices.

B. Candidate Evaluation of the Initial Teacher Education Program (Exit Survey): This is a cumulative survey from the candidate’s perspective regarding the Armstrong’s preparation programs. The data gathered from the survey assist the faculty, Dean, Departments Heads, and staff to assess operations regarding program admission procedures, advising and support services, student teaching/internship placement, availability of courses, library and technology resources, quality of instruction, and overall quality of the program. Data is used for EPP and program improvement. The Exit Survey is anonymous and conducted using LiveText in order to assure candid evaluations.

C. Field Experience Survey: All candidates enrolled in any field experience are required to complete a survey regarding the appropriateness of the placements, expertise of the mentor teacher, and alignment with course objectives and standards.

D. Candidate Evaluation of University Supervisor and Candidate Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher: All candidates enrolled in the initial education program complete these surveys at the end of the clinical internship semester. These forms help Director of OFECP provide the quality of the supervision and support that the candidates received from the college supervisor and from the cooperating teacher.

E. Cooperating Teaching Evaluation of the Clinical Experience: All cooperating teachers supervising clinical interns complete a survey evaluating the clinical experience provided by OFECP.
F. Faculty Teaching Evaluations: Each full-time and part-time faculty member at Armstrong is evaluated by students enrolled in each course each semester. The evaluations are collected by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research, and forwarded to the faculty member and the Department Head.

G. Each Department Head has the responsibility to effectively manage, coordinate, and oversee the planning and personnel of their respective departments. Feedback is sought and obtained from faculty, TEAC, and Director of OFECPP, and Dean’s Leadership Team.

H. GaPSC PAAR Reports: Using TPMS (the GaPSC electronic data management system), educator preparation programs will be analyzed and ranked across the state. Armstrong COE will use this data to improve programs and EPP operations. Information included in the report includes Completer Survey (1 year teachers), Employer Surveys (GA Public Schools), retention data, yield data, effect of student learning data, and Teacher Evaluation Measures (observational data from induction level teachers). (Effective 2016-2017.)

IX. FAIRNESS, ACCURACY, CONSISTENCY, AND ELIMINATION OF BIAS

The EPP uses the following strategies to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency, and elimination of bias throughout its assessment system:

- The EPP ensures that the assessments are linked to the COE’s Conceptual Framework, and the InTASC and CAEP Standards are demonstrated in the alignment matrix in the LT Exhibit Center.
- The COE informs all initial undergraduate and graduate candidates of all requirements in the education program when they initially meet with their pre-education advisor and before they submit their application for admission to the program. Information about the conceptual framework, dispositions expected of candidates, transition points, key assessments, and other requirements are included during the mandatory Education Majors Orientation (prior to Transition Point 2), mandatory Clinical Internship Orientation, and in the Clinical Internship Handbook, which candidates receive at the end of Transition Point 2. The handbooks are also located on the EPP web site.
- Advanced candidates receive information regarding program requirements in the Acceptance Packet, on the school website, and when they meet with the Graduate Advisor to plan and sign the program of study.
- Rubrics to assess candidates’ work are shared with the candidates before the rubrics are used. Thus, candidates know what they will be assessed on, what is expected of them, and the level of proficiency associated with each scoring decision.
- Electronic Forms that are used to assess clinical interns on Intern Keys, and Intern Keys Summary Candidate Evaluation are discussed by the Director of OFECPP at the beginning of each semester with the clinical interns, cooperating teachers, and clinical faculty/university supervisors.
- Rubrics that are used for program specific assessments are discussed with the candidates each semester by the department heads and program faculty members.
- Reliability studies are conducted each year on a rotational basis for EPP Key Assessment Rubrics.
- Validity studies for Disposition Assessment and Lesson Plan Assessment were conducted spring 16, with high positive results regarding the nature of the assessment elements and content validity.
- Data are triangulated wherever possible to enhance the reliability of findings. For example, many of the same questions are asked on the Candidate Exit Survey, the Alumni Survey, and Employer (Principal) Survey. Also, the intern, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor collaboratively completes the intern
CAP/Intern Keys Formative Evaluation (midterm) and CAP/Intern Keys Summary Candidate Evaluation at the end of the semester. Three-way communication then occurs to reach consensus on the midterm and final intern evaluation.

- EPP faculty members review and discuss professional dispositions and evaluation of key assessments at professional education meetings. These discussions are documented in program, department, committee, and COE meeting minutes.
- In order to show candidate progress during a semester, some performance assessments may be administered multiple times at different points of the candidates’ progression through the program. For example, dispositions are first assessed by professionals with whom the pre-candidate has worked to assess work history and responsibility. Dispositions are then measured during an early field experience, during Internship I, and finally in Internship II. This enables the faculty to assess the challenges and areas for growth of dispositions across the program and for each individual candidate.

X. USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

The EPP uses LiveText to maintain the majority of data on its initial education candidates. Candidates are required to purchase a LiveText account similar to purchasing a textbook for the course. Candidates have access to the account at no extra charge for five years. Candidates submit designated key assessments via LiveText. Also, cooperating teachers and college supervisors submit evaluations via LiveText.

Each semester, the LiveText Administrator for the EPP, develops an Assessment Blueprint that includes information on the key common EPP assessments and on the program assessments that are administered via and stored in LiveText. The information includes: course number, who completes the assessment, name of the assessment, date when the assessment is available for use in LiveText, and date when the data are available for faculty to review.

COE has developed an in-house database used to collect and maintain candidate data, including but not limited to, names, demographic information (e.g., race, gender), GPA, transition data (pre-professional, candidate, clinical intern), test scores (e.g., SAT, GACE). Faculty can access this information by logging into the “M” drive. Placement information (field and post graduate employment) is maintained by the OFECPP. This academic year, the M drive was plagued with a number of viruses. In response the COE has decided to capitalize on the TPMS system and adopt the Field Experience Module (FEM) from LT to keep data safe and off-site. The in-house database will still be used as a validating tool for all clinical placement data. Data collected in FEM will include information regarding: P12 school sites demographics; cooperating teacher demographics, experience, certification levels; candidate placements, assignments, attendance, and grade band requirements.

XI. PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND USE

The Educator Preparation Program created the Assessment System Handbook that was endorsed by the Assessment Committee, Dean’s Leadership Team, College of Education (COE) faculty, and the Teacher Education Advisory Council Board (TEAC) in spring 2013 and became effective immediately. The process has been reviewed, revised, and approved annually since 2013.
A. Collecting and Entering Data into LiveText

Data from all common EPP and program assessments will be collected each semester and entered into LiveText by the individual designated to complete the assessment form (i.e. faculty, supervisor, cooperating teacher) within one week after final exam week has ended each semester.

Data for the Field Experiences Module (FEM) will be input by the Director of OFECPP, or the OFECPP Administrative Assistant, regarding university supervisors, cooperating teacher data, candidate data, and course/experience expectations. Candidates participating in field experiences will be responsible for updating data continuously throughout the experience depending on course expectations (attendance, requirements, etc.).

B. Aggregating and Disaggregating Data

1. EPP data from all common EPP assessments will be aggregated for the EPP, and then disaggregated for each program and level through LiveText by the LiveText Administrator within one month after final two weeks has ended each semester.

2. Program data from all specific program assessments will be aggregated for the program through LiveText by the LiveText Administrator within one month after the final exam week has ended each semester.
C. Forwarding Data

1. The aggregated EPP data will be forwarded by the LiveText Administrator to the within three weeks after final exam week has ended each semester.

2. The disaggregated EPP (by departments/program/level) data will be forwarded by the LiveText Administrator to department heads within one month after final exam week has ended each semester. The format of the disaggregated program data for key assessments will be copied into an Assessment Report template for analysis and use by the departments and programs.

D. Summarizing, Analyzing, Reporting, and Disseminating Data

1. Fall Semester

a) By September 15 – Department Heads will meet with their initial certification division faculty to review the aggregated specific program data for the fall semester that includes:

   1) for each EPP and on each key program assessment instrument, the number and percent of candidates performing in each cell on the scoring scale along with an assessment report template;
   2) strengths and weaknesses identified in a course(s) or in the program based on the data; and
   3) change(s) in a course(s) or in the program that will be made based on the data, if any changes are appropriate at this time.

b) By October 1 – The Department Heads will complete an overall Summary and Analysis of data report for the program for fall semester and submit the completed Assessment Reports to the . This will be forwarded to the Armstrong State University Director of Assessment.

c) The will present aggregated data analyses of EPP Key Assessments at the Fall COE Faculty Meeting (Data Day) and all relevant program Advisory Board meetings.

d) By November 15 – The Associate Dean will complete an overall Summary and Analysis of data report for the previous academic year.

2. Spring Semester

a) By May 20 – Faculty for non-certification and advanced programs meet during a proposed ½ day assessment retreat to review the aggregated specific program data for the spring that includes:

   1) each EPP and program key assessment instrument, the number and percent of candidates performing in each cell on the scoring scale along with an assessment report template;
   2) strengths and weaknesses identified in a course(s) or in the program based on the data; and
   3) change(s) in a course(s) or in the program that will be made based on the data, if any changes are appropriate at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Evaluation Measure</th>
<th>Administration Date</th>
<th>Education EPP Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Assessment Rubrics</td>
<td>Various (dependent on assessment/program)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACE Data (Content)</td>
<td>Continually</td>
<td>Annually (September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA (MAT cohort exception)</td>
<td>End of each semester and advisement, prior to admissions (&lt;10%)</td>
<td>Semi-annually: August, December, May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACE Professional Admissions Test (BSED cohort exception)</td>
<td>End of each semester and advisement, prior to admissions (&lt;5%)</td>
<td>Transition Points 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition Data</td>
<td>Transition Points (Prof. Application, Field Experience, Clinical Internship 1, Clinical Internship 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Keys Data</td>
<td>Clinical Internship 2</td>
<td>Annually: August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edTPA</td>
<td>Clinical Internship II</td>
<td>Semi-Annually: December and May Annual Report: Fall for previous academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Ethics Entry Assessment</td>
<td>Pre-Certification</td>
<td>Annually: September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Ethics Exit Assessment</td>
<td>Program Completion</td>
<td>Annually: September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP Evaluation Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluations (Smart Eval)</td>
<td>End of Each Semester (Fall, Spring, Summer)</td>
<td>Department Heads review results at the end of each term and during annual reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Evaluations</td>
<td>Annually: Spring Semester</td>
<td>Department Chair conducts reviews at the end of each term and during annual reviews; submits evaluations to the Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Evaluations</td>
<td>Annually: Spring Semester</td>
<td>conducts reviews of Certification Officer and LiveText Coordinator. Submits evaluations to the Dean. Dean conducts reviews of the administrative assistants, OFECPP director, graduate recruiter, Department Heads and.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teachers Survey (CI2)</td>
<td>Fall and Spring Semester</td>
<td>Annually: OFECPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Supervisors Survey</td>
<td>Fall and Spring Semester</td>
<td>Annually: OFECPP with Department Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer Exit Survey (CI2)</td>
<td>Fall and Spring Semester</td>
<td>Annually: Faculty Data meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP Assessment Data (Aggregate):</td>
<td>Annually: Spring Semester</td>
<td>August Department meeting and Fall Faculty Data meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intern Keys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- edTPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GACE Content Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethics Assessment (entrance &amp; exit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Review</td>
<td>Fall and Spring Semester</td>
<td>Continually Dean (COE) Department Head (program budget) OFECPP –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-registration Reports</td>
<td>Fall and Spring Semester</td>
<td>Advisement and registration periods. Dean, Graduate Recruitment Coordinator, Department Heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Program/EPP Assessments*
Syllabi Review/Alignment | Annually: Summer | Annually: Department Heads and Faculty, Assessment Committee, and Dean
Candidate Advisement File Audit | Annually: Summer | Summer – Director OFECPP with Administrative Assistant
Teacher Keys | Post-Graduation: 2-3 years DoE Portal | May or August Department meeting (tentative 2016-2017)
Employer Survey (Principal) | Every year for 3rd year teachers | January PAAR Data

E. Presenting Data to COE and TEAC

A draft of the EPP Key Assessment Reports will be presented by the Assessment Coordinator at the Department of Education faculty meetings in the fall (initial certification programs) and spring semesters (non-certification and advanced programs). The Dean, Associate Dean or Department Head will share a summary of the Key Assessment Reports at advisory board meetings. The advisory boards will review and discuss the reports and make recommendations for improvements in the EPP and respective program, as appropriate.

F. Sharing Data on Campus

The EPP and program assessment reports, along with the recommendations of the advisory boards, will be shared by the Dean with the program coordinators, department chairs, and Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. In addition, all reports will be shared with the Institutional Office of Assessment.

G. Completing Annual Report on Candidate Performance Data

In addition to the assessment report completed each semester, the Department Heads complete Departmental Assessment Reports on candidate learning outcomes for their respective programs for the academic year (covering fall and spring semesters) by November 1 of each year. The Annual Report will include an overall summary and analysis of candidate performance data for the EPP for the academic year.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Key Personnel/Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACTE</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Associate Dean Certification/Title II Coordinator&lt;br&gt;Institutional Research Director&lt;br&gt;Budget&lt;br&gt;University enrollment&lt;br&gt;Key Assessment Reports&lt;br&gt;GACE Summary Reports&lt;br&gt;BANNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional Report Card&lt;br&gt;• Parts A&amp;B (suspended spring 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP (NCATE)</td>
<td>National Accreditation</td>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>Associate Dean Certification/Title II Coordinator&lt;br&gt;TPMS Database&lt;br&gt;COE Database&lt;br&gt;LiveText</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>April 20 (per GaPSC requirements) November February/March</td>
<td>Associate Dean Certification Officer &amp; Institutional Research Director TPMS Database BANNER GACE Summary Reports Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACE Data Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ETS GACE Content GACE PAA GACE Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II Completer Report Spreadsheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westat Validation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Certification Officer &amp; Department Heads/Assistants GACE Summary Reports TPMS Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACE Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACE PAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACE Ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson (ETS) Report</td>
<td>edTPA</td>
<td>December May September</td>
<td>Associate Dean/edTPA Coordinator Departmental Database edTPA Summary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAAR Reports</td>
<td>GaPSC</td>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Department Heads Associate Dean Key Assessment Reports Enrollment Faculty Roster TPMS TKES Survey Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP Institutional Report: Self-Study</td>
<td>National Accreditation</td>
<td>June 2016 Delayed 1 year – Summer 2017</td>
<td>Dean &amp; Associate Dean Department Heads &amp; Faculty Key Assessment Reports Surveys Assessment &amp; Diversity Reports TPMS Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPMS Data Report</td>
<td>GaPSC</td>
<td>On-Going</td>
<td>Certification/Title II Coordinator Department Databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service Certification Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS Assessment Report (Candidate Learning Outcomes)</td>
<td>National Accreditation</td>
<td>Annually: Fall</td>
<td>Department Heads Key Assessment Reports Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Non-Academic Office Assessment Report</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Annually: Spring</td>
<td>OFECPP Director/Associate Dean LiveText Coordinator Clinical Partnership Data Key Assessment Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Assessment Reports</td>
<td>EPP/College of Education</td>
<td>Annually: Summer</td>
<td>Associate Dean LiveText Coordinator Department Heads Key Assessment Data Assessment Report Templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Preparation Annual Assessment Report/Comprehensive Program Reviews</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Dean Associate Dean Department Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XII. TIMELINE

The Educator Preparation Program adheres to the following assessment timeline:

- Prior to the beginning of each semester: The LiveText Coordinator receives information from the department heads and develops the Assessment Blueprint (LiveText assessment master list) for that semester.

- During each fall and spring semester: Data are collected via LiveText according to dates identified by the Department Chair and the Associate Dean/LiveText Coordinator.

- During each fall and spring semester: Progress of initial undergraduate candidates is monitored at designated transition points by the candidates’ advisors and the Professional Program Committee.

- Within one month after the final exam each semester: Associate Dean/LiveText Coordinator aggregates the data from the common EPP assessments for the EPP and disaggregates the EPP data for each program; and aggregates the program data from the specific program assessments.

- Within one month after the final exam each semester: Assessment Coordinator/LiveText Coordinator forwards the aggregated EPP data to the COE Chair, and forwards the disaggregated EPP data and the aggregated specific program data to the faculty.

- Each March and October: Program assessment reports are presented at the COE faculty meeting, and annual advisory board meetings when scheduled by programs, and which are completed by the program faculty and forwarded to the LiveText Coordinator to be posted in the LiveText Exhibit Center.

- By November 1 annually: COE Associate Dean prepares EPP Assessment Report on candidate performance for the EPP for the academic year (covering fall semesters, and summer). This report is shared with the Dean of the EPP for recommendations for improvement. The EPP and program assessment reports, along with the recommendations of the advisory boards, are shared by the EPP Department Heads including those outside the COE, and with the Provost and University Assessment Director. The Annual Report is posted in the LiveText Exhibit Center.

XIII. MATRIX OF KEY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS AND SCORING GUIDES / RUBRICS

A list of the EPP common key assessment instruments and scoring guides/rubrics used in the initial teacher education program is contained in Appendix E. Key Assessment by program and level is listed in Appendix F.
XIV. Glossary of Assessment and Accreditation Terminology

AAED. Adolescent and Adult Education.

Accreditation. (1) A process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review. CAEP (NCATE) accreditation informs the public that an institution has an educator preparation program that has met state, professional, and institutional standards of educational quality. (2) The decision is rendered by CAEP (NCATE) when an institution’s educator preparation program meets CAEP (NCATE)’s standards and requirements.

Accuracy in Assessment. The assurance that key assessments are of the appropriate type and content such that they measure what they purport to measure. To this end, the assessments should be aligned with the standards and/or learning proficiencies that they are designed to measure.

Advanced Programs. Programs for (1) the continuing education of teachers who have previously completed initial preparation or (2) the preparation of other school professionals. Advanced programs commonly award graduate credit and include master, specialist, and doctoral degree programs as well as non-degree endorsement programs offered at the graduate level. Examples of these programs include those for teachers who are preparing for a second license at the graduate level in a field different from the field in which they have their first license; programs for teachers who are seeking a master’s degree in the field in which they teach; and programs not tied to licensure, such as programs in curriculum and instruction. In addition, advanced programs include those for other school professionals such as school counselors, school psychologists, educational administrators, and reading specialists.

Alignment. A method of devising teaching activities that directly address learning outcomes and standards. The process of determining correspondences between concepts by matching the element being measured with the standards addressed.

Annual Report. The AACTE/CAEP (NCATE) Joint Data Collection Report that is required of all CAEP (NCATE)-affiliated institutions as a condition of accreditation. A compilation of these reports serves as primary documentation for Board of Examiners teams as they prepare for on-site accreditation visits.

Area for Improvement (AFI). A statement cited by the Board of Examiners or the Accreditation Board indicating that an EPP has not met expected levels of achievement in one or more elements of a standard. The Board of Examiners may cite one or more areas for improvement and still recommend that the standard is met.

Assessment System. A comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures that provides information for use in monitoring candidate performance and managing and improving EPP operations and programs for the preparation of professional educators.

Avoidance of Bias in Assessment. The assurance that the EPP has addressed any contextual distractions and/or problems with key assessment instruments that introduce sources of bias and thus adversely influence candidate performance. Contextual distractions include inappropriate noise, poor lighting, discomfort, and the lack of proper equipment. Problems with assessments include missing or vague instructions, poorly worded questions, and poorly reproduced copies that make reading difficult.

Board of Examiners (BOE). On-site evaluators who review institutions based on the CAEP Standards. BOE members are nominated by CAEP member organizations and must successfully complete the CAEP training.

BSED. Bachelor of Science in Education.

CAEP. Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation.
Candidate Performance Data. Information derived from assessments of candidate proficiencies, in areas of teaching and effects on student learning, candidate knowledge, and professional dispositions. Candidate performance data may be derived from a wide variety of sources, such as projects, essays, or tests demonstrating subject content mastery; employer evaluations; state licensure tests; and student teaching notebooks as well as assessments, projects, reflections, clinical observations, and other evidence of pedagogical and professional teaching proficiencies.

Candidates. Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers, teachers continuing their professional development, or other school professionals. Candidates are distinguished from students in P–12 schools.

CEED. Childhood and Exceptional Education.

Certification. The process by which a non-governmental agency or association grants professional recognition to an individual who has met certain predetermined qualifications specified by that agency or association. (The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards grants advanced certification.)

Clinical Faculty. P–12 school personnel and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice. See Professional Education Faculty.

Clinical Practice. Student teaching or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

Conceptual Framework. An underlying structure in an educator preparation program that gives conceptual meaning to the EPP’s operations through an articulated rationale and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and EPP accountability.

Consistency in Assessment. The assurance that key assessments produce dependable results or results that would remain constant on repeated trials. Institutions can document consistency through providing training for raters that promote similar scoring patterns, using multiple raters, conducting simple studies of inter-rater reliability, and/or comparing results to other internal or external assessments that measure comparable knowledge, skills, and/or professional dispositions.

CI. Continuous Improvement. Using data driven evidence to move programs and EPP toward Target.

Dispositions. Professional Dispositions. Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development. NCATE expects institutions to assess professional dispositions based on observable behaviors in educational settings. The two professional dispositions that NCATE expects institutions to assess are fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Based on their mission and conceptual framework, educator preparation programs can identify, define, and operationalize additional professional dispositions.

Diversity. Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionally, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area. The types of diversity necessary for addressing the elements on candidate interactions with diverse faculty, candidates, and P–12 students are stated in the rubrics for those elements.

EPP. Educator Preparation Program.
**edTPA.** A pedagogical skills, knowledge and content assessment designed by SCALE out of Stanford University. This assessment may be adopted by GaPSC as a mandatory requirement for all initial certification candidates in 2015.

**Faculty.** Those individuals employed by a college or university, including graduate teaching assistants, who teach one or more courses in education, provide services to candidates (e.g., advising), supervise clinical experiences, or administer some portion of the EPP.

**Field Experiences.** A variety of early and ongoing field-based opportunities in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research. Field experiences may occur in off-campus settings such as schools, community centers, or homeless shelters.

**GACE.** Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators.

**Good-Faith Efforts.** Specific actions that EPPs take, which, given their scope, intensity, and appropriateness, could reasonably be expected to increase or maintain candidate opportunities to interact with diverse faculty, peers, or P12 students over an agreed-upon length of time.

**IHE.** Institution of Higher Education.

**Initial Teacher Preparation Programs.** Programs at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels that prepare candidates for the first license to teach. They include five-year programs, master’s programs, and other post-baccalaureate and alternate route programs that prepare individuals for their first license in teaching.

**Institutional Report (IR).** A report that provides the institutional and EPP contexts, a description of the EPP’s conceptual framework, and evidence that the EPP is meeting the CAEP standards. The report serves as primary documentation for Board of Examiners teams conducting on-site visits. (See the CAEP website for details.)

**INTASC.** The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) that has developed model performance-based standards and assessments for the licensure of teachers.

**MAT.** Master of Arts in Teaching, an initial graduate education certification program at ARMSTRONG.

**NBPTS.** The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, an organization of teachers and other educators, which has developed both standards and a system for assessing the performance of experienced teachers seeking national certification.

**NCATE Coordinator.** The person(s) identified by the EPP to manage preparations for the NCATE visit. The NCATE coordinator, along with the EPP head, is NCATE’s contact at an institution. At some institutions, the EPP head is the NCATE coordinator.

**P–12 School Personnel.** Licensed practitioners in P–12 schools who provide instruction, supervision, and direction for candidates during field-based assignments.

**PAAR.** Preparation Approval Annual Report.

**Professional Knowledge.** The historical, economic, sociological, philosophical, and psychological understandings of schooling and education. It also includes knowledge about learning, diversity, technology, professional ethics, legal and policy issues, pedagogy, and the roles and responsibilities of the profession of teaching.
Professional Standards. Standards set by the specialized professional associations (SPAs) and adopted by NCATE for use in its accreditation review. Professional standards also refer to standards set by other recognized national organizations/accrediting agencies that evaluate professional education programs (e.g., the National Association of Schools of Music).

Program. A planned sequence of courses and experiences for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings. Programs may lead to a degree, a recommendation for a state license, both, or neither.

Program Report. The report prepared by faculty responsible for a program (e.g., math education, elementary education) responding to specialized professional association (SPA) standards.

Rubrics. Written and shared criteria for judging performance that indicate the qualities by which levels of performance can be differentiated, and that anchor judgments about the degree of success on a candidate assessment.

Scoring Guide. A tool such as a rubric, evaluation form, etc. used by faculty to evaluate an assessment. Scoring guides should differentiate varying levels of proficiency on performance criteria.

SPAs. Specialized Professional Associations. The national organizations that represent teachers, professional education faculty, and other school professionals who teach a specific subject matter (e.g., mathematics or social studies), teach students at a specific developmental level (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle level, or secondary), teach students with specific needs (e.g., bilingual education or special education), administer schools (e.g., principals or superintendents), or provide services to students (e.g., school counselors or school psychologists). Many of these associations are member organizations of NCATE and have standards for both students in schools and candidates preparing to work in schools.

State Program Standards Review. The process by which specialized professional associations evaluate the degree to which a state’s program standards are aligned with the NCATE and SPA standards. (In states where state program standards are judged to be substantially aligned with SPA standards, the state standards will be approved by NCATE’s Specialty Area Studies Board, and NCATE will defer to the state’s review of institutions’ teacher education programs.)

Standards. Written expectations for meeting a specified level of performance.

State Program Approval. Process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state’s standards for the preparation of school professionals.

State Program Review. The process by which the state assesses the quality of programs offered by an institution for teachers and other school professionals.

State Standards. The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school professionals. State standards may include candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Transition Point. Key points in a program when a EPP assesses candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to determine if candidates are ready to proceed to the next stage in a program. Standard 2 requires transition points upon program entry, at appropriate point(s) during the program, and upon program completion.

UAB. Unit Accreditation Board.

Unit. *(This term is no longer used and has been replaced by “EPP” – Education Preparation Program.*) The college, school, department, or other administrative body in colleges, universities, or other organizations with the
responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and other school professionals, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed in an institution. Also known as the “Educator Preparation Program.” The educator preparation program must include in its accreditation review all programs offered by the institution for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade settings.

**EPP Head.** The individual officially designated to provide leadership for the EPP (e.g., dean, director, or chair), with the authority and responsibility for its overall administration and operation.

**EPP Key Assessments.** An EPP key assessment is one of the 6-8 assessments common to all programs within the EPP. These assessments are important because they are used to measure candidate performance reported on the College of Education/CAEP standards.

**EPP Operations.** Activities undertaken by the EPP pertaining to governance, planning, budget, personnel, facilities, services and procedures such as advising and admission, and resources that support the EPP’s mission in preparing candidates.

Reference:
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## Appendix C: Alignment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Strands</th>
<th>CAP Keys</th>
<th><strong>TAPS</strong></th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>InTASC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>CP 1.1 Plans with knowledge of content and delivery techniques.</td>
<td>PRO KNW</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>CP 1.2 Plans to ensure students make connections to life experiences.</td>
<td>PRO KNW</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>CP 1.3 Plans with knowledge of Students.</td>
<td>PRO KNW</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4f-4i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>CP 2.1 Uses required curriculum and organizing framework to plan instruction and assessment.</td>
<td>PRO KNW</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>CP 2.2 Plans assessments to measure student progress of required curriculum.</td>
<td>INSTR PLAN</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>SBI 1.1 Uses research-based practices for student engagement.</td>
<td>INSTR STRAT1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>SBI 1.2 Engages students in higher-order thinking skills and processes.</td>
<td>INSTR STRAT1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>SBI 1.3 Uses appropriate accessible technology to enhance learning.</td>
<td>INSTR STRAT 3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.75.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Delivery</td>
<td>Diff. Instruction</td>
<td>SBI 2.1 Uses flexible grouping practices based on diagnostic assessments.</td>
<td>DIFF INSTR 2.4 4.3</td>
<td>PR REF ASS</td>
<td>2.5 3.1 3.2 4.8 5.5</td>
<td>2.a 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Delivery</td>
<td>Diff. Instruction</td>
<td>SBI 2.2 Demonstrates high expectations with students playing roles in learning.</td>
<td>ACE 8.5 8.6 8.7</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>2.1 2.2</td>
<td>3c 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of and for Learning</td>
<td>Assessment Strategies</td>
<td>AL 1.1 Uses diagnostic assessment strategies to inform planning.</td>
<td>Assess 6.1 4.4</td>
<td>PR ASS</td>
<td>4.1 4.2 4.3 4.8</td>
<td>1a 2a 2b 4e 6e 6g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of and for Learning</td>
<td>Assessment Strategies</td>
<td>AL 1.2 Uses formative assessment strategies to adjust instruction.</td>
<td>Assess 6.3 4.4</td>
<td>PR ASS</td>
<td>4.1 4.3 4.8 5.4</td>
<td>1a 2a 6a 6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of and for Learning</td>
<td>Assessment Strategies</td>
<td>AL 1.3 Uses a variety of summative assessment strategies to evaluate mastery of curriculum.</td>
<td>Assess 6.2 4.4</td>
<td>PR ASS</td>
<td>4.1 4.3 4.6 4.7</td>
<td>1a 6a 6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of and for Learning</td>
<td>Assessment Uses</td>
<td>AL 2.1 Uses data to design appropriate, timely interventions.</td>
<td>Assess 6.1</td>
<td>REF PR ASS</td>
<td>4.1 4.2 4.3 4.6 4.7 4.8</td>
<td>1a 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of and for Learning</td>
<td>Assessment Uses</td>
<td>AL 2.2 Provides effective feedback on student performances.</td>
<td>Assess 6.6</td>
<td>PR REF ASS</td>
<td>4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8</td>
<td>6b 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>LE 1.1. Maintains a positive learning environment through routines and procedures.</td>
<td>PLE 7.2</td>
<td>PR COL</td>
<td>2.3 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.5 3.7</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>LE1.2 Fosters a sense of community and belonging.</td>
<td>PLE 7.4</td>
<td>COL PR</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>Acad. Chal. Environment</td>
<td>LE 2.1 Maximizes instructional time.</td>
<td>ACE 8.1</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>Acad. Chal. Environment</td>
<td>LE 2.2 Helps students take responsibility for learning.</td>
<td>ACE 8.7</td>
<td>PR COL</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Pro. Behavior and Growth</td>
<td>P 1.1 Takes responsibility for professional growth.</td>
<td>PRO 9.5</td>
<td>PR COL</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Pro. Behavior and Growth</td>
<td>P 1.2 Demonstrates a professional demeanor and adheres to policies, and procedures.</td>
<td>PRO 9.1 9.2 10.6</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Comm. and Advocacy</td>
<td>P 2.1 Communicates effectively and respectfully with students, colleagues, families, and community.</td>
<td>Comm10.1 10.4</td>
<td>PR DIV COL</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>