Guidance for Georgia Standards 2016

The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) advances excellence in educator preparation through an evidence-based peer review approval process using the Georgia Standards for the Approval of Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs. These standards were adopted in May 2014, and they became effective for all approval reviews in September 2016. The standards are based on evidence, continuous improvement, innovation, and clinical practice to ensure that approved providers in Georgia are preparing educators who are classroom-ready and equipped to impact student learning. The new standards demand the use of quality evidence, as well as an explanation of that evidence, in the continuous improvement of educator preparation and the GaPSC approval process.

During an approval review, a provider uploads evidence and narratives into PRS-II, making the case that standards are met at both the provider (previously known as the "unit") and program levels. Site Visitors then look at evidence for each component, determining if the evidence makes a case for meeting the overall standard. This document, created to help providers and Site Visitors better understand the standards and components, **is not a CHECKLIST**. Possible examples are listed and serve only as guidance to help providers apply evidence to address the Georgia Standards 2016. Providers are encouraged to gather and analyze data from their programs and use this information to drive continuous program improvement and increase P-12 student learning.

Note that this guidance is for providers that are seeking GaPSC approval (and for Site Visitors reviewing providers that are seeking GaPSC approval). Providers seeking national accreditation should also refer to guidance from those accrediting bodies.

Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Standard 2: Clinical Practice and Partnerships

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

Standard 4: Program Impact

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Standard 6: Georgia Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs

CROSS-CUTTING THEMES: DIVERSITY AND TECHNOLOGY

Diversity

The standards listed below have possible embedded aspects of diversity within them, extending across learning disabilities, language learners, gifted students, and P-12 students from diverse racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. For example:

- Standard 1 endorses the Interstate Teacher and Support Consortium (InTASC) teacher standards. The performances, knowledge and dispositions that are extensions of those standards contain literally scores of references to cultural competence, individual differences, creativity and innovation, as well as working with families and communities.

- Standard 2 is framed in terms of preparing candidates to work with "all students" and calls for diversity in clinical experiences.

- Standard 3 insists that providers undertake positive outreach efforts to recruit a more able and more diverse candidate pool.

Technology

The standards listed below include several references to applications of new technologies to educational situations. For example:

- As stated above, Standard 1 endorses the InTASC teacher standards. The performances, knowledge, and dispositions that are extensions of those standards include many references to applications of technology. Educators must know how to use technologies and how to guide learners to apply them. They must know how to use digital and interactive technologies for efficiently and effectively achieving specific learning goals.

- Standard 1 also states that providers are to "ensure that completers model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning and enrich professional practice."

- Standard 2 refers to technology-enhanced learning opportunities as part of clinical experiences, as well as appropriate technology-based applications for selection, development, evaluation, and continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators. Clinical partnerships are to include technology-based collaborations, as well.

- Standard 3 states that providers present multiple forms of evidence of candidates developing knowledge and skills during preparation, including "the integration of technology in all of these domains."

In addition to the components listed above, evidence may be used in other components where the EPP might address the cross-cutting themes.

Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Underlying Concepts and Considerations for Standard 1

Standard 1 is constructed around content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions as essential foundations for educator preparation. The evidence of candidates' proficiencies in these areas demonstrates the competence of candidates, including their ability to draw on knowledge to demonstrate effective professional skills that foster P-12 student learning. Information regarding the **Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)** Model Core Teaching Standards can be found here:
http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_(InTASC).html

Component 1.1: *Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.*

Underlying Concepts and Considerations specific to Component 1.1:

Evidence includes multiple indicators across the four categories of the InTASC standards:
- **Learner and Learning:** The provider addresses learner development, learning differences, and creation of learning environments.
- **Content:** The provider knows that candidates have deep subject knowledge and can apply that knowledge.
- **Instructional Practice:** The provider allows candidates opportunities to practice and then demonstrate knowledge and skills in assessment, planning for instruction, and instructional strategies. Those opportunities allow candidates to engage all students and connect to all students, modeling digital and interactive technologies to achieve learning goals.
- **Professional Responsibility:** The provider offers dispositional and professional data, as well as leadership roles during the program.

Essential Question: Where in each program are the four InTASC domains (the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility) addressed?

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- Program of Study for Candidates (required for all programs)
- Program Alignment to InTASC (edTPA, Danielson, Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES), etc.)
- Professional Learning Plans or Goals (Individualized Induction Plans) developed from the InTASC Progressions
- Reflections on improving one's professional practice using progressions
- Lesson and Unit Plans
- Portfolios
- Teacher Work Samples
- Dispositional and professional responsibility data
- Measures of candidate impact on P-12 student learning
- Pre and Post instruction student data

- Benchmark test results of P-12 students
- Ethics Entry and Exit
- The InTASC category of Instructional Practice might be addressed from clinical experiences
  - edTPA
  - Observation Instrument (traditional providers)
  - Danielson Observation Rubric (for non-traditional providers)
  - Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS—for in-service candidates)
- Multiple indicators/measures specific to application of content knowledge in clinical practice are identified with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
  - Dispositions Rubric
  - GACE
  - Intern Keys or other observation instrument
  - Danielson Rubric
- Analysis of data/evidence includes identification of trends/patterns, comparisons, and/or differences (e.g., GACE, edTPA data, key assessment data)
- Data/evidences support interpretations and conclusions (e.g., meeting agendas and evidence that indicate programs/provider have used data to make decisions)
- Class average at or above acceptable levels on the provider scoring guide indicators specific to the four categories of InTASC Standards using key assessments
- edTPA averages for the provider's candidates compared to state and national averages
- Classroom performance indicates competency and is benchmarked against the average performance of completers from other providers (comparisons are made with scaled scores and/or state/national data when available)

Component 1.2: *Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.*

Essential Question: How do we know that candidates use research and evidence to
1. **understand the profession;**
2. **measure and improve student progress; and**
3. **improve and guide professional practice?**

If an educational strategy is evidence-based, data-based, or research-based, providers compile, analyze, and use objective evidence to inform the design of the program or guide the modification of instructional techniques.

Possible Evidence
- Evidence that candidates are able to use data both for instructional decision making and for developing an understanding of evidence-based professional practice.
- Planning, implementing, and evaluating learning experiences are formal and are based on research, evidence, or data

- Work sample
- Portfolio
- edTPA (specifically rubrics 3, 10, and 15 demonstrate evidence-based professional practice)
- Candidates use data to reflect on teaching
- Data/evidence that candidates use research and evidence for planning, implementing, and evaluating P-12 students' progress, with performance at or above acceptable levels on rubric indicators (e.g., use of key assessment data, as well as program of study, syllabi/sample candidate evidence of performance-based activities demonstrating that research is used to plan, implement, and evaluate lesson plans)
- Data/evidence that candidates use data to reflect on teaching effectiveness and their own professional practice with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators (e.g., use of key assessment data, as well as program of study)
- Data/evidence that candidates use data to assess P-12 student progress and to modify instruction based on student data (data literacy), with performance at or above acceptable level on rubric indicators (e.g., use of key assessment data, as well as syllabi/sample candidate evidence of performance-based activities demonstrating that candidates modify instruction based on student data)

Component 1.3: *Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).*

Essential Question: How do we know that candidates effectively apply content and pedagogical knowledge to positively impact P-12 learning?

Possible Evidence
- Required 6 key program assessments for all initial teaching programs (4 related to InTASC Standards are required; 2 program choice assessments)
- Required 6 key program assessments for leadership programs (GACE is required; 5 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)
- Required 3 key program assessments for endorsement programs (3 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)
- Required 4 key program assessments for service programs (GACE is required; 3 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)
- Required 4 key provider assessments across all initial teaching programs (GACE and edTPA are required; 2 provider choice)
- Comparisons and trends across program areas based on data
- Alignment of key assessments to standards
- Number of completers who have obtained National Board Certification

Component 1.4: *Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).*

Essential Question: How do we know that candidates in ALL programs know the standards, use the standards to prepare instruction and

assessments, and use data to monitor student progress?

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- Evidence that candidates unpack and use the Georgia Standards of Excellence
- Multiple indicators/measures specific to evaluating proficiencies for college- and career- readiness are scored at or above the provider scoring guide indicators at the minimal level of sufficiency (acceptable level):
  – candidates' ability to provide effective instruction for all students (differentiation of instruction)
  – candidates' ability to have students apply knowledge to solve problems and think critically
  – candidates' ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences and to teach for transfer of skills
  – candidates' ability to design and implement learning experiences that require collaboration and communication skills
- Programs of study aligned to P-12 curriculum, edTPA, and other key assessments
- Evidence that candidates use approaches such as higher level thinking skills and problem-solving, learning experiences, differentiation, collaboration, and communication skills
- Observational instruments and data
- Lesson or unit plans
- Work samples
- Portfolios

Component 1.5: *Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.*

Underlying Concepts and Considerations

Evidence shows that preparation assessments of candidates and candidates' teaching and assessment of P-12 students are aligned with technology standards, ISTE standards for teachers and students. Evidence demonstrates that candidates involve P-12 students in the use of technology that is aligned with the goals of the lesson, and that they use technology to differentiate instruction; to track student progress; communicate with other stakeholders; and to enhance the lesson.

Essential Question: How do we know that candidates in all programs know and use the standards from the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) as they plan, instruct, differentiate, assess track student progress, and communicate with stakeholders? Do both candidates and students use technology? What data are available to demonstrate that?

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- Exiting candidates model and apply technology standards (e.g., ISTE) in coursework and in clinical work
- Observation instrument measures technology usage of teacher and students
- Lesson or Unit Plan assessments
- Flipped classroom requirement
- Candidates demonstrate knowledge and skill proficiencies including accessing databases, digital media, and/or electronic sources with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Candidates demonstrate the ability to design and facilitate digital learning with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric

indicators
- Candidates demonstrate the ability to track and share student performance data digitally with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators
- Work Samples identify technology as an important component of the P-12 classroom
- Programs of study or syllabi indicate technology is modeled as an instructional tool
- Observations that evaluate both teacher and student use of technology

Standard 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

Definition of Clinical Educator: Clinical educators include all provider and P-12 school-based individuals, who assess, support, and develop candidates' knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences.

Underlying Concepts and Considerations for Standard 2

This standard addresses three essential interlocking components of strong clinical preparation:

(1) provider/P-12 partnerships

(2) the clinical educators

(3) the clinical experiences

Close partnerships between providers and public school districts, individual schools, and other community organizations create especially effective environments for clinical experiences. These partnerships should be continuous and should feature shared decision making about crucial aspects of the preparation experiences and of collaboration among all clinical educators.

In cases where clinical practice is job embedded (e.g., GaTAPP, MAT programs), Standard 2 encourages providers to (1) be purposeful in and reflective on breadth, depth, duration, coherence and diversity of their clinical experiences; (2) provide opportunities for candidates to practice the application of course knowledge in a variety of instructional settings; and (3) keep a clear focus on candidate experiences that have positive effects on P-12 student learning.

2.1: Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider and its partners co-construct arrangements for clinical preparation (entry and exit), share in the responsibility and improvement of candidate preparation (theory and practice), and share accountability for candidate outcomes?

Possible Evidence

- Description of Partners – e.g. MOU – plus documentation that the partnership is being implemented as described
- Formalized review of Professional Development Schools (if they are used)
- Schedule of joint meetings with purpose and topics (provide documentation of how stakeholder input during meetings is used)
- Documentation of stakeholder involvement
- Handbooks which include field experiences
- Evidence that placements, observational instruments, and evaluations are co-constructed by partners

- Evidence that candidate expectations are co-constructed and identified on evaluation instruments
- Documentation of a shared responsibility model
- Evidence that P-12 schools and providers have both benefitted from the partnerships
- Evidence that a collaborative process is in place and is reviewed annually
- Evidence that provider regularly seeks input from P-12 teachers and/or educational leaders regarding candidate preparation, including developing or refining criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences
  - For nontraditional providers, the description and role of the Candidate Support Team (CST)
- Providers document a shared responsibility model that includes these components:
  - Co-construction of instruments and evaluations;
  - Co-construction of criteria for selection of mentor teachers;
  - Involvement in ongoing decision-making;
  - Stakeholder input into curriculum development;
  - Evidence of provider and P-12 educators giving descriptive feedback to candidates; and
  - Opportunities for candidates to observe and implement effective teaching strategies linked to coursework.
- Provider demonstrates an alignment of coursework to job-embedded practice and field experiences
- Evidence that provider participates in P-20 Collaborative and uses feedback from those conversations to drive changes.

2.2: *Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain high quality clinical educators, both provider and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.*

Essential Question: How can we know that the provider co-selects, prepares, evaluates, supports, and retains high quality clinical educators with its partners? Do we have evidence that demonstrates that clinical educators include all provider and P-12 school-based individuals who assess, support, and develop candidates' knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences?

Possible Evidence
- Provider documents its criteria for selection of clinical educators, including recent field experience and currency in relevant research.
- Provider and P-12 clinical educators and/or educational leaders co-construct criteria for selection of clinical educators and make co-selections.
- School-based clinical educators evaluate provider-based clinical educators and candidates.
- Provider-based clinical educators and candidates evaluate school-based clinical educators.
- Provider shares performance evaluations of supervisors, instructors, mentors, and candidates.
- Providers and P-12 clinical educators use data collected to modify selection criteria, determine future assignments of candidates, and make changes in clinical experiences. (For nontraditional providers, the role of the CST.)
- All clinical educators receive professional development and are involved in creating professional development opportunities on the use of evaluation instruments, evaluating professional dispositions of candidates, setting specific goals/objectives of the clinical experience, and

- providing feedback.
- Supervisory resources and professional development opportunities resources are available online.
- Provider conducts surveys of clinical educators and candidates on the quality of and consistency among clinical educators.
- Provider makes and keeps records of remediation and/or "counseling out" of the program available.
- Evidence that training and coaching of clinical educators is available in person and online.
- Joint sharing of curriculum development/design/redesign occurs between the provider and P-12 partner(s).
- Provider collects and uses data for modifying clinical experiences.
- Evidence that provider participates in P-20 Collaborative and uses feedback from those conversations to drive changes.

2.3: The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple, performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider designed and continues to revise clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration with its partners? How do we know that clinical experiences in all programs are effective and impact student learning and development?

Possible Evidence
- Evidence that all candidates have active clinical experiences in diverse settings (e.g. field placement chart, including demographics and diversity of experiences).
- Evidence of transition points during clinical practice linked to student outcomes and candidate performance.
- Evidence that both candidates and students have used technology to enhance learning.
- Specific criteria for appropriate use of technology are identified.
- Evidence that candidates have used technology to track student progress and growth.
- Evidence of a sequence of clinical/field experiences with specific goals that are focused, purposeful, and varied.
- Clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria.
- Candidates are assessed throughout the program with data supporting increasing levels of candidate competency.
- Evidence documents the relationship between clinical experiences and coursework (coherence).
- Attributes (depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration) are linked to student outcomes and candidate/completer performance documented in Standards 1 and 4.
- Evidence documents that candidates have purposefully assessed the impact on student learning and development with both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting: used two comparison points, used the impact data to guide instructional decision-making, modified instruction based on impact data, and differentiated instruction.
- Evidence that provider participates in P-20 Collaboratives or other professional organizations and uses feedback from those conversations

to drive changes.

Standard 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

Underlying Concepts and Considerations for Standard 1
Standard 3 is focused on the need for providers to recruit and develop a strong applicant pool. The standard and its admissions criteria for component 3.2, are based on predictors indicating that student learning is associated with the academic achievement of teachers. The standard and its recruitment component 3.1 also reflect evidence that students in preschool through high school are best served by an educator workforce that broadly represents the same wide and growing diversity we see in our student population.

3.1: The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields—currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider is recruiting and supporting high quality and diverse candidates for programs? What are the needs of the provider's partners, and how are those addressed?

Possible Evidence
- Application, acceptance, and enrollment rates are disaggregated by demographic variables such as socio-economic background, gender, ethnicity, and other background characteristics.
- Evidence shows provider awareness of employment needs of partner(s).
- Evidence of a recruitment and candidate support plan that includes diversity of candidates' backgrounds.
- The recruitment plan demonstrates a deliberate effort and focused outreach strategy for the provider and includes input and guidance from, as well as collaboration with, P-12 partners.
- Disaggregated data on applicants, those admitted, and those enrolled by relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and/or sex/gender.
- Recruitment results are recorded, monitored, and used in the planning and modification of recruitment strategies.
- Knowledge of and action that addresses employment opportunities in schools, districts, and/or regions where candidates seek employment.
- Awareness and analysis of shortage fields, including STEM, ELL, Special Education.
- Hard-to-staff school needs are addressed through surveys, needs assessment, minutes from advisory council, etc.
- Evidence that the recruitment plan and its implementation have moved the provider toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement.

- Evidence that the provider monitors the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns.
- Provider includes plans for outreach, numerical goals and baseline data, monitoring of progress, analyses and judgment of adequacy of progress toward goals, and making indicated changes.
- Evidence of marketing and recruitment and evidence of collaboration with other providers, states, and school districts.
- Evidence that the provider's recruitment plan is in addition to the recruitment plan of the college or agency.

3.2: The Provider sets admission requirements, including all criteria from GaPSC Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The Provider ensures the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates in a reporting year is a minimum of 3.0. While CAEP requires a group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE, Georgia Providers will require the GACE Program Admission Assessment (PAA) results in lieu of nationally normed ability/achievement results. Candidates may exempt the assessment with appropriate SAT, ACT, or GRE scores.

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider has monitored the candidate pool? How do we know that the accepted cohorts have high academic ability? Do data demonstrate that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence?

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- The average score of each admitted candidate cohort meets GPA of 3.0 (demonstrated through the Traditional Program Management System (TPMS)/the Non-Traditional Reporting System (NTRS)/and the Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR)).
- All admission requirements set in Rule 505-3-.01 are satisfied. Provider assures that all candidates pass the Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Program Admission Assessment (PAA) OR exempt the assessment with appropriate SAT, ACT, or GRE scores prior to admission.
- If the Program Admission Assessment Policy Flexibility is utilized for any candidates, the scaffolded support provided to those candidates has been documented.
- Data are disaggregated for enrolled candidates by (1) relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, SES, and sex/gender and (2) mode of delivery, where applicable.

3.3: Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

Essential Question: What evidence demonstrates that there is a focus on candidate quality from recruitment, at admission, and through the progression of courses and clinical experiences? What data show how academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance and effective teaching? How can we know that development of candidate quality is the goal in all phases of the program? Are the measures used to determine candidate quality both valid and reliable? (This process is ultimately determined by a provider's meeting of Standard 4.)

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- All data evidence disaggregated by certification field, unless the same assessment for attributes and dispositions is used across all programs.

- For non-traditional providers offering endorsement programs – principal recommendations for program admission and dispositional assessments throughout the program. Reflections throughout the program are analyzed and discussed.
- Provider documents evidence of established non-academic criteria used during admissions, such as:
  – Dispositional assessment prior to entry (or, for GaTAPP providers, during TAPP Essentials early in the program);
  – Candidate interviews;
  – Reflections and writing prompts;
  – Informal observation of behaviors during coursework or seminars; and
  – Interviews by hiring principals (for non-traditional providers).
- Provider's rationale for established non-academic criteria makes an evidence-based case (existing literature or provider investigations) for the selection and implementation.
- Provider associates/correlates non-academic criteria with candidate and completer performance.
- Provider monitors candidate progress on established non-academic criteria at multiple points and takes appropriate actions based on results.
- Analysis of data demonstrating the relationship between academic/non-academic criteria and candidate effectiveness in teaching. For example:
  – Is there a correlation between the GACE Content Assessment and the edTPA score?
  – Is there a correlation between candidates who exempt PAA and their performance on the edTPA or other key assessments?

3.4: The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career- ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider monitors candidate program progression from admission to completion? How do we know that candidates have content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and have the ability to teach the Georgia Standards?

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- Two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) are documented.
- Evidence of documented transition points (formative and summative) throughout program progression, such as:
  – Admission requirements data;
  – Ethics data;
  – Candidate Support Team (CST) data (or mentor/cooperating teacher and college supervisor data—could be based on certificate identification numbers of mentors);
  – edTPA data (shown in Standard 1);
  – Observational data;
  – Data from field experiences; and

- – Data from key assessments.
- Explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.
- Evidence of developing proficiencies of candidates at two or more measures/gateways of candidate progression (from key decision points) in:
  - – Ability to teach to college- and career- ready standards;
  - – Content knowledge;
  - – Pedagogical content knowledge;
  - – Pedagogical skills; and
  - – Integration of use of technology.
- Results and stated candidate progressions criteria align with evidence of actions taken, such as the following:
  - – Changes in curriculum or clinical experiences;
  - – Providing interventions;
  - – Counseling candidates out of programs.
- Professional Growth Plans for candidates who are not demonstrating the knowledge, skills, or dispositions necessary to be successful in the classroom.

3.5: *Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.*

Essential Question: How do we know that candidates know and can teach their content, and that they will have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development?

Possible Evidence
- Successful pass rates on the GACE content examination at both Induction and Professional level, disaggregated by certification field.
- edTPA data
- Evidence documenting effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates as noted in Standard 1
- Final evaluation of the candidate's dispositions/skills (generally completed at the end of clinical practice)
- CST or Cooperating/Mentor Teacher Recommendation (for non-traditional providers)
- TAPs Data (for those in job-embedded clinical practice)
- Summative assessment TKES (for those in job-embedded clinical practice)
- Benchmark/Milestones Data (for those in job-embedded clinical practice)

3.6: *Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.*

Essential Question: Do candidates in all programs understand the expectations of the profession, the code of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies?

Possible Evidence

- Evidence documents candidates' understanding of the Georgia Code of Ethics and professional standards of practice. Possible evidence might include:
    – Course assessments and/or experiences;
    – Successful pass rates on the Georgia Educator Ethics Assessment Exit;
    – Observations;
    – InTASC Standard "Professional Responsibility" (e.g., "Professional Responsibility Portfolio");
    – TKES/TAPS data (for candidates completing in-service clinical practice);
    – Danielson Domain 4 (for non-traditional providers); and
    – GaTAPP portfolio requirements (For GaTAPP providers).
- Evidence documenting candidates' knowledge of relevant laws and policies (e.g., 504 disability provisions, ESSA, education regulations, bullying, etc.), including:
    – Matrix of courses identifying where relevant laws and policies are addressed;
    – Documentation that candidates can demonstrate this knowledge;
    – System-wide professional learning in which candidates are involved; and
    – New Teacher Orientation (for in-service candidates).

Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT

The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Underlying Concepts and Considerations for Standard 4

Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation in terms of completer impact on the job. The standard especially emphasizes impact on P-12 student learning as measured in multiple ways including classroom instruction and completer and employer satisfaction.

Note: This standard asks providers to demonstrate the results of their preparation and its impact on educators while they are on the job. Although this standard focuses on completers, programs preparing employed (certified) candidates may demonstrate that their preparation is job embedded, positively impacts P-12 student learning, and results in satisfactory evaluations by employers.

Because GaTAPP programs require candidates to retain employment throughout the program, GaTAPP providers may use in-service candidate data as evidence in Standard 4. M.A.T. programs enrolling candidates who are employed as the teacher of record may also use in-service data; however, <u>CAEP</u> does not allow the use of candidate data for Standard 4.

All non-traditional endorsement providers will collect and analyze both employer and completer survey data. Endorsement providers serving certified employees must show that their preparation is job embedded, extends knowledge and skills, and positively impacts P-12 student learning. This may include anecdotal evidence describing program impact on the educators, school system(s) served, and/or the P-12 learners.

4.1: The provider documents, using multiple measures that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

Essential Question: How do we know that completers impact student growth and learning?

- Provider submits one or more measures of state-provided impact data at the in-service level when available.
- Provider demonstrates use of action research (e.g., case studies) detailing a minimum of five candidates from various programs, highlighting their impact on P-12 student learning. Formative (benchmark) data would be appropriate. Examples would include completer-conducted action research and a description of methods and development of any assessment used.
- Provider aligns an analysis and interpretation of evidence to standard/component, and conclusions are supported by data.
- Provider includes context and description of the source of P-12 learning data.
- Provider includes description and explanation on the representativeness of the data.
- Provider maintains a continuing cycle of such studies, examining completer performance in different grades and/or subjects over time.
- Use of focus groups, blogs, electronic journals, interviews, and other evidence.

Endorsement providers serving certified employees must show that their preparation is job embedded, extends knowledge and skills, and positively impacts P-12 student learning. These providers make the case that the endorsement adds value to the educator(s) and the system(s) served. This requirement is not expected for embedded endorsements. This might include the following types of evidence:

- **TAPS data (differentiation measures improved)**
- **Focus groups of completers**
- **Interviews of completers**
- **Case studies**
- **Pre- and post-assessments while in the program**
- **Narrative, anecdotal evidence describing an impact on the educators, school system(s) served, and/or the P-12 learners**

GaTAPP providers may collect impact data from <u>both</u> candidates and completers. Providers may summarize the data from a sampling of candidates.
 This might include the following types of evidence:
- **Candidate Testing Data (eg. benchmark data, end of course data, state testing data)**
- **Comparison of GaTAPP candidate testing data with first-year teachers and veterans**
- **Comparison of GaTAPP candidate testing data with system/state data**
- **Information on completer persistence (Retention Rates)**
- **Focus Group Data**
- **Case Studies**
- **Employment Milestones (TOTY – school and system, GaTOTY, Awards, Leadership Roles)**
- **State Teacher Evaluation Data (TKES and TAPS)**

4.2: The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

Essential Question: How do we know that completers effectively apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions learned in preparation experiences? How do we know that the evidence is valid?

- Observation and/or student survey assessments measure the application of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding with teaching effectiveness and/or P-12 student learning
- Observation and/or student survey assessments utilized a representative sample inclusive of most certification areas or a purposive sample to be enlarged over time.
- Survey return rates were at acceptable levels (20% or above) and inclusive of most certification areas in the provider.
- Provider identifies specific types of validity and includes appropriate descriptions.
- Provider submits valid interpretations of data that are supported by results.

- TAPs data
- TKES summative scores

4.3: *The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.*

Essential Question: How do we know that employers are satisfied with the completers from these programs?

Possible Evidence (at least three cycles of data/evidence are presented and analyzed)
- Provider submits evidence that employers perceive completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities
- Provider includes appropriate analysis and interpretation of results.
- Provider describes a system for the analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of data, and conclusions are supported by data.
- Provider documentation includes:
  - a description of the system for gathering data;
  - adequate response rates (20% or more);
  - a description of the representativeness of the sample;
  - data specific to high need schools;
  - data specific to certification fields; and
  - comparison points for data.
- Provider submits documentation of employment milestones, including promotion, employment trajectory, and retention for at least some completers and conducts an appropriate analysis of those data.
- Employer satisfaction surveys (include instrument sampling, response rates, timing)
- Employer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)
- Employer satisfaction focus groups (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)
- Employer satisfaction case studies (include description of methodology).
- Data on employment milestones such as the following:
  - Promotion;
  - Employment trajectory;
  - Employment in high needs schools;
  - Retention in either (1) an education position for which initially hired; or (2) other education role by the same or a different employer.

4.4: *The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.*

Essential Question: How do we know that completers think their preparation was effective?

- Provider submits evidence that completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Provider includes appropriate analyses and interpretation of results.
- Provider shows evidence of an adequate and representative sample reflected in responses.
- Provider achieves adequate response rates (20% or more).

- Analysis and interpretation of data aligned with the intent of the standard/component.
- Conclusions are supported by the data.
- Completer satisfaction surveys (include instrument, sampling, response rates, timing)
- Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)
- Inductee satisfaction surveys (data are provided by GaPSC)
- Completer satisfaction interviews (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)
- Provider focus groups of employers (include population represented, response rates, instrument content, timing)
- Completer satisfaction case studies (include methodology)

Standard 5: PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Underlying Concepts and Considerations for Standard 5

Provider evidence for Standards 1 through 4 constitutes a significant demonstration of the capabilities and performance of the quality assurance system. Additional evidence for Standard 5 unifies and gives purpose to evidence relevant to previous standards; it includes documentation of how the provider collects, monitors, reports and uses data.

5.1: The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all approval standards.

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider has a quality assurance system that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness?

Possible Evidence

- Provider offers evidence of system capabilities, including support for data-driven change:
    – Data can be disaggregated by field and/or candidate level, as appropriate
    – Ability to disaggregate data by relevant aspects of provider management and policy (usefulness).
- Provider describes how the evidence submitted in Standards 1-4 and other provider data are collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported.
- Provider evidence shows that the system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence on all Approval Standards.
- Provider offers a schedule and process for continuous review, together with roles and responsibilities of system users.
- Provider uses evidence/data from multiple measures to inform, modify, and evaluate provider's operational effectiveness.
- Provider submits evidence that it regularly reviews system operations and data.
- Provider offers evidence that the system supports disaggregation of data by various dimensions:
    – over time
    – by race/ethnicity
    – gender, etc.
- Provider documents evidence of appropriate access and use by a variety of users for various purposes.
- Provider shows evidence of using data (quantitative and qualitative) to improve provider operational effectiveness.

Quality Assurance System Indicators by Standard:

Standard 1
- There is a process in place for developing and revising assessments of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- The candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are assessed align with state and national or association standards for educators.
- There is a data management system in place for recording, storing, and retrieving data on candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- There is a system in place to collect, sort, and review data on candidates' practical application of professional knowledge and skills in field settings.
- There is a process in place for regularly reviewing and monitoring candidate performance.

Standard 2
- There is a mechanism in place whereby the provider and clinical sites collaborate to determine the terms, structure, and content of field experiences hosted at the partner sites.
- Providers and their partners collaborate on candidate evaluation tools and processes.
- Providers and clinical partners regularly discuss the terms, structure, and content of field experiences hosted at the partner site.
- Clinical partners have a mechanism for giving feedback to the provider on patterns in candidate strengths and needs and providing input on potential program enhancements.
- There is a mechanism to ensure that clinical placements occur in diverse settings.
- There is a mechanism to manage the attributes of field experiences (breadth, depth, duration, and coherence) so that they provide practical experience. (Relevant to Standard 1.)

Standard 3
- There is a mechanism in place to manage recruitment initiatives to attract applicants from groups in all areas identified in Component 3.1.
- There is a system in place to collect, store, analyze, and review data relevant to Standard 3 on applicants, enrollees, and completers.

Standard 4
- There are processes in place to collect and update contact information for alumni for 3-years after completion.
- There is a process in place for developing and revising measures of initial level completers' instructional practices and impact on P-12 student learning.
- There is a process in place for developing and revising measures of employers' satisfaction with the completers' preparation and performance.

Standard 5
- There is a process for involving diverse stakeholders in decision-making, program evaluation, and selection and implementation of improvement initiatives.
- Documentation of stakeholder inputs to specific decisions, evaluations, and/or improvement initiatives is stored and accessible.

5.2: *The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.*

Essential Question: How do we know that the quality assurance system contains valid and reliable empirical evidence about all programs?

Possible Evidence
- Documentation that provider-created EPP-level assessments (except for surveys) have:
  - Established content validity;
  - Established inter-rater reliability (agreement is at an acceptable level – 80% or above, except for surveys); or
  - Evidence of EPP progression toward 80% agreement of inter-rater reliability.
- Survey questions align to standards.
- Provider documents that evidence is characterized by the following attributes:
  - Relevant (related to standard);
  - Verifiable (accuracy of sample);
  - Representative (specificity on sample characteristics and free of bias);
  - Cumulative (generally 3 cycles or more); and
  - Actionable (in a form to guide program improvement).
- Provider documents that interpretations of evidence are consistent, accurate, and supported by data/evidence
- Description of developmental steps in constructing instruments
- Empirical/analytical data supporting the use of the instrument for its intended purposes
- Formal study of the alignment of instruments with their intended goals
- Implementation procedures and context
- Empirical evidence that interpretations of data are consistent and valid

5.3: *The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.*

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider tracks results over time, tests innovations, and uses results to improve programs and processes? What evidence demonstrates that the provider analyzes candidate criteria and data from entrance to exit and uses the results to inform and improve programs?

Possible Evidence
- Provider documents that it regularly and systematically:
  - Reviews quality assurance system data;
  - Identifies patterns across certification fields (both strengths and weaknesses);
  - Uses data/evidence for continuous improvement; and
  - Tests innovations.
- Change and program modifications are linked back to evidence/data with specific examples provided.

- Evidence/data from Standards 1 through 4 are cited and applied, particularly related to goal setting within each standard.
- Provider documents explicit investigation of selection criteria used for.
- Provider documents evidence that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for providers, their candidates, and P-12 students.
- Provider has baseline data, tracks interventions, has a rationale for conclusions, comparisons of results, and states next steps taken or planned. (Component 3.2 in relation to candidate progress and completion)

5.4: *Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.*

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider collects measures of completer impact, analyzes the results, and uses the information to improve candidate preparation?

Possible Evidence
- Outcome and impact measures are systematically monitored and reported together with:
    - Relevant analysis of trends;
    - Comparisons with benchmarks;
    - Evidence of corresponding resource allocations; and
    - Alignment of results to future directions anticipated.
- Evidence that annual outcome and impact measures and their trends are widely shared.
- Program changes and modifications are linked to provider's own evidence/data for topics described in outcome and impact measures (with possible evidence below):

    Impact measures
    - P-12 student learning/development
    - Observations of teaching effectiveness
    - Employer satisfaction and completer persistence
    - Completer satisfaction

    Outcome measures
    - Completer or graduation rate
    - Rate of those who become certified
    - Employment rate

    Analysis of trends
    - Comparisons with benchmarks:
        o Indication of changes made in provider preparation curricula and experiences;
        o How/where/with whom results are shared;
        o Resource allocations; and
        o Future directions.

5.5: *The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.*

Essential Question: In what ways does the provider ask its stakeholders to be involved in program evaluation and improvement?

Possible Evidence

- Provider documents specific evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement through multiple sources in each of the following areas:
    - Decision-making;
    - Program evaluation; and
    - Selection and implementation of changes for improvement.
- Provider identifies at least two examples of input from stakeholders and use of that input.
- Provider describes stakeholder roles as relevant to specific examples shared.
- Provider describes stakeholders and roles as relevant to specific examples of shared decision making and results, evaluation, and selection and implementation of changes for improvement.

Standard 6: GEORGIA REQUIREMENTS FOR EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) to offer programs leading to educator certification are expected to ensure that all preparation programs meet all applicable requirements of Rule 505-3-.01. The elements of Standard 6 are intended to supplement and/or further explain program requirements specified in Rules 505-3-.01 and 505-3-.02, and to guide Site Visitor Teams in properly evaluating programs. All GaPSC programs leading to certification are expected to meet the applicable components of this standard.

6.1: *Admission Requirements*

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider adheres to the admission requirements described in Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01?

Possible Evidence (Most elements are required for initial preparation programs)
- Documentation of approval prior to enrollment
- Documentation of GPA
- Documentation of Program Admissions Assessment
- Documentation of Educator Ethics Assessment
- Documentation of Criminal Record Check
- Documentation that requirements must be met prior to enrollment (e.g., handbook/catalog; evidence of assessments; criminal record)

6.2: *Reading Methods*

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider adheres to the reading methods requirements described in Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01?

Possible Evidence
- Documentation that candidates in specified programs (Early Childhood, Middle Grades, and the special education fields of General Curriculum, Adapted Curriculum, and General Curriculum/Early Childhood Education (P-5)) demonstrate competence in the knowledge of methods of teaching reading

6.3: *Identification and Education of Children with Special Needs*

Essential Question: How do we know that the provider meet the requirements described in the Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01 regarding the identification and education of children with special needs?

Possible Evidence
- Documentation of three or more semester hours in the identification and education of children who have special educational needs, or equivalent coursework through a Georgia-approved professional learning program

6.4: *Georgia P-12 Curriculum, Instruction, and Educator Evaluation*

Essential Question: How do we know that candidates are prepared to implement the appropriate sections of any Georgia mandated P-12 standards to use appropriate instructional strategies, and to utilize formative and summative assessments of students' learning to make adjustments in curriculum and instructional strategies? What evidence shows that candidates demonstrate an understanding of student

testing rules and protocols, as well as the requirements for and implementation of any state mandated educator evaluation system?
Possible Evidence • Evidence that candidates are prepared to implement the appropriate sections of any Georgia mandated P-12 standards • Evidence that candidates understand student testing rules • Evidence that candidates understand the requirements for and implementation of the state-mandated evaluation system
6.5: *Professional Ethical Standards and Requirements for Certification and Employment*
Essential Question: How do we know that candidates adhere to the professional ethical standards and understand requirements for certification and employment described in the Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01?
Possible Evidence • Evidence of training candidates in ethical decision-making skills • Evidence of Code of Ethics training • Evidence that information on criminal background checks, tiered certification, professional learning, and employment options are shared
6.6: *Field Experiences and Clinical Practice*
Essential Question: How do we know that the provider adheres to the field experience requirements described in the Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01?
Possible Evidence • A description of the sequencing of field experiences and expectations for clinical practice, including grade band experiences • Criteria for schools in which clinical practice candidates are placed • Evidence that candidates are provided with opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards • Evidence that experiences are systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with which candidates apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills • Documentation that candidates spend a minimum of one full semester or the equivalent in student teaching or internships in regionally accredited schools
6.7: *Content Coursework Requirements for Service Programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Technology, and Teacher Leadership*
Essential Question: How do we know that the provider adheres to content coursework requirements for service programs in curriculum and instruction, instructional technology, and teacher leadership requirements described in the Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01?
Possible Evidence • Programs of Study • Aligned curriculum crosswalks