Today’s Agenda

• 9:00-9:05 – Sign In, Security Form for Katja
• 9:05-9:35 – Dr. Cara Smith, SMART Report
• 9:35-10:15 – COE Assessment Presentation
• 10:15-12:00 – Program Assessment Meetings
• 12:00-1:00 – Lunch
• 1:00-5:00 – COE Retreat
CAEP

- The following universities have decided not to pursue CAEP accreditation: UGA, Georgia State, and Augusta State University.
- Georgia Professional Standards Commission Standards are the CAEP standards.

Timeline to Review
- AY 2019-2020
- AY 2020-2021 - Spring 2021 Submit Self-Study for Formative Review, Summer 2021 Submit Addendum
- AY 2021-2022 - Fall 2021 CAEP On-Site Visit
Assessment Goals for AY 2018-2019

Standard 1

• Consistently collect and analyze data from EPP Assessments and document changes
• Consistently collect program data – all faculty are responsible (Part-time, Limited Term, Tenured) – SMART, PSC, SPA
• Initial Teaching Programs
  – Review effectiveness of Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience Performance Assessment (data available, add student completion, continuous improvement)
  – Review effectiveness of Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Rubric (add student completion of rubric in LT; response to dispositional issues, needs improvement)
  – Obtain Content Validity and Inter-rater Reliability on both
  – Ensure alignment of current program data points with InTASC Domains – 6 program assessments -1.) Learner and Learning, 2.) Content Knowledge, 3.) Instructional Practice, 4.) Professional Responsibility, 5.) Program Choice, 6.) Program Choice
Assessment Goals for AY 2018-2019

• Service and Leadership Programs
  – Choose 3 of the 6 competencies to be measured in each program.
    • Curriculum and Instruction
    • Instructional Technology
    • Media Specialist
    • Teacher Leadership
    • Educational Leadership Tier 1
    • Educational Leadership Tier 2
  – Implement Completer Perception Survey for Service Programs
  – Create and Implement Completer Perception Survey for Leadership Programs

• Technology Cross Cutting Theme – Initial and Service/Leadership
• Diversity Cross Cutting Theme – Initial and Service/Leadership
Assessment Goals for AY 2018-2019

• Develop CAEP Team
• Meet regularly as an Assessment Committee
• Communicate regularly at COE Meetings
• Reconstitute the Educator Preparation Council – consider additional members
• GaPSC Data Conversation – December 5th 10:00-12:00pm
• Reconvene the edTPA Professional Learning Community – seek out ways to support Teacher Leadership and Ed Leadership in portfolio support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPP and its existing programs</th>
<th>First Continuing Review of a Program or new program added to an approved EPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPP Standards</strong></td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards 1-5</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Standards</strong></td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards 1 and 6 (see appropriate cell to the right for additional information regarding programmatic reviews)</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Assessments</strong></td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Cell" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Key EPP Assessments across all initial teaching programs (GACE and edTPA are required; 2 EPP choice)</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Cell" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teaching Program</th>
<th>Leadership Program</th>
<th>Service Program</th>
<th>Endorsement Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards 1 and 6</td>
<td>Standard 1 and applicable components from Standard 6 (see chart on next page)</td>
<td>Standard 1 and applicable components from Standard 6 (see chart on next page)</td>
<td>Standard 1 and applicable components from Standard 6 (see chart on next page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Key Program Assessments (4 related to InTASC Standards are required; 2 program choice assessments)</td>
<td>6 Key Program Assessments (GACE is required; 5 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)</td>
<td>4 Key Program Assessments (GACE is required; 3 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)</td>
<td>3 Key Program Assessments (3 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard One – Initial Teaching

EPP-Level Data

- GACE Content Data
- edTPA
- EPP Assessment
- EPP Assessment

Program-Level Data

- The Learner and Learning
- Content Knowledge
- Instructional Practice
- Professional Responsibility
- Program Assessment
- Program Assessment
## Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Service/Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1.1: Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
<td>Component 1.1: Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1.2: Candidates’ Use of Research and Evidence</td>
<td>Component 1.2: Content Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1.3: Content Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1.4: P-12 Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1.5: Use of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Initial EPP Assessments

- edTPA (required)
- GACE (required)
- Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience Performance Assessment
- Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Rubric
edTPA

Passrate

- Spring 2015: 63%
- Spring 2016: 94%
- Spring 2017: 100%
- Spring 2018: 99%
edTPA Scores by Rubric
GACE

September 2017-August 2018

• JHL College of Education
  – 277 examinees with 256 passing = 92.42% pass rate
  – Initial Certification Only – 164 examinees with 158 passing scores = 96.34%
Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience Performance Assessment

Spring 2018

Spring 2017

Spring 2016

Chart Area

Partner Teacher

Mentor Leader
Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience
Performance Assessment

Ratings are higher in Spring than Fall

Exemplary ratings by Partner Teacher by Year (only Springs)
Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Rubric

- Missing data
- Low n
- No obvious pattern of development in dispositions over time in program
- Low response rate
- Revisit in Assessment Committee meeting
Completer Perception Survey

- Piloted in Spring 2018 – BS, MAT in Secondary, M.Ed in Curriculum and Instruction and Ed.S. in Teacher Leadership
- Aligned to CAEP, InTASC, Diversity Strand, Technology Strand
- Successful response rate
- Program data included in the program packets
- Copy of Survey is included in packet to consider changes
- 2018 Results Overview: (n=127) (BS – 85, MAT 41, M.Ed -1)
  - 96% - Field Experiences in advancing your ability to have a positive impact on learning and development of all P-12 students.
  - 96% - Prepared to demonstrate skills and commitment to creating environments that support active and collaborative learning.
  - 95% - Satisfied with overall program
  - 84% - In preparing you to use technology to enrich professional practice
  - 81% - In preparing you to use research and understanding qualitative and quantitative methodologies
Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (PPEMs)

### Provider PPEM Rating: Level 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPEM Index Score</th>
<th>Provider Measures</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPEM index: 181</td>
<td>edTPA PPEM points: 24.5</td>
<td>TAPS PPEM points: 23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar EPP average: 172</td>
<td>State-wide average: 3.03</td>
<td>State-wide average: 20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar EPP average: 3.00</td>
<td>Similar EPP average: 19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GACE PPEM points 17.3</td>
<td>Employer Survey PPEM points 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GACE average 263 N 447</td>
<td>Employer Survey average 3.20 N 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State-wide average: 262</td>
<td>State-wide average: 3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar EPP average: 261</td>
<td>Similar EPP average: 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>Induction Survey PPEM points: 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Induction Survey average: 3.38 N 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State-wide average: 3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar EPP average: 3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider PPEM Index</th>
<th>Statewide average</th>
<th>Similar EPP average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GaPSC PPEM Rating Implications

## 1st year with rating
- **Exemplary**
  - Publication of Exemplary status
  - Service as peer/expert mentors

- **Effective**
  - Action plan for continuous improvement

- **At Risk of Low Performing**
  - GaPSC monitoring
  - Action plan for moving to effective

- **Low Performing**
  - GaPSC monitoring
  - Action plan for moving to effective

## 2nd year with rating
- **Exemplary**
  - Publication of Exemplary status and practices
  - Service as peer/expert mentors
  - Share exemplary practices at conferences or statewide meetings

- **Effective**
  - Action plan for continuous improvement

- **At Risk of Low Performing**
  - GaPSC monitoring
  - GaPSC on-site technical assistance
  - Action plan for moving to effective
  - Peer technical assistance

- **Low Performing**
  - GaPSC monitoring
  - GaPSC on-site technical assistance
  - Action plan for moving to effective
  - Peer technical assistance

## 3rd year with rating
- **Exemplary**
  - Publication of Exemplary status and practices
  - Streamlining of approval process
  - Service as peer/expert mentors
  - Share exemplary practices at conferences or statewide meetings

- **Effective**
  - Action plan for continuous improvement

- **At Risk of Low Performing**
  - GaPSC monitoring
  - GaPSC on-site technical assistance
  - Action plan for moving to effective
  - Peer technical visit
  - Probation

- **Low Performing**
  - GaPSC on-site review
  - Revocation of GaPSC approval

* An EPP that is rated Low Performing after the first year will start on the second year of implications.

---

May 2018
TPPEM

• Level 4 – Exemplary
• Our score – 181
• Exemplary is 180-200
• Based on the following metrics:
  – Outcomes Measures 50%
    • Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAP) – 30%
    • Employer Perception of Preparation – 10%
    • Inductees’ Perception of Preparation – 10%
  – Program Measures 50%
    • GACE – 20%
    • edTPA – 30%
LPPEMs

- **LPPEM for Tier 1**
  - Employers’ Perceptions of Preparation – 10% (administered at the end of year 1)
  - Inductees’ Perceptions of Preparation – 10% (administered at the end of year 1)
  - Completer Survey – 10% - (administered at the end of the program)
  - Leader Assessment on Performance Standards (LAPS) – 35% - Summative
  - Tier 1 GACE Content Knowledge Assessment – 35%

- **LPPEM for Tier 2**
  - Employers’ Perceptions of Preparation – 10% (administered at the end of year 1)
  - Inductees’ Perceptions of Preparation – 10% (administered at the end of year 1)
  - Completer Survey – 10% - (administered at the end of the program)
  - Leader Assessment on Performance Standards (LAPS) – 35% - Summative
  - Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL) – 35%
Standard 4

- TPPEM (including Employer and Inductee Survey - PSC)
- LPPEM (including Employer and Inductee Survey – PSC)
- Case Study – Mentor-led, Field-based, Cohort Model Research Study
Pumped to be starting my teaching career at LAMBERT HIGH SCHOOL!
Thrilled to be starting my teaching career at Creek View Elementary.

Over the moon to be starting my teaching career at Mountain View Elementary.

Pumped to be starting my teaching career at Creek View Elementary.

Overjoyed to be starting my teaching career at Bonaire Elementary.

34 likes

Holley's Post
Megan Moss,
BS in Early Childhood Education, May 2012
M.Ed. In Learning and Teaching, Harvard University, May 2018
Program Assessment Meetings

• Confirm Program Assessment Plan (label Class, Program, EPP)
• Review Program Data in Packets and in Power Point provided
  – edTPA Program compared to previous years
  – edTPA Program compared to state and national scores
  – GACE scores
  – Completer Perception Survey Results
  – PPEM Rating for Program
  – Initial Teacher Candidate Field Experience Performance Assessment
  – Initial Teacher Candidate Professionalism Rubric
• SMART Reports
• SPA Reports