PEF Annual Assessment Report 2011

The following report was developed by the Standards and Accreditation Committee and the Assessment Committee. This was done in accordance with the overall assessment flowchart for the PEF.

The Standards and Accreditation Committee focuses on content issues related to Unit level assessment. Section I addresses the Standards and Accreditation Committee report with respect to the following: (I.) Ongoing review of the conceptual framework, (II.) General overview of the 2010 Unit Action Plans, (III.A) 2010 – 2011 reports of Committee findings, and (III.B) 2011 – 2012 Priorities.

The Assessment Committee focuses on process issues related to Unit level assessment. The Assessment Committee reviewed the Annual Assessment Reports from the following committees (a) Content Knowledge; (b) Diversity; (c) Induction; (d) Professional Development Ad-Hoc; and (e) Standards and Accreditation. This information was forwarded to the Assessment Committee via the Standards and Accreditation Committee who sets the priorities for the unit action plan items, makes recommendations for revisions in the program and unit assessment goals/plans, and oversees implementation and evaluation of the action plans. The second section addresses the Assessment Committee suggestions.

Section I

I. Ongoing review of the Conceptual Framework. The Ad-hoc Committee – Conceptual Framework (CF) became a working committee fall 2009. In reviewing faculty input from the Education Retreat and feedback from P-12 partners, the Ad-hoc Committee- CF met on a regular basis to review, revise, and develop the vision, mission, and unit learning outcomes which are aligned to the current framework knowledge base, the INTASC and NBPTS. The new framework was presented at the PEF meeting in December 2009 for faculty feedback. Additionally, the committee chair presented the framework to the PDS Advisory Council for feedback in January 2010. The committee continued to follow up in small groups with the faculty and PDS Advisory Council regarding final revisions needed in the new framework. The newly revised framework was voted on and passed at the PEF meeting in April 2010.

II. General Overview of 2010 Unit Action Plans. In review of the implementation and evaluation of Unit Action Plans listed in the PEF Annual Assessment Report for 2010, the committee summary is as follows:

A. Standards & Accreditation Committee follow-up on previous action plans:

The S & A Committee continued collaborations with the Assessment Committee to provide guidance regarding the assessment of knowledge, performance and dispositions across programs and the unit. LiveText, an electronic course assessment management system, was adopted by the unit.

In considering other ways to increase the response rate of our graduates, year one and year two post graduation, due to a low response rate from our graduates, first and second year follow up, the S & A Committee delegated this action to the Induction
Committee. In addition to the BOR Survey of Graduates, the Induction Committee has proposed a new survey of GSU graduates and will send this out beginning spring 2011.

Additionally, the Induction Committee reviewed data (sources: BOR Employer Survey – Graduate Self-Ratings; INTASC STARS Assessment Principal Ratings of GSU Graduates; Beginning Teacher Needs Assessment) in the following areas identified for follow up: technology ratings from principals, candidates confidence in working with students identified as having special needs, candidate ratings on classroom management and discipline skills. Findings will be summarized in section I part III, Induction Committee, of this report.

The S & A Committee reviewed course syllabi requirements and developed a document, Recommendations for Writing Syllabi Based on NCATE and the PEF Conceptual Framework, to ensure that syllabi reflect the conceptual framework and required standards.

As proposed in the spring 2010 report, the Unit Level Assessment Data Report Templates were revised to include newly assigned committee priorities. Findings will be summarized by committee in section I part III of this report.

B. Follow-up on other committee work:

As recommended by the S & A Committee, each PEF committee monitored the implementation and reporting of previous action plans as identified in the committee reporting template (Please refer to detailed committee reports and summary information in section III).

III. All committees created reports using the standardized reporting template, summarizing data reviewed, establishing action plans, and following up on the implementation of previous action plans. The findings for analysis of data from fall 2009 - spring 2010 and the recommendations/priorities set for the following unit action plan items for the spring 2011 report are listed in relation to the relevant PEF committee responsible.

A. 2010 – 2011 report of Committee findings. (Analysis of 09-10 data):

The Standards & Accreditation Committee reported on the following areas:

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates- Initial & Advanced

- Faculty ratings end of program indicated that the majority of candidates met the target (Data Source: Knowledge & Performance Assessments-Initial & Advanced; GPA Core Courses – Learning Theory, Research, Social Foundations, and Diversity).

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

- Faculty ratings end of program indicated that the majority of candidates met the target (Data Source: Knowledge & Performance Assessments-Other School Professionals; GPA Core Courses – Learning Theory, Research, Social Foundations, and Diversity).
Professional Dispositions for all Candidates

- Faculty ratings end of program indicated that the majority of candidates met the target 
  *(Data Source: Dispositions Assessment).*

There were no recommendations for improvement in any of these areas other than to 
 maintain and monitor candidate performance (GPA Core Courses).

The Ad-hoc Conceptual Framework Committee reported on the following areas:

The Ad-Hoc Conceptual Framework Committee was created to review the PEF Conceptual 
 Framework and revise it to better reflect the unique vision and mission of Georgia State 
 University, an urban, research institution. The committee met monthly fall 2009 – 2010 following 
 the Education Retreat established for the PEF to begin work reviewing and revising the 
 framework. Additionally, the committee shared information and reviewed feedback from the P- 
 12 Advisory Council regarding the design and the development of the newly revised framework. 
 The vision, mission, learning outcomes and literature review were updated. The knowledge base 
 continues to reflect national standards, INTASC and NBPTS. The final document was presented 
 and approved at the April PEF meeting 2010.

The committee recommended that the PEF be provided opportunities to read new research and 
 to share their research as it aligns with the three Conceptual Framework domains: Informed &
  Empowered, Committed, and Engaged. The Standards & Accreditation Committee will follow-up 
 on this recommendation.

The Content Knowledge Committee reported on the following areas:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial

- GACE Content Assessments: The pass rate for the GACE exam was a 98% for all 
  certification programs in the unit
- INTASC STANDARD 1 (Knowledge): 95% of students in the various certification programs 
  in the unit met or exceeded the target of 85% set for performance. *(Data Source: STARS 
  INTASC Assessment)*

Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial

- INTASC STANDARD 1 (Disposition): 87% of students were considered “proficient” or 
  “advanced proficient”. The mean score was 4.5 (out of 5) and the mode was 5
- INTASC STANDARD 1.2 (Performance): 96% of our students were considered “proficient” 
  or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.4 (out of 5) and the mode was 4.
- INTASC STANDARD 1.3: (Performance): 95% of our students were considered 
  “proficient” or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.41 (out of 5) and the mode was 4.
- INTASC STANDARD 4 D (Disposition): 85% of our students were considered “proficient” 
  or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.24 (out of 5) and the mode was 4.
- INTASC STANDARD 4.1 (Knowledge): 96% of our students were considered “proficient” 
  or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.4 (out of 5) and the mode was 4.
- INTASC STANDARD 4.2 (Performance): 95% of our students were considered “proficient” 
  or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.4 (out of 5) and the mode was 4.
- INTASC STANDARD 4.3 (Performance): 95% of our students were considered “proficient” 
  or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.38 (out of 5) and the mode was 4.

*(Data Source: STARS INTASC Assessment)*
Candidates' effective use of technology in the assessment of P-12 learning

- INTASC STANDARD 4.1 (Knowledge): 96% of our students were considered “proficient” or “advanced proficient.” The mean was 4.4 (out of 5) and the mode was 4. (Data Source: STARS INTASC Assessment)

The Induction Committee reported on the following areas:

Follow-up on previous action plans pertaining to the effectiveness of programs in terms of teacher performance, the committee noted the following:

A weakness of the New Educators Induction Conference (NEIC), traditionally held in the fall at GSU’s campus, was that teachers needed to take time from the classroom to attend, and school districts needed to fund the conference fee. As school budgets became more and more strained, and principals less able to fund and to allow release time for new teachers to attend, fewer new educators were able to attend.

In order to reach a greater number of new educators and to cope with budgetary constraints, the committee replaced the conference with an Induction strand at the NET-Q Summer Institute. Induction programming included:

- Plenary session guest speaker Betty Achinstein-- a researcher at the Center for Educational Research in the interest of Underserved Students at the University of California, Santa Cruz-- on “New Teacher Induction: Mentoring and Being Mentored to Support Equity and Diversity.” Induction strand attendees rated this lecture 4.45 out of 5 as “very effective.”
- Break-out session with Dr. Melissa Leontovich of GSU on “How New Teachers Can Support Students with Disabilities: Six Models.” Induction strand attendees rated this session 4.7 out of 5 as “contributing to my knowledge on this topic.”
- Break out sessions-- “How the RTI Model Can Help You and Those You Mentor”; “21st Century Perspectives and Practical Conversation about Special Needs and Inclusion”; “ESOL/ELL Panel”; “Teacher-Intern-Professor Model”—were rated by Induction strand attendees 4.6 out of 5 for “broadening my knowledge and understanding of these topics.”

Effectiveness of programs in leading to teacher retention

(Data Sources: BOR Employer Surveys: Principal and Self Ratings -2009-2010 data not available; CCLC Training Rosters, Summer 2010; NET-Q Summer Institute and Induction Conference (Summer 2010) attendance roster; USG STEM Initiative Annual Report (June 25, 2010)’ 8 new STEM program initiatives in MSIT)

Strengths:

- The CCLCs are designed to mentor and retain new teachers. During the summer 2010 training sessions, attendees included 37 teachers from six K-12 school districts (APS, Cobb, Clayton, Dekalb, Gwinnet, Fulton Counties), two GSU faculty members (ECE, EPS) and two NET-Q Liaisons.
- 130 attendees from six K-12 school districts, two universities (Columbus State U, Georgia State U), and two NET-Q Liaisons. Participants included new teachers in their
first 5 years of teaching, NET-Q new teacher residents, the mentors, and school administrators.

- The 8 new program initiatives listed below are designed to recruit and prepare teacher candidates to effectively work in K-12 schools specifically in STEM fields.
  1. New BS/MAT program in Physics Education (admitted 3 candidates for 2011)
  2. Reactivation of the BSE in Middle Education Program, with students choosing two majors from language arts, reading, social studies, mathematics, or science. (10 students admitted for 2010; 27 students admitted for 2011; 150 undergraduates have declared as major)
  3. New addition to the Science MAT degree: A Single Subject Specialty in 6-12 Science Education
  4. NSF Noice Mathematics & Science Education Scholarships to support 36 students in each of the math and science programs as they begin careers in math and science education.
  5. NET-Q Teacher Residency Fellowships in Mathematics and Science Education. Ten (10) mathematics residents began fall 2010 in Clayton, Cobb, Dekalb, Fulton and Gwinnett school districts.
  6. A FLC course titled Careers in Teaching Mathematics or Science was developed to recruit undergraduates interested in teaching careers.
  7. Development of the Urban Education Minor Partnership with TFA (currently enrolled 18 secondary math and 14 secondary science teacher candidates)

Effectiveness of programs in terms of teacher performance


Strengths:

- In answer to the statement, “Overall, the NET-Q Summer Institute has contributed well to my professional development,” Induction strand attendees’ average rating was 4.79 out of 5.
- From BOR survey it was determined that at least 92% of employers who responded agreed or strongly agreed that GSU graduates hired in their schools were effective in domains related to teacher performance (specific domains analyzed: Domain II: Knowledge of students, teaching and learning, and Domain V: Planning and Instruction).
- From BOR survey self ratings, 99% of 2008 GSU graduates who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in domains related to teacher performance (see above) with the exception of 2 indicators of Domain II.

Indicator 9: “ability to work with students identified as needing special education services.” 95% of candidates who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in this specific area. This is an increase in their level of confidence in working with children with special needs compared to the 2007 and 2008 graduates reporting last year.

Indicator 7: “hold high expectations for all because I believe everyone can learn at high levels.” 96% of candidates who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in this specific area. In contrast, 100% of the 2009 graduates who responded
indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that they “hold high expectations for all learners.”

- From BOR survey self ratings, 99% of 2009 GSU graduates who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in domains related to teacher performance (see above) with the exception of 2 indicators within Domain II and V.
  
  **Domain II Indicator 9:** “ability to work with students identified as needing special education services.” 96% of candidates who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in this specific area. Compared to the 2007 and 2008 graduates reporting last year, this group shows a higher level of confidence in their level of confidence in working with children with special needs.
  
  **Domain V Indicator 25:** “Integrating technology and other multimedia resources appropriately to maximize learning opportunities for all students.” 97% of candidates who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in this specific area.

- From INTASC ratings by principals of 2008 graduates, the range of mean scores on the 30 Knowledge and Performance Indicators was 3.875 – 4.35 on the following 5 point scale: 1 = not demonstrated; 2 = Basic; 3 = Developing; 4 = Proficient; 5 = Advanced. The range of mean scores for Disposition Indicators was 3.87 – 4.16 with the same scale listed above.

  From INTASC ratings by principals of 2009 graduates, the range of mean scores on the 30 Knowledge and Performance Indicators was 4.07 – 4.53, with the same scale listed above. The range of mean scores for Disposition Indicators was 3.9 – 4.36 with the same scale listed above.

- From INTASC self ratings by graduates of 2008, the range of mean scores on the 30 Knowledge and Performance Indicators was 3.49 – 4.18, on the following 5 point scale: 1 = not demonstrated; 2 = Basic; 3 = Developing; 4 = Proficient; 5 = Advanced. The range of mean scores for Disposition Indicators was 3.69 – 3.96 with the same scale listed above.

  From INTASC self ratings by graduates of 2009, the range of mean scores on the 30 Knowledge and Performance Indicators was 3.61 – 4.31, on the following 5 point scale: 1 = not demonstrated; 2 = Basic; 3 = Developing; 4 = Proficient; 5 = Advanced. The range of mean scores for Disposition Indicators was 3.52 – 3.87 with the same scale listed above.

**Areas of Improvement:**

- Data from BTNA indicate that 2008 graduates need help with teaching students with special needs. 27.2% of responders indicated they needed help in this area, which is consistent with the BOR Employer and Graduate Self-Assessment reports. This percentage is also consistent with results from last year’s Induction Report.

  Data from BTNA indicate that 2009 graduates need help with the following: teaching students with special needs (35%); help using time effectively at school (35%); and, having enough time to teach well (45%). These data are again consistent with the BOR Employer and Graduate Self-Assessment reports about their needs for teaching students with special needs. However, the indication about time management and have enough time to teach well are unique to this survey.

**Effectiveness of induction initiatives in leading to teacher retention**

During Spring 2010, eleven (11) undergraduate STEM majors participated in FOCUS service learning projects. They completed 520 hours of service to schools in the Atlanta Public School district.
The FLC: Teaching in Today’s Society was revised for Fall 2010 by the ECE Department. The course is now offered as PERS 2001: Teaching in Today’s Society with a current enrollment of 61 students. This revision allows students to receive course credit in Area B of the undergraduate program. The GSU 1010 Freshman Learning Community is a small group of students (24) who are also enrolled in the PERS course and wish to pursue the study skills and campus life topics offered in all FLC courses. Both courses are taught by the same ECE faculty member in order to maintain integration and consistency across the 2 courses.

(Data Source: PEIS Evaluation Summary Report)

Strengths:

- The Fall 2010 Professional Educator Induction Seminar consisted of 2 components. Part I of the seminar focused on the PSC Code of Ethics for Educators and the Georgia Frameworks. 167 GSU candidates from TEEMS, MSIT, KH, and Art teacher preparation programs attended the PEIS during fall 2010. 98% agreed or strongly agreed that “Participation in PEIS was helpful to my professional development as an educator”. (33% agree/65% strongly agree)
- PEIS Part II: Human Resource directors from 7 metro counties served on a panel to discuss application and hiring procedures for new educators. 253 candidates from ECE, TEEMS, MSIT, KH and Art teacher preparation programs attended this component of the seminar. The GSU Career Center also presented resources available to students for developing resumes and portfolios.

The Field Experience & Clinical Practice Committee reported on the following areas:

Follow-up on previous action plans:

In 2009-2010, an Ad-hoc Committee for Field Experience examined the criminal background check process and the procedures used to arrange placements prior to admission to teacher education and the procedures used to place students after admission to teacher education. District placement officers and the GSU legal office provided feedback as new policies and procedures were developed.

An Office of Field Placement was established within the COE Office of Academic Assistance in 2009. The OAA staff member in this office (a) oversees the criminal background check process for all PEF programs, (b) arranges the placements of students for education courses prior to their admission to teacher education, (c) maintains a database of student teaching placements and a website of information, (d) attends state meetings of the PSC and Field Experience Coordinators, (e) maintains and monitors our MOU’s with participating districts and schools, (d) serves as the Certification Officer for the PEF.

NCATE Element 3a: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

(Data Sources: OAA-Office of Field Placement report, Ad-Hoc Field Experience meeting notes, new policies and procedures for field placements and criminal background check -Field Experience data folder; Placement Summary Table and data for 09-10 -Field Experience data folder; Mentor Teacher Feedback survey)

- Effectiveness of the unit in placing students in high needs urban schools

The new OAA-Office of Field Placement has undertaken the new duties for CBC, and field placements of EDUC courses. A website has been created. The committee noted
that individual program coordinators/staff will need regular communication regarding any district level changes which might occur.

The unit was successful in placing student teachers in high needs schools, with 56% of our student teachers placements occurring in schools with 50% or more students on free and reduced lunch and 66% of our placements occurring in schools where under-represented populations made up 60% or more of the student population. We recommend that data be collected in the future on our placements for field experiences as well as for student teaching.

- **Effectiveness of the unit in involving P-12 partners in the design, delivery, implementation, and evaluation of the unit’s conceptual framework and school programs**

The Mentor Teacher Survey needs to be shared with P-12 advisory council and adapted to make it more applicable across all programs. The committee recommends that the survey be distributed at the unit level rather than at the program level. A preliminary form will be sent to students in field experience courses and in student teaching courses asking for information on their placement and contact information for their teacher. This information will be used for to compile data related to placement information for both field experiences and student teaching. The contact information for the mentor teacher will be used to distribute the mentor teacher survey to cooperating mentor teachers.

The committee noted that the procedures programs follow in identifying mentors for interns who are on non-renewable certificates vary greatly across departments. To better understand current practices, the committee feels it would appropriate to survey programs regarding their practices.

**NCATE Element 3b: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

(Data Sources: PSC policies on certification, PSC/NCATE standards for field experiences and work with diverse learners; COE Dean’s Office Audit and Report - 2009-2010; GSU Catalog ; New Student Assessment of Conceptual Framework instrument)

- **Application of entry & exit requirements for all candidates**
  COE Dean’s Office Report - In 2009-2010 all programs were audited to determine compliance with the use of GACE Basic Skills as an entrance requirement for educator preparation programs. GSU Catalog changes reflect this rule clarification by the PSC.

- **Placement of candidates in a variety of settings for application of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions and observations of candidates**
  Initial preparation and endorsement programs are asked to document their plan for ensuring that candidates have field experiences at all levels of their base certificates, with culturally diverse learners and with students of exceptionalities. This documentation must be ready for submission for the PSC program reports prior to the NCATE visit. Sample forms which can be used at the program level or at the student level will be shared with programs as an appendix to the unit report. The field experience committee will maintain a folder with the sample forms and with program-specific forms as a resource for the unit.

- **Extension of the unit’s conceptual framework into practice**
The new conceptual framework was shared with P-12 advisory committee to enable P-12 partners to be informed of the final version of the instrument. Students will provide feedback on this framework using the assessment in 2010-2011. This data will help the committee understand the degree to which students feel these outcomes are reflected in the field experience and practicum.

**NCATE Element 3c: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Children Learn**

(Data Sources: INTASC 3.3, 6.3, 7.3; NBPTS 1.3; No data was available from the NET-Q grant on student achievement in light of the fact that the grant is in initial year.)

- **Student Learning for Teacher Candidates (Initial & Advanced)**
- **Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

The data reviewed provided a limited view of the impact of our programs on our candidates being able to impact student learning and development. The committee noted that this is a primary area of focus in Georgia’s Race for the Top grant and future data in this area will be directly impacted by what is developed through that initiative.

**PDS definition and process**

(Data Sources: Review of PDS definition and process established in 2009)

The committee notes the strength of the PDS definition that was officially adopted in 2009 but an area of concern is that the process was never submitted to the PEF for approval. The committee clarified the process in the original document by noting where potential PDS partners are to submit the proposal. The process for becoming a PDS school was officially presented at the fall 2010 faculty meeting and approved at that time.

The **Diversity Committee** reported on the following areas:

- Confusion over the overlapping responsibilities of the PEF Diversity committee and the COE Diversity committee has led to difficulties in the functioning of this committee. This spring the committee will analyze data related to faculty and student recruitment and retention. In addition the committee recommends the bylaws be changed to clarify the distinctions between the committees.

The **Student Affairs Committee (SAC)** reported on the following areas:

**Follow-up on previous action plans:**

The committee has identified an ongoing – 2010 action item which is to review advising services at other colleges and universities to see how their practices are applicable to the College of Education. In fall 2010, the college hosted Welcome reception for COE students. The Welcome was well received, and plans are to repeat this event in 2011. The committee completed the review of student appeal information/hearing process. Recommendations for changes in the college bylaws to streamline the process to convene a student academic dishonesty will be presented to the faculty for review in 2011. Additionally, the committee examined the procedure for awarding student awards and scholarships. The one process change that was
made was to allow applicants not awarded in fall to roll over their application for spring review. Awards were made twice per year in the fall and spring, a reversal of the 2009 decision to award once per year.

(Data Sources: 2009-2010 university exit survey - commensurate data from undergraduate and graduate surveys - and previous data from 2005/6 through 2008/9; 2009-2010 university exit survey and previous data from 2005 through 2009; COE Deans' Office Administrator Reports; Student Travel Budget and Allocations; Awards and scholarships applications and procedure materials)

- **Effectiveness of overall student advising services (i.e., Academic Support)**
The mean average on undergraduate advising in the college decreased slightly to 2.90 on a 4-point scale in FY10, in comparison to the FY09 college average of 2.95. Undergraduate students' satisfaction with advising from the university Student Advisement Center in FY10 improved from FY09 survey results from a mean of 2.77 to 2.92. In addition, advising satisfaction for education undergraduates surpassed the university mean in FY10 of 2.84. Graduate students satisfaction with Academic Support Services decreased in FY10 to 3.07, from the FY09 average of 3.14. This data remains consistent with data from the past five years. Fall 2009, the college hosted a welcome back event for students to increase their awareness of college academic support. Overall, the effectiveness of student advising services is increasing each year.

- **Effectiveness of program academic advising (i.e., in the college, in your major, department) – Undergraduate**
The mean average for departmental advising of education majors decreased from 2.98 (FY09) to 2.90 (FY10) on a 4-point scale, which was slightly below the university mean in FY09 (2.93) and FY210 (2.95). Although this data shows a dip in student satisfaction with program advising at the college level, the FY10 results still increased from earlier years (FY06: 2.65; FY07: 2.81; FY08: 2.84). Overall, the effectiveness of undergraduate student program advising continues to increase each year.

- **Effectiveness of program academic advising (i.e., in the college, in your major, department) – Graduate**
Graduate students rated their overall advising experience from the college as 3.18 in FY10, an increase from 3.11 in FY09. These means were higher than the mean of other majors in the university (FY09: 2.98; FY10: 2.88). Graduate students' satisfaction with advising from their major/department increased from a mean of 3.18 in FY09, an increase from FY10, as compared to the means of other university majors (FY09: 2.88; FY10:2.88).
SAC acknowledges the student satisfaction with advising as a strength of the college.

- **Completor Satisfaction with program (i.e., preparation for advanced study, preparation for career) – Undergraduate**
Undergraduate education students note their programs have prepared them for advanced study (FY09: 3.56; FY10: 3.62) at a higher rate than do undergraduates in other majors (FY09: 3.33; FY10: 3.39). They also indicate their programs have prepared them for their career (FY09: 3.65; FY10: 3.68) at a higher level than do other majors (FY09: 3.16; FY10: 3.33).

- **Completor Satisfaction with program (i.e., preparation for advanced study, preparation for career) – Graduate**
Graduate education students also feel prepared for advanced work as a result of their programs (FY09: 3.57; FY10: 3.54) at a higher mean than do other graduate program
completers (FY09: 3.47; FY10: 3.42); and feel more prepared for their careers (FY09: 3.59; FY10: 3.09) than do other university majors (FY09: 3.47; FY10: 3.42). Overall, education students are satisfied that their programs have prepared them for their careers or advanced study.

- **Effectiveness of student access to appeals process**
  For academic dishonesty hearings, a SAC member attended the hearings as a non-voting member to observe and take note of any feedback that come out of the hearings. The member reported back to the committee to see if any action needs to be taken.
  COE Dean’s Office Administrator is available by phone and e-mail to answer questions from students and faculty about the appeals process.

- **Effectiveness of student groups**
  The student groups continue to be a very positive experience. Ten COE groups requested funding for FY10 and were awarded $11,178. SAC also dispersed $7,610 in travel funds to COE students.
  One area for improvement, or which bears attention is the award process for the distribution of Student Activity Fee funds.

- **Effectiveness of Student Awards/Scholarships**
  Adjustments made in FY09 (3 awards per semester, and increased funding) were well received in FY10 and a larger pool of qualified applicants were identified.
  An area for improvement is communication. Students and departments might not be aware as they could be about the availability of scholarships. An effort is needed to increase the communication throughout the College of Education population in hopes of developing a larger applicant pool in FY10.

B. **2011 – 2012 Priorities.** Priorities set for the 2011 report are grouped by recommendations for specific committees:

**All Committees:** Specific recommendations as related to the priorities set for each committee and the alignment to the PEF Conceptual Framework can be found in the attached charts: *Georgia State University PEF Unit Level Assessment System Committee Priorities (Appendix A); Conceptual Framework Alignment by Committee (Appendix B); and PEF Conceptual Framework Alignment Chart (Appendix C).*

**Consider the following Bylaw change:** The PEF Diversity committee recommends the following changes to the PEF bylaws:

**Existing PEF Bylaws:**

3. The PEF Diversity Committee shall:
   (a) evaluate the progress of the Professional Education Faculty towards the goals and outcomes stated in the unit’s diversity plan;

   (b) make recommendations to the Professional Education Council regarding the progress of the Professional Education Faculty towards the goals and outcomes outlined in the unit’s diversity plan;

   (c) produce a report for the Professional Education Council based on its review, evaluation, and recommendations;
(d) develop and compile a menu of strategies for the recruitment of minority 
underrepresented faculty; and

(e) compile and maintain a database of resources available in specific academic areas for 
the retention of minority/underrepresented faculty.

PEF Bylaws change Recommendation:

3. The PEF Diversity Committee shall:

(a) evaluate the progress of the Professional Education Faculty towards standards 
related to diversity as established by state and national accrediting bodies;

(b) make recommendations to the Professional Education Council regarding the 
progress of the Professional Education Faculty towards these diversity standards; and,

(c) produce a report for the Professional Education Council based on its review, 
evaluation, and recommendations.

Standards & Accreditation Committee:

1) To collaborate with the Assessment Committee on the process and content summary of 
data collected at the unit level, following the PEF’s identification of key assessment 
targets by program.

2) To provide opportunities for faculty to share their research as it relates to the learning 
outcomes of the PEF Conceptual Framework. Specifically, each semester the PEF will 
focus readings/discussions/presentations on one domain of the framework (i.e., 
Informed & Empowered, Committed, and Engaged).

Assessment Committee:

1) To continue with follow up on the revised plan to review program reports (e.g., WEAVE, 
PAAR, Program Level Assessment Report Template) including analysis of program 
strengths and areas for improvement, as submitted each fall by each educator 
preparation program.

2) To follow up on the use of LiveText as a technological mechanism to consistently 
disseminate and accurately aggregate program and unit level data.

Content Knowledge Committee:

1) To make policy recommendations to the PEF regarding means of assessing content 
knowledge of education students, as stated in the 2009 bylaws of the PEF GSU.

2) To advise on integrating content, pedagogy and technology knowledge in teacher 
education programs, as stated in the 2009 bylaws of the PEF GSU. 
Although infusing technology integration into the content areas is a desirable practice, a 
more focused instrument to collect data on this domain needs to be considered. This 
will provide richer data in this area.

3) To strengthen candidates’ understanding of content within the context of teaching, the 
following actions were proposed: Team teaching of major and content faculty; 
Collaboration of major and content faculty in redeveloping syllabi for content courses, 
promoting pedagogical content knowledge. An instrument is being developed to 
determine the types of collaboration that exist between faculty who teach pedagogy 
and content courses from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education.
The Dean's Office will facilitate the survey dissemination, data collection, and initial analysis using LiveText, Excel, and SPSS software.

**Induction Committee:**

1) To review 2009-2010 BOR Workforce Rates Reports, when available, to analyze current retention rates of GSU graduates in initial certification programs. Disseminate and discuss BOR Workforce Rates by Programs data with designated program faculty.

2) To continue to collaborate with the NET-Q Design Team to support CCLC training provided to partner school systems through grant funding specifically through NET-Q Summer Institute and recruitment of candidates for the NET-Q Teacher Residency Fellowships. The committee will continue to collaborate with MSIT regarding enrollment and retention data on the USG STEM Initiatives.

3) To plan an ongoing Induction strand as part of the NET-Q Summer Institute and Induction Conference. For summer 2011, include focused topic seminars on teaching children with special needs and classroom management strategies. Also include these topics as part of the agenda for PEIS in Fall 2011.

4) To recommend discussions at the program level regarding teaching candidates about time management specific to area and level of certification.

5) To continue to develop and implement Professional Educator Induction Seminar (PEIS) fall 2011.

6) To consult the PERS 2001 course instructor for course feedback from students regarding the effectiveness of the revised structure with the Freshman Learning Community (FLC).

7) To distribute a listing of potential teacher education candidates identified through enrollment in the PERS 2001/FLC 1010: Teaching in Today’s Society, FOCUS and FLC: Math and Science Careers to appropriate program coordinators for early identification, contact and advisement opportunities.

**Field Experience & Clinical Practice Committee:**

1) To monitor through the Office of Academic Assistance (OAA) the district changes in placement processes and notify department level individuals of changes as they occur. The OAA will also update the new GSU website with relevant information as needed.

2) To follow up with the Dean's Office on the sharing of the Mentor Teacher Survey with the P-12 Advisory Council and to create a unit-level form via LiveText so the survey can be used by all programs. Data will be summarized at the unit level and disaggregated and shared with programs.

3) To create a survey to send to M.A.T. and post-baccalaureate programs on their policy and procedures regarding identification of mentors for interns who are on non-renewable certificates.

4) To follow up with the Dean's Office in creating sample forms in the LiveText which can be used at the program level or at the student level to document initial preparation and endorsement program plans for ensuring that candidates have field experiences at all levels of their base certificates with culturally diverse learners and with students of exceptionalities. The field experience committee will maintain a folder with the sample forms and program-specific forms as a resource for the unit. Documentation will be ready for submission for the PSC program reports prior to the NCATE visit.

5) To recommend that the PDS process be adopted by the PEF, that the Dean's Office ensures the procedures for becoming a PDS are published on the web, and that a database and web-presence is maintained to include our official PDS partners.
Diversity Committee:

1) To assume responsibility for leadership related to diversity for our Unit in the following areas:
   a) Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences;
   b) Professional development of PEF faculty to ensure the individuals with whom candidates work are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing diverse candidates to work with each other and to work with diverse learners; and
   c) Effectiveness of the unit in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools with diverse learners.

Student Affairs Committee:

1) To review and monitor advising services at other colleges and universities and will see how their practices and services are applicable to the College of Education.
2) To coordinate the effort with department chairs and faculty, along with the COE Office of Academic Assistance regarding the implementation of orientation and advising services at the program level across the college.
3) To continue an in-depth review of advising services at other colleges and universities and will see how their practices are applicable to the College of Education.
4) To continue to monitor the student appeal/hearing process to determine if further changes should be made.
5) To review the award process to examine equity of allocations among groups/departments to determine if all eligible student groups are served with the current application procedure.
6) To continue to monitor the award process to ensure ease of application for students.
Section II

The following section was developed by the Assessment Committee. The task of the Assessment Committee during Spring semester is to review the Annual Assessment Report drafts, review the unit system process, add proposed changes to the Annual Assessment Report drafts, and send the Annual Assessment Reports to the PEF. The Assessment Committee reviewed the unit assessment processes implemented for 2010-2011 and the specific analyses of the 2009-2010 data and the resulting recommendations of committees as presented to the PEF. Below is a summary of that review and recommendations for 2011-2012 year.

Review of the committee work submitted to the PEF for review in 2010-2011 indicated that the process of reviewing of data by the committees is functioning very well. No major changes to the process are indicated at this time. The Assessment Committee continues to monitor the processes and to make modifications as needed.

For our NCATE Self-Study, the PEF has elected to focus on NCATE Standard 2 related to the unit assessment system. The goal is to move from a rating of Acceptable to a rating of Target. For a Target rating, units are expected to “regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards.” ¹ Therefore, during the 2010-2011 year, the Assessment Committee has focused its efforts on examining elements related to NCATE Standard 2. Toward this goal, the Assessment Committee has supported and implemented the following changes in process:

1. Creation and Implementation of two new unit-wide assessments:

   - **Dispositions of Effective Education Professionals**: Because the STARS system, which was previously used for collecting data on dispositions, is no longer available, the Assessment Committee adopted a new assessment that could be embedded in courses taught through LiveText and used to collect unit-wide data on dispositions at the end of each semester. Faculty in each PEF program were asked to designate two courses where the rubric could be embedded and used to evaluate students at the midpoint and the endpoint of each program. The rubric is electronically linked to five of the PEF Conceptual Learning Outcomes (1.4, 2.1., 2.2, 2.3, 3.1) and was first used in Fall 2010.

   - **Student Self-Assessment of Programs (SAPP)**: A survey was developed by the Assessment Committee to collect data on students’ perceptions of their experiences and to align with the Conceptual Framework Learning Outcomes prescribed by the PEF. Faculty in each PEF program were asked to designate two courses in which students would be sent an email with an invitation to complete the survey (midpoint and endpoint of program). By using LiveText as a tool for collecting data, the results of the survey can be electronically tabulated and disaggregated. Questions on the form were developed specifically to address all 10 of the Conceptual Framework Outcomes. The survey was first used in Fall 2010.

¹ From the website for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
2. Development of Electronic Exhibit Room to showcase the PEF assessment system

- The Assessment Committee approved the use of LiveText for the creation of a master document, which will be used as the Electronic Exhibit Room for the NCATE report. The Exhibit Room will contain all required narratives, the PEF committee reports, and links to data reports for each program.

- Templates for initial teacher preparation programs, endorsements, and advanced programs have been created in LiveText for faculty to use to enter data for the NCATE data reports. The program data reports can serve as a central warehousing area for NCATE data as well as data for other reports (e.g., WEAVEonline) and can be amended each year for ongoing and systematic organization and reporting.

Recommendations for 2011-2012

- Implement a unit-wide assessment of mentors/cooperating teachers. Recognizing the need for increased feedback from P-12 partners, the Assessment Committee recommends the development of a unit-wide survey to obtain perspectives from mentors/cooperating teachers. Two departments are currently using a LiveText survey form to obtain these data. The form should be revised and distributed at the unit level in order to obtain feedback from P-12 partners on program effectiveness.

- Develop a system for ensuring that programs are adding data to the data reports every year. With the new program data reports in LiveText, faculty can easily update data in the reports each year.

- Develop a system for ensuring that programs regularly analyze data for strengths and areas for improvement. NCATE Standard 2 states that for a Target rating, units should ensure the following: “Data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.”

- Develop ways to improve systematic dissemination of data publicly. The committee will explore the creation and development of a webpage where program data can be easily accessed.

---

2 From the website for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
# APPENDIX A: Georgia State University PEF Unit Level Assessment System Committee Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSC/NCATE Element</th>
<th>Professional &amp; Pedagogical Knowledge &amp; Skills and Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c. Professional &amp; Pedagogical Knowledge &amp; Skills (Initial &amp; Adv. Teacher Candidates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Knowledge &amp; Skills of Other School Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g. Dispositions All Candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content &amp; Pedagogical Content Knowledge Technology in Assessment of P-12 Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge (Initial &amp; Adv. Teacher Candidates)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning &amp; Dispositions (Initial &amp; Adv. Teacher Candidates &amp; Other School Professionals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Children Learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity; Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty (recruitment &amp; retention of diverse faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates (recruitment &amp; retention of candidates from under-represented groups @ GSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction, Teacher Retention &amp; Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Program &amp; Induction Initiatives on Teacher Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Programs on Teacher Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Student Advising Services Effectiveness of Program Academic Advising (Undergraduate & Graduate) |
| Complete satisfaction with program (i.e. preparation for advanced study & career) |
| Effectiveness of student access to appeals process |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Committee</th>
<th>Standards &amp; Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources &amp; Conceptual Framework Alignment</td>
<td>GPA Core Courses (i.e. Learning Theory, Research, Social Foundations, Diversity) CF 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Planning &amp; Clinical Practice) CF 1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Initial &amp; Adv. Teacher Candidates) CF 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Experiences &amp; Clinical Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents (BOR) Employer Survey – Principal Ratings &amp; Graduate Self Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOR Workforce Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCLC Training Rosters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit Survey of Recipients of Graduate and Undergraduate Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs COE Survey on Advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 1.4; Dispositions Assessment CF 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 2.3; Dispositions Assessment CF 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Clinical Practice) CF 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B: Georgia State University PEF Unit Level Assessment System

## Conceptual Framework Alignment by Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSC/NCATE Element</th>
<th>Professional &amp; Pedagogical Knowledge &amp; Skills (Planning &amp; Clinical Practice); Dispositions</th>
<th>Content Knowledge &amp; Pedagogical Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Student Learning; Dispositions</th>
<th>Diversity; Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Committee</td>
<td>Standards &amp; Accreditation Committee</td>
<td>Content Knowledge Committee</td>
<td>Field Experiences &amp; Clinical Practice Committee</td>
<td>Diversity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources &amp; Conceptual Framework Alignment</td>
<td>GPA Core Courses (i.e. Learning Theory, Research, Social Foundations, Diversity)</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 1.2</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 2.1</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Clinical Practice) CF 1.4</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Technology) CF 3.2</td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 2.1</td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Planning &amp; Clinical Practice) CF 1.3</td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment CF 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Clinical Practice) CF 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispositions Assessment CF 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Performance Assessment (Clinical Practice) CF 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSU PEF Conceptual Framework Alignment Chart</td>
<td>INTASC</td>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>GA-GSTEP</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Informed &amp; Empowered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Our candidates use their knowledge of child, adolescent, and adult development and theories of learning to design meaningful educational opportunities for all learners.</strong></td>
<td>2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7D</td>
<td>2, 5, 7</td>
<td>2, 3, 5</td>
<td>1, 3, 4b, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Our candidates possess and use research-based, discipline-specific knowledge and pedagogy to facilitate learning for all.</strong></td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1D, 4.2, 4D</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td>4b, 4c, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Our candidates reflect critically upon data as part of a recursive process when planning, implementing and assessing teaching, learning, and development.</strong></td>
<td>4.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.2, 4D, 7D, 8D, 9D</td>
<td>4, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td>1, 2, 4b, 4d, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Our candidates critically analyze educational policies and/or practices that affect learners in metropolitan contexts.</strong></td>
<td>7.2, 10.1</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>1, 2, 4a, 4b, 4d, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Committed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Our candidates know and respect individual differences, establish productive and ethical relationships with students, and modify the learning environment to positively impact student learning.</strong></td>
<td>2D, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3D, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3, 7.3, 8.3</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>1, 2, 4b, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Our candidates create engaging learning communities where the diverse perspectives, opinions, and beliefs of others are acknowledged and respected.</strong></td>
<td>5.2, 5.3, 5D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>1, 3, 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Our candidates commit to continuing personal and professional development.</strong></td>
<td>9.1, 9.3, 9D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Engaged</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Our candidates use knowledge of students’ cultures, experiences, and communities to create and sustain culturally responsive classrooms and schools.</strong></td>
<td>2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.3, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10D</td>
<td>2, 3, 10</td>
<td>2, 3, 6</td>
<td>1, 2, 4a, 4b, 4d, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Our candidates coordinate time, space, activities, technology and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse learners in real world experiences.</strong></td>
<td>4.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6D</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4a, 4b, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Our candidates implement appropriate communication techniques to provide for learner interaction within local and global communities.</strong></td>
<td>6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4a, 4b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards

The educator:

1. understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of the subject matter meaningful for students;
2. understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development;
3. understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners;
4. understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills;
5. uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation;
6. uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques, including technology, to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom;
7. plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, student, the community, and curriculum goals;
8. understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner;
9. is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally;
10. fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Standards

The educator:

1. is committed to students and their learning and/or development;
2. is an expert in his/her field and can effectively apply that expertise to promote learning/development;
3. is responsible for managing and monitoring student learning/development;
4. is mindful of the principle objectives of learning/development;
5. is a member of one or more learning communities.