



Georgia Professional Standards Commission

Protecting Georgia's Higher Standard of Learning

GEORGIA STANDARDS FOR THE APPROVAL OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDERS AND EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

(Adopted May, 2014; Effective 09/01/2016)

**Kelly Henson
Executive Secretary**

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge.....	5
Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice.....	10
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity.....	14
Standard 4: Program Impact.....	21
Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement.....	24
Standard 6: Georgia Requirements for Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs.....	27
CAEP Glossary of Terms.....	32
GaPSC Glossary of Terms.....	34

Endnotes

Links to Additional CAEP Resources

Additional Recommendations of the CAEP Commission

Annual Reporting and CAEP Monitoring

Levels of Accreditation Decisions

Cross-cutting Themes: Diversity and Technology and Digital Learning

Scope of the CAEP Commission’s Recommendations

CAEP Commission Recommendations on Evidence in Accreditation

Typical and Suggested Measures for Accreditation Evidence References

Introduction

The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) adapted the Accreditation Standards published August 19, 2013 by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) for use in the Georgia Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) and preparation program approval process. The adapted standards include all five of the CAEP standards, as well as one additional standard addressing preparation program requirements specific to the state of Georgia. The adapted standards, *the Georgia Standards for the Approval of Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs* will become effective September 1, 2016 and apply to all EPPs and initial educator preparation programs offered by Georgia-based institutions and agencies, as well as to out-of-state EPPs seeking to gain and/or maintain GaPSC approval of Educational Leadership programs.

The CAEP Commission adopted a structure for the standards that begins with three areas of teacher preparation identified by the National Academy of Sciences 2010 report, *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy*. The Academy panel found that existing research provides some guidance regarding factors “likely to have the strongest effects” on outcomes for students: content knowledge; field experience; and the quality of teacher candidates.¹

Adapting that guidance to its task, the first three standards adopted by the Commission are:

- Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
- Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
- Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The ultimate goal of educator preparation is the impact of program completers on P-12 student learning and development, as framed by the Commission in the fourth standard. That impact would be demonstrated both directly through multiple measures and indirectly by the satisfaction of the completers and their employers.

- Standard 4: Program Impact

Finally, the Commission explored important functions of an accrediting body that are fashioned around attributes of high-performing education organizations. These are supported by research on effective management and, especially, by the Baldrige education

award criteria, as well as recent trends and new approaches among accreditors. The fifth standard and the recommendations on annual reporting and levels of accreditation are built on these sources:

- Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

Georgia Standards For The Approval Of Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs

(Effective 09/01/2016)

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.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) ² in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Provider Responsibilities

1.2 Providers ensure that completers 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.

1.3 Providers ensure that completers 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).

1.4 Providers ensure that completers 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).

1.5 Providers 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.

CAEP Commission Rationale

This standard asserts the importance of a strong content background and foundation of pedagogical knowledge for all candidates. Teaching is complex and preparation must provide opportunities for candidates to acquire knowledge and skills that can move all P-12 students significantly forward—in their academic achievements, in articulating the purpose of education in their lives and in building independent competence for life-long learning. Such a background includes experiences that develop deep understanding of major concepts and principles within the candidate’s field, including college and career-ready expectations.³ Moving forward, college- and career-ready standards can be expected to include additional disciplines, underscoring the need to help students master a range of learner goals conveyed within and across disciplines. Content and pedagogical knowledge expected of candidates is articulated through the InTASC standards. These standards are:

- Standard #1: **Learner Development.** The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
- Standard #2: **Learning Differences.** The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
- Standard #3: **Learning Environments.** The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
- Standard #4: **Content Knowledge.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

- Standard #5: **Application of Content.** The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
- Standard #6: **Assessment.** The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
- Standard #7: **Planning for Instruction.** The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
- Standard #8: **Instructional Strategies.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
- Standard #9: **Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.** The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.
- Standard #10: **Leadership and Collaboration.** The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning and development, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Content knowledge describes the depth of understanding of critical concepts, theories, skills, processes, principles, and structures that connect and organize ideas within a field.⁴ Research indicates that students learn more when their teachers have a strong foundation of content knowledge.⁵

Teachers need to understand subject matter deeply and flexibly so they can help students create useful cognitive maps, relate one idea to another, and address misconceptions. Teachers need to see how ideas connect across fields and to everyday life. This kind of understanding provides a foundation for pedagogical content knowledge that enables teachers to make ideas accessible to others.⁶

These essential links between instruction and content are especially clear in Darling-Hammond's description of what the Common Core State Standards mean by "deeper learning":

- An understanding of the meaning and relevance of ideas to concrete problems
- An ability to apply core concepts and modes of inquiry to complex real-world tasks
- A capacity to transfer knowledge and skills to new situations, to build on and use them
- Abilities to communicate ideas and to collaborate in problem solving
- An ongoing ability to learn to learn.⁷

Pedagogical content knowledge in teaching includes:

Core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks; . . . deciding among alternative courses of action and analyze(ing) the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities."⁸ It is crucial to "good teaching and student understanding."⁹

The development of pedagogical content knowledge involves a shift in teachers' understanding from comprehension of subject matter *for themselves*, to advancing *their students'* learning through presentation of subject matter in a variety of ways that are appropriate to different situations—reorganizing and partitioning it and developing activities, metaphors, exercises, examples and demonstrations—so that it can be grasped by students.¹⁰

Understanding of pedagogical content knowledge is complemented by knowledge of learners—where teaching begins. Teachers must understand that learning and developmental patterns vary among individuals, that learners bring unique individual differences to the learning process, and that learners need supportive and safe learning

environments to thrive. Teachers' professional knowledge includes the ways in which cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development occurs.¹¹ Neuroscience is influencing education, and future educators should be well-versed in findings from brain research, including how to facilitate learning for students with varying capacities, experiences, strengths and approaches to learning.

To be effective, teachers also must be prepared to collaborate with families to support student success.¹² When teachers understand families and communicate and build relationships with them, students benefit. Many studies confirm that strong parent-teacher relationships relate to positive student outcomes for students, such as healthy social development, high student achievement and high rates of college enrollment.¹³ Thus, by giving teachers the support they need to work with families, Educator Preparation Providers can have an even greater impact on student learning and development.

The Commission's development of this standard and its components was influenced especially by the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, the Common Core State Standards Initiative,¹⁴ and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' Five Core Propositions.¹⁵ Additionally the Commission used the work of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)¹⁶ and the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP).¹⁷

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.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

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.

Clinical Educators

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.

Clinical Experiences

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.

CAEP Commission Rationale

Education is a practice profession and preparation for careers in education must create nurturing opportunities for aspiring candidates to develop, practice, and demonstrate the content and pedagogical knowledge and skills that promote learning for all students. These developmental opportunities/ experiences take place particularly in school-based situations, but may be augmented by community-based and virtual situations. The 2010 NCATE panel report, *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice*,¹⁸ identified important dimensions of clinical practice and the Commission drew from the Panel's recommendations to structure the three components of this standard.

Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) seeking accreditation should have strong collaborative partnerships with school districts and individual school partners, as well as other community stakeholders, in order to pursue mutually beneficial and agreed upon goals for the preparation of education professionals. These collaborative partnerships are a shared endeavor meant to focus dually on the improvement of student learning and development and on the preparation of teachers for this goal. The partners shall work together to determine not only the values and expectations of program development, implementation, assessment, and continuous improvement, but also the division of responsibilities among the various partnership stakeholders. At a minimum, the district and/or school leadership and the EPP should be a part of the partnership; other partners might include business and community members.

Characteristics of effective partnerships include: mutual trust and respect; sufficient time to develop and strengthen relationships at all levels; shared responsibility and accountability among partners, and periodic formative evaluation of activities among partners.¹⁹ Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden²⁰ call for strong relationships between universities and schools to share standards of good teaching that are consistent across courses and clinical work. This relationship could apply, as well, to all providers. The 2010

NCATE panel proposed partnerships that are strategic in meeting partners' needs by defining common work, shared responsibility, authority, and accountability.

Clinical educators are all EPP and P-12 school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions at some state in the clinical experiences. Literature indicates the importance of the quality of clinical educators, both school- and provider-based, to ensure the learning of candidates and P-12 students.²¹ Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice described high-quality clinical experiences as ones in which both providers and their partners require candidate supervision and mentoring by certified clinical educators—drawn from discipline-specific, pedagogical, and P-12 professionals—who are trained to work with and provide feedback to candidates. Clinical educators should be accountable for the performance of the candidates they supervise, as well as that of the students they teach.²²

High-quality clinical experiences are early, ongoing and take place in a variety of school- and community-based settings, as well as through simulations and other virtual opportunities (for example, online chats with students). Candidates observe, assist, tutor, instruct and may conduct research. They may be student-teachers or interns.²³ These experiences integrate applications of theory from pedagogical courses or modules in P-12 or community settings and are aligned with the school-based curriculum (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, college- and career-ready standards, Common Core State Standards). They offer multiple opportunities for candidates to develop, practice, demonstrate, and reflect upon clinical and academic components of preparation, as well as opportunities to develop, practice, and demonstrate evidence-based, pedagogical practices that improve student learning and development, as described in Standard 1.

The members of the 2010 Panel on clinical preparation and partnerships consulted both research resources and professional consensus reports in shaping their conclusions and recommendations, including proposed design principles for clinical experiences.²⁴ Among these are: (1) a student learning and development focus, (2) clinical practice that is integrated throughout every facet of preparation in a dynamic way, (3) continuous monitoring and judging of candidate progress on the basis of data, (4) a curriculum and experiences that permit candidates to integrate content and a broad range of effective

teaching practices and to become innovators and problem solvers, and (5) an “interactive professional community” with opportunities for collaboration and peer feedback. Howey²⁵ also suggests several principles, including tightly woven education theory and classroom practice, as well as placement of candidates in cohorts. An ETS report proposed clinical preparation experiences that offer opportunities for “Actual hands-on ability and skill to use . . . types of knowledge to engage students successfully in learning and mastery.”²⁶ The report of the National Research Council (2010) concluded that clinical experiences were critically important to teacher preparation but that the research, to date, does not tell us what specific experiences or sequence of experiences are most likely to result in more effective beginning teachers.²⁷

Until the research base for clinical practices and partnerships is more definitive, “wisdom of practice” dictates that the profession move more forcefully into deepening partnerships; into clarifying and, where necessary, improving the quality of clinical educators who prepare the field’s new practitioners and into delivering field and clinical experiences that contribute to the development of effective educators.

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.

Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

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.

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability

3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:

- is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;
- is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.²⁸

If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then Educator Preparation Providers from that state will

be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.

Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.

The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.

[CAEP Board amendment adopted by CAEP February 13, 2015] CAEP will work with states and providers through this transition regarding nationally or state normed assessments. Alternative arrangements for meeting this standard (beyond the alternative stated above for “a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard”) will be approved only under special circumstances. The CAEP staff will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision. In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate the quality of the admitted candidates.

Additional Selectivity Factors

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.

Selectivity During Preparation

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.²⁹

Selection At Completion

3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or 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.

3.6 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or 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. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards in light of new results.

CAEP Commission Rationale

Educator Preparation Providers (EPP) have a critical responsibility to ensure the quality of their candidates. This responsibility continues from purposeful recruitment that helps fulfill the provider's mission to admissions selectivity that builds an able and diverse pool of candidates, through monitoring of candidate progress and providing necessary support, to demonstrating that candidates are proficient at completion and that they are selected for employment opportunities that are available in areas served by the provider. The integration of recruitment and selectivity as EPP responsibilities to ensure quality is emphasized in a 2010 National Research Council report:

The quality of new teachers entering the field depends not only on the quality of the preparation they receive, but also on the capacity of preparation programs to attract and select academically able people who have the potential to be effective teachers. Attracting able, high-quality candidates to teaching is a critical goal.³⁰

The majority of American educators are white, middle class, and female.³¹ The makeup of the nation's teacher workforce has not kept up with changing student demographics. At the national level, students of color make up more than 40 percent of the public school population, while teachers of color are only 17 percent of the teaching force.³² The mismatch has consequences. Dee; Goldhaber, and Hansen; and Hanushek and colleagues³³ found that student achievement is positively impacted by a racial/ethnicity match between

teachers and students.

While recruitment of talented minority candidates is a time- and labor-intensive process,³⁴ “teachers of color and culturally competent teachers must be actively recruited and supported.”³⁵ Recruitment can both increase the quality of selected candidates and offset potentially deleterious effects on diversity from more selective criteria—either at admissions or throughout a program.³⁶ “Successful programs recruit minority teachers with a high likelihood of being effective in the classroom” and “concentrate on finding candidates with a core set of competencies that will translate to success in the classroom.”³⁷ There is evidence that providers of alternative pathways to teaching have been more successful in attracting non-white candidates. Feistritz reports alternative provider cohorts that are 30 percent non-white, compared with 13 percent in traditional programs.³⁸

The 2010 NCATE panel on clinical partnerships advocated attention to employment needs as a way to secure greater alignment between the teacher market and areas of teacher preparation.³⁹ The U.S. Department of Education regularly releases lists of teacher shortages by both content-area specialization and state.⁴⁰ Some states also publish supply-and-demand trends and forecasts and other information on market needs. These lists could assist EPPs in shaping their program offerings and in setting recruitment goals.

There is a broad public consensus that providers should attract and select able candidates who will become effective teachers. The 2011 Gallup Phi Delta Kappan education poll⁴¹ reported that 76 percent of the U.S. adult public agreed that “high-achieving” high school students should be recruited to become teachers. Another example is found in a 2012 AFT report on teacher preparation, recommending setting GPA requirements at 3.0, SATs at 1100 and ACT scores at 24.0 in order to “attract academically capable students with authentic commitment to work with children.”⁴²

Researchers such as Ball, Rowan, and Hill; Floden, Wayne, and Young⁴³ conclude that academic quality, especially in verbal ability and math knowledge, impacts teacher effectiveness. A study for McKinsey and Company⁴⁴ found that high-performing countries had a rigorous selection process similar to that of medical schools. Whitehurst⁴⁵ suggests that Educator Preparation Providers should be much more selective in terms of their candidates’ cognitive abilities. When looking at the cost of teacher selection, Levin⁴⁶ found

“that recruiting and retaining teachers with higher verbal scores is five-to-ten times as effective per dollar of teacher expenditure in raising achievement scores of students as the strategy of obtaining teachers with more experience.” Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, and Staiger concluded that “teachers’ cognitive and non-cognitive skills...have a moderately large and statistically significant relationship with student and teacher outcomes, particularly with student test scores.”⁴⁷

Programs do not all start at the same place in their history of recruiting an academically strong and/or diverse candidate pool. Some programs will need to set goals and move successively toward achieving them. As better performance assessments are developed and as various licensure tests are shown to be predictors of teacher performance and/or student learning and development, CAEP may be able to put more emphasis on exit criteria rather than on entrance criteria. Irrespective of changes CAEP may make, this does not reduce the program’s responsibility to recruit a diverse candidate pool that mirrors the demography of the student population served.

There is strong support from the professional community that qualities outside of academic ability are associated with teacher effectiveness. These include “grit,” the ability to work with parents, the ability to motivate, communication skills, focus, purpose, and leadership, among others. Duckworth, et al, found “that the achievement of difficult goals entails not only talent but also the sustained and focused application of talent over time.”⁴⁸ A Teach for America (TFA) study concluded that a teacher’s academic achievement, leadership experience, and perseverance are associated with student gains in math, while leadership experience and commitment to the TFA mission were associated with gains in English.⁴⁹ Danielson asserts that “teacher learning becomes more active through experimentation and inquiry, as well as through writing, dialogue, and questioning.”⁵⁰ In addition, teacher evaluations involve “observations of classroom teaching, which can engage teachers in those activities known to promote learning, namely, self-assessment, reflection on practice, and professional conversation.” These “other” attributes, dispositions and abilities lend themselves to provider innovation. Some providers might emphasize certain attributes because of the employment field or market for which they are preparing teachers.

Research has not empirically established a particular set of non-academic qualities that

teachers should possess. There are numerous studies that list different characteristics, sometimes referring to similar characteristics by different labels. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a clear measure for these non-academic qualities, although a few of them have scales and other measures that have been developed. The CAEP Commission recognizes the ongoing development of this knowledge base and recommends that CAEP revise criteria as evidence emerges. The Commission recognizes the InTASC standards' set of dispositions as a promising area of research.

Several pieces of research, including Ball's work in mathematics education,⁵¹ the MET study on components of teaching,⁵² and skills approaches such as Lemov's Teach Like a Champion,⁵³ assert there are important critical pedagogical strategies that develop over time. Henry,⁵⁴ Noell and Burns,⁵⁵ and Whitehurst⁵⁶ all found that, in general, teachers became more effective as they gained experience. Both research, as synthesized by the National Research Council,⁵⁷ and professional consensus, as represented by the Council of Chief State School Officers' InTASC standards,⁵⁸ indicate that the development of effective teaching is a process.

There are various sets of criteria and standards for effective teaching and teacher education, many including performance tasks⁵⁹ and artifacts created by the candidate.⁶⁰ These standards, like those of the Commission, have a central focus on P-12 outcomes. Student learning and development should be a criterion for selecting candidates for advancement throughout preparation. The evidence indicators that appear in the Appendix can be used to monitor and guide candidates' growth during a program. Standard 4 is built around the ultimate impact that program completers have when they are actually employed in the classroom or other educator positions.

Many professional efforts to define standards for teaching (e.g., InTASC; NCTQ, and observational measures covered in the Measures of Effective Teaching project) recommend that candidates know and practice ethics and standards of professional practice, as described in these national standards (such as those in InTASC standard 9 and 9(o)). The Commission recommends that CAEP strongly encourage additional research to define professional practices of P-12 educators and how these practices, beliefs, and attitudes relate to student learning and development. (See also CAEP component 1.4 on equity responsibilities.)

However, many measures of both academic and non-academic factors associated with high-quality teaching and learning need to be studied for reliability, validity, and fairness. CAEP should encourage development and research related to these measures. It would be shortsighted to specify particular metrics narrowly because of the now fast-evolving interest in, insistence on, and development of new and much stronger preparation assessments, observational measures, student surveys, and descriptive metrics. Instead, CAEP should ask that providers make a case that the data used in decision-making are valid, reliable, and fair. States and localities are developing their own systems of monitoring, and both providers and CAEP should obtain data from these systems, where available, to use as valuable external indicators for continuous improvement.

CAEP should monitor the impact of these new admission standards. The Commission recommends that CAEP develop an expert advisory committee to monitor developments in assessment, outcomes research, and other evidence that will influence the CAEP standards. Such a committee would make recommendations on the evolution of the standards and assessments used in program improvement and accreditation.

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.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development

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.

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

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

Satisfaction of Employers

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.

Satisfaction of Completers

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.

CAEP Commission Rationale

Standards 1 through 3 address the preparation experiences of candidates, their developing knowledge and skills, and their abilities at the point of program completion. Candidate progress and provider conclusions about the readiness of completers at exit are direct outcomes of the provider's efforts. By contrast, Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation at the point where they most matter—in classrooms and schools. Educator Preparation Providers must attend to candidate mastery of the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching, but that judgment is finally dependent on the impact the completers have on-the-job with P-12 student learning and development.

The paramount goal of providers is to prepare candidates who will have a positive impact on P-12 students. Impact can be measured in many ways. Component 4.1 enumerates some of these approaches. The Commission underscores here what also is said in the Recommendations on Evidence section, below, that multiple measures are needed for these and other accreditation evidence. One approach being adopted by several states and districts is known as “value-added modeling” (VAM). A large research effort supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, provides useful guidance about the circumstances under which this model can most validly be used. These findings are consistent with those noted in *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy* (NRC, 2010): “Value-added models may provide valuable information about effective teacher preparation, but not definitive conclusions and are best considered together with other evidence from a variety of perspectives.”⁶¹

The Commission recommends that CAEP encourage research on the validity and reliability of VAM for program evaluation purposes.⁶² Because members expect that methodologies for measuring teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development will continue to evolve and hopefully improve, the Commission recommends that CAEP also make certain that its standards and processes reflect the profession's best current thinking on appropriate use of evidence for program improvement and accreditation decisions. In this regard, providers should refer to the Data Task Force, the American Psychological Association guidance on preparation measures, and the University of Wisconsin Madison Value-Added Research Center reports regarding use of multiple sources of data, including value-added data, for program evaluation.⁶³

Multiple types of surveys can serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2), satisfaction of employers (Component 4.3), and satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4). Research by Ferguson, for example, shows that K-12 student surveys are a valid means for understanding aspects of teaching effectiveness.⁶⁴ The Commission recommends that CAEP consider the development of common survey items and instruments for employers and completers. CAEP also should participate in the validation of student survey instruments for use in teacher pre-service programs.

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.

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

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 CAEP standards.

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.

Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

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.

CAEP Commission Rationale

Effective organizations use evidence-based quality assurance systems and data in a process of continuous improvement. These systems and data-based continuous improvement are essential foundational requirements for effective implementation of any of the three CAEP accreditation pathways an Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) chooses—whether it is the Inquiry Brief, Continuous Improvement, or Transformational Initiative pathway.

A robust quality assurance system ensures continuous improvement by relying on a variety of measures, establishing performance benchmarks for those measures (with reference to external standards where possible), seeking the views of all relevant stakeholders, sharing evidence widely with both internal and external audiences, and using results to improve policies and practices in consultation with partners and stakeholders.⁶⁵

The quality of an EPP is measured by the abilities of its completers to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.⁶⁶ Program quality and improvement are determined, in part, by characteristics of candidates that the provider recruits to the field; the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions that candidates bring to and acquire during the program; the relationships between the provider and the P-12 schools in which candidates receive clinical training; and subsequent evidence of completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development in schools where they ultimately teach.⁶⁷ To be accredited, a preparation program must meet standards on each of these dimensions and demonstrate success in its own continuous improvement efforts.

Effective quality assurance systems function through a clearly articulated and effective process for defining and assuring quality outcomes. Reasons for the selection of each measure and the establishment of performance benchmarks for individual and program performance, including external points of comparison, are made clear. Providers show evidence of the credibility and dependability of the data that inform their quality assurance systems, as well as evidence of ongoing investigation into the quality of evidence and the validity of their interpretations of that evidence. Providers must present empirical evidence of each measure's psychometric and statistical soundness (reliability, validity, and fairness).⁶⁸

Continuous improvement systems enable programs quickly to develop and test prospective

improvements, deploy what is learned throughout the organization, and add to the profession's knowledge base and repertoire of practice.⁶⁹ CAEP should encourage providers to develop new models for evaluating and scaling up effective solutions. Research and development in the accreditation framework can deepen the knowledge of existing best practices and provide models of emerging innovations to transform educator preparation.⁷⁰

Standard 6:

Georgia Requirements for Educator Preparation Providers and 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, REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS FOR APPROVING EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDERS AND EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS and Rule 505-3-.02 EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER ANNUAL REPORTING AND EVALUATION. The elements of Standard 6 are intended to supplement and/or further explain program requirements specified in Rule 505-3-.01, and to guide Site Visitor Teams in properly evaluating programs. All GaPSC programs leading to certification are expected to meet the applicable elements of this standard.

Elements of Standard 6

6a. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1. Approval. The EPP and preparation programs must be approved by the GaPSC before candidates are formally admitted to programs and begin coursework.
2. GPA. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates admitted to GaPSC-approved initial preparation programs at the baccalaureate level or higher must have a minimum GPA of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale. The provider shall ensure that the average GPA of each admitted cohort (at the provider level) is 3.0 or higher; this requirement applies to all initial preparation programs, regardless of degree level. The provider shall ensure candidates admitted into initial preparation programs at the post-baccalaureate level have attained appropriate depth and breadth in both general and content studies, with a minimum of a bachelor's degree from a GaPSC accepted accredited institution.
3. Program Admissions Assessment. A passing score on the Program Admission Assessment (formerly the Basic Skills Assessment) or a qualifying exemption is required for admission to all initial preparation programs except those leading to certification in the field of Career and Technical Specializations. Candidates seeking

certification in Career and Technical Specializations who do not hold an associate's degree must pass the Program Admission Assessment within three (3) years of program admission or prior to program completion, whichever occurs first. Qualifying exemptions include minimum scores on the ACT, GRE, and SAT.

4. Educator Ethics Assessment. Beginning fall semester 2014, candidates entering initial teacher preparation programs at the baccalaureate level or higher must take the state-approved assessment of educator ethics by December 31, 2014. Candidates admitted after January 1, 2015, must take the assessment at or prior to program admission. Although a minimum score is not required for program admission, assessment results shall be used by the EPP to design appropriate ethics instruction needed for each candidate. Beginning January 1, 2015 the assessment will be required for the Pre-service Certificate.
5. Criminal Record Check. Beginning July 1, 2015, GaPSC-approved Educator Preparation Providers shall require at or prior to admission to initial teacher preparation programs at the baccalaureate level or higher, completion of a criminal record check. As of July 1, 2015, successful completion of a criminal record check is required to earn the Pre-service Certificate and to participate in field and clinical experiences in Georgia P-12 schools.

6b. READING METHODS

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates in initial certification programs in the fields of Early Childhood Education, Middle Grades Education, 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.

6c. IDENTIFICATION AND EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates in all teaching fields, the field of educational leadership, and/or the service fields of Media Specialist and School Counseling successfully complete 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. This requirement may be met through a dedicated

course, or content may be embedded in courses and experiences throughout the program.

6d. GEORGIA P-12 CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND EDUCATOR EVALUATION

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates are prepared to implement the appropriate sections of any Georgia mandated P-12 standards (i.e. Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS), Georgia Performance Standards (GPS), etc.) in each relevant content area, use appropriate instructional strategies, use formative and summative assessments of student learning to make adjustments in curriculum and instructional strategies, demonstrate understanding of student testing rules and protocols, and demonstrate understanding of the requirements for and implementation of any state-mandated educator evaluation system.

6e. PROFESSIONAL ETHICAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION AND EMPLOYMENT

1. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates complete a well-planned sequence of courses and/or experiences in professional studies that includes knowledge about and application of professional ethics and social behavior appropriate for school and community, ethical decision making skills, and specific knowledge about the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators. Candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and dispositions reflective of professional ethics and the standards and requirements delineated in the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators. GaPSC-approved Educator Preparation Providers shall assess candidates' knowledge of professional ethics and the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators either separately or in conjunction with assessments of dispositions.
2. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall provide information to each candidate on the process for completing a background check, and Georgia's tiered certification structure, professional learning requirements, and employment options.

6f. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

1. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall require in all programs leading to initial certification and endorsement programs, field experiences that include organized and sequenced

engagement of candidates in settings that provide them with opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards. The experiences shall be systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with which candidates apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills. Since observation is a less rigorous method of learning, emphasis should be on field experience sequences that require active professional practice or demonstration and that include substantive work with P-12 students or P-12 personnel as appropriate depending upon the preparation program. Field experience placements and sequencing will vary depending upon the program.

2. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates complete supervised field experiences consistent with the grade levels of certification sought. Candidates for Birth Through Kindergarten certification must complete field experiences at three levels: with children aged 0 to 2, 3 to 4, and in a kindergarten classroom. Candidates for Early Childhood certification must complete field experiences at three levels: in grades PK-K, 1-3, and 4-5. Candidates for Middle Grades certification must complete field experiences at two levels: in grades 4-5 and 6-8. Candidates for P-12 certification must complete field experiences at four levels: in grades PK-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Candidates for certification in secondary fields must complete field experiences in their fields of certification at two levels: in grades 6-8 and 9-12.
3. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall offer clinical practice (student teaching/internships) in those fields for which the provider has been approved by the GaPSC. Although year-long student teaching/internship experiences, in which candidates experience the beginning and ending of the school year are recognized as most effective and are therefore strongly encouraged, teacher candidates must spend a minimum of one full semester or the equivalent in student teaching or internships in regionally accredited schools. GaPSC preparation program rules may require additional clinical practice (reference Rules 505-3-.05 - .106).

6g. Content Coursework Requirements for Service Programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Technology, and Teacher Leadership

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates in degree-granting initial preparation programs in the fields of Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Technology, and Teacher Leadership complete the following requirements at the appropriate level.

1. Master's Degree level: a minimum of twelve (12) semester hours (or the quarter hours equivalent) of advanced level coursework focused on the content or content pedagogy of a certificate field held by the educator. All twelve hours may be satisfied through advanced level content or content pedagogy courses in which candidates are required to demonstrate advanced skills related to their field of certification. Three of the twelve semester hours may be satisfied through a thesis directly focused on the content of a certificate field held by the educator.
2. Specialist or Doctoral degree level: a minimum of nine (9) semester hours (or the quarter hours equivalent) of advanced level coursework focused on the content or content pedagogy of a certificate field held by the educator. All nine hours may be satisfied through advanced level content or content pedagogy courses in which candidates are required to demonstrate advanced skills related to their field of certification, or these hours may be satisfied through work on a thesis, research project or dissertation directly focused on a content field held by the educator.

Glossary

Terms Referenced in Standard 1:

All P-12 students: Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

Candidate: In this report, the term “candidate” refers to individuals preparing for professional education positions.

Completer: A term to embrace candidates exiting from degree programs and also candidates exiting from other higher education programs or preparation programs conducted by alternative providers that may or may not offer a certificate or degree.

Note: In Standard 1, the subjects of components are “candidates.” The specific knowledge and skills described will develop over the course of the preparation program and may be assessed at any point, some near admission, others at key transitions such as entry to clinical experiences and still others near candidate exit as preparation is completed.

Provider: Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) – An inclusive term referring to the sponsoring organization for preparation, whether it is an institution of higher education, a district- or state-sponsored program, or an alternative pathway organization.

Terms Referenced in Standard 2:

Clinical Educators: All EPP- and P-12-school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support, and develop a candidate’s knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences.

Partner: Organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing the clinical experience.

Partnership: Mutually beneficial agreement among various partners in which all

participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.

Stakeholder: Partners, organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs interested in candidate preparation or education.

Terms Referenced in Standard 3:

Cohort: A group of candidates admitted at the same time, e.g., a class entering in a fall semester.

Group average: The GPA and standardized test scores are averaged for all members of a cohort or class of admitted candidates. Averaging does not require that every candidate meet the specified score. Thus, there may be a range of candidates' grades and scores on standardized tests.

STEM: Science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Terms Referenced in Standard 5:

Continuous improvement: An organizational process through which data are collected on all aspects of a provider's activities; analyzed to determine patterns, trends, and progress; and used to define changes for the purpose of improving the quality of programs, faculty, candidates, policies, procedures, and practices of educator preparation.

GaPSC Glossary

(a) **Accreditation:** A process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through voluntary peer review and annual reporting; also the decision rendered by an accrediting body when an institution/agency or Educator Preparation Provider meets its standards and requirements.

(b) **Advanced Preparation Program:** An educator preparation program at the post-baccalaureate level for the continuing education of educators who have previously completed initial preparation. Advanced preparation programs commonly award graduate credit and include masters, specialist, and doctoral degree programs.

(c) **Approval:** A process for assessing and enhancing academic and education quality through peer review and annual reporting, to assure the public that an Educator Preparation Provider and/or program has met institutional, state, and national standards of educational quality; also, a Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) decision rendered when an Educator Preparation Provider or program meets GaPSC standards and required annual reporting.

(d) **Approval Review:** Examination of evidence and interviews of stakeholders conducted by the GaPSC Board of Examiners (BOE) either on-site at an institution/agency, or electronically through the use of web and telephone conferencing systems as part of a Developmental, Initial Performance, Continuing, Focused, or Probationary Review.

(e) **Branch Campus:** A campus that is physically detached from the parent university or college. A branch campus generally has full student and administrative services with a chief executive officer and may be regionally accredited separately from the parent campus.

(f) **Candidates/Teacher Candidates:** Individuals admitted to, or enrolled in, programs for the initial or advanced preparation of educators, programs for the continuing professional development of educators or programs for the preparation of other professional school personnel. Candidates are distinguished from students in P-12 schools.

(g) **Clinical Practice:** Residency (formerly referred to as *student teaching*) or internship experiences which provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in the learning community and provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

(h) **Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP):** The national accreditation organization formed as a result of the unification of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). CAEP advances excellence in educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning.

(i) **Distance Learning:** A formal educational process in which instruction occurs when candidates and the instructor are not in the same place at the same time. Distance learning can occur through virtually any media including asynchronous or synchronous, electronic or printed communications.

(j) **Distance Learning Program:** A program delivered primarily (50% or more contact hours) through distance technology in which the instructor of record and candidates lack face-to-face contact and instruction is delivered asynchronously or synchronously (see definition of Distance Learning). These preparation programs include those offered by the Educator Preparation Provider through a contract with an outside vendor or in a consortium arrangement with other Educator Preparation Providers, as well as those offered solely by the provider.

(k) **Educator Preparation Program:** A planned sequence of courses and experiences for preparing P-12 teachers and other professional school personnel. See the definitions for the three types of educator preparation programs: Initial, Endorsement, and Advanced.

(l) **Educator Preparation Provider (EPP):** The institution of higher education (IHE), college, school, department, agency, or other administrative body with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed (formerly referred to as the professional education unit).

(m) **Endorsement Program:** A planned sequence of courses and experiences, typically no more than four courses in length, designed to provide certified educators with an additional, specific set of knowledge and skills. Successful completion of an endorsement program results in the addition of the endorsement field to the Georgia educator certificate. Endorsement programs may lead to college credit and/or professional learning units, must be approved by the GaPSC, and may be offered by any GaPSC-approved Educator Preparation Provider. See GaPSC Rule 505-2-.14, ENDORSEMENTS.

(n) **Field Experiences:** Field experiences are those activities that include organized and sequenced engagement of candidates in settings that provide opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards. The experiences must be systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with which candidates apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills. Since observation is a less rigorous method of learning, emphasis should be on field experience sequences that require active professional practice or demonstration, and that include substantive work with P-12 students and P-12 personnel as appropriate.

(o) **Franchise Program:** An endorsement program developed by and approved for one GaPSC-approved Educator Preparation Provider (the franchise manager) and consequently shared with other GaPSC-approved Educator Preparation Providers operating as franchisees.

(p) **Georgia Teacher Academy for Preparation and Pedagogy (GaTAPP):** Georgia's non-traditional preparation program for preparing career changers for certification as P-12 teachers. See GaPSC Rule 505-3-.05, GEORGIA TEACHER ACADEMY FOR PREPARATION AND PEDAGOGY (GaTAPP).

(q) **Initial Preparation Program:** A program designed to prepare candidates for their initial, professional certificate in a teaching, leadership, or service field. Examples include degree programs at the baccalaureate, master's, or higher levels; or post-baccalaureate programs, non-degree certification-only programs, and non-traditional programs such as the GaTAPP program.

(r) **Local Unit of Administration (LUA):** A local education agency or a regional educational service agency, including but not limited to public, waiver, Investing in Educational Excellence (IE2), charter schools and private schools (i.e., faith-based schools, early learning centers, hospitals, juvenile detention centers, etc.).

(s) **Nationally Recognized Program:** A program that has met the standards of a national specialized professional organization (SPA) that is a constituent member of CAEP.

(t) **Non-traditional Preparation Program:** A program designed to prepare individuals holding an appropriate degree in the content field or a field closely related to the field of certification sought. Non-traditional preparation programs do not lead to a degree or college credit and:

1. Feature a flexible timeframe for completion;
2. Are job-embedded allowing candidates to complete requirements while employed by a regionally accredited local education agency (school district) or regionally accredited private school as a classroom teacher full-time or part-time for at least a half day;
3. Require that candidates are supported by a Candidate Support Team;
4. Require an induction component that includes coaching and supervision;
5. Provide curriculum, performance-based instruction and assessment focused on the pedagogical knowledge and skills necessary for the candidate to teach his/her validated academic content knowledge; and
6. Are Individualized based on the needs of each candidate with respect to content knowledge, pedagogical skills, learning modalities, learning styles, interests, and readiness to teach. See Rule 505-3-.05, GEORGIA TEACHER ACADEMY FOR PREPARATION AND PEDAGOGY (GaTAPP).

(u) **Out-of-State Institution:** An institution of higher education that is administratively based in a state within the United States other than Georgia.

(v) **Preconditions:** Fundamental requirements that undergird the GaPSC standards that must be met before an Educator Preparation Provider is permitted to schedule a Developmental Approval Review.

(w) **Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (PPEMs):** A collection of common measures applied to all teacher and leader preparation programs leading to initial certification in a field. Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (TPPEMs) and

Leader Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (LPPEMs) are further defined in GaPSC Rule 505-3-.02, EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROVIDER ANNUAL REPORTING AND EVALUATION.

(x) **Program Completer:** A person who has met all the requirements of a GaPSC-approved or state-approved out-of-state educator preparation program.

(y) **Specialized Professional Association (SPA):** A constituent member of CAEP representing a particular disciplinary area that develops standards for the approval of educator preparation programs in that area and reviews programs for compliance with those standards.

(z) **Traditional Preparation Program:** A credit-bearing program designed for the preparation of educators typically offered by institutes of higher education.

Endnotes

¹ U. S. Department of Education. (2013), *For each and every child—a strategy for education equity and excellence*, p. 12.

¹ NRC. (2010), p. 180.

STANDARD 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

² Progression levels are described in *InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0* (2011), pp. 16-47.

³ Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO]. (2011). *InTASC model core teaching standards*. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Resources_Listing.html?search=model+core+teaching+Standards

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [NBPTS]. (2002). *What teachers should know and be able to do*. Retrieved from <http://www.nbpts.org/resources/publications>

⁴ Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407. Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

⁵ Schacter, J., & Thum, Y. M. (2004). Paying for high- and low-quality teaching. *Economics of Education Review*, 23(4), 411–430. American Council on Education [ACE]. (1999). *To touch the future: Transforming the way teachers are taught. An action agenda for college and university presidents*. Washington, DC.: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.physics.ohio-state.edu/~jossem/REF/115.pdf> Hill, H. C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42 (2), 371-406.

⁶ Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.

⁷ Darling-Hammond, L. Power Point presentation, "Supporting Deeper Learning." E. Elliot, personal communication, January 29, 2013.

⁸ Ball, D. L. (2000). Bridging practices: Intertwining content and pedagogy in teaching and learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 241-247.

⁹ Cochran, K. F., DeRuiter, J. A., & King, A. R. (1993). Pedagogical content knowing: An integrative model for teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4), 263-272.

¹⁰ Shulman, Knowledge and teaching, p. 13.

¹¹ InTASC model core teaching standards, p. 8.

¹² Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A*

research synthesis. Washington DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

¹³ For a discussion of the benefits of family engagement at different developmental stages, please see Harvard Family Research Project's *Family Involvement Makes a Difference* publication series, available online at <http://www.hfrp.org/FamilyInvolvementMakesADifference>.

¹⁴ Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFAQ.pdf>

¹⁵ NBPTS, *What teachers should know and be able to do*.

¹⁶ International Society in Technology Education (ISTE). (2008) *Advancing digital age teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.iste.org/docs/pdfs/nets-t-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

¹⁷ Harvard Family Research Project. (2006/2007). *Family Involvement Makes a Difference* publication series. Retrieved from <http://www.hfrp.org/FamilyInvolvementMakesADifference>

STANDARD 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

¹⁸ National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

¹⁹ Houck, J. W., Cohn, K. C., & Cohn, C. A. (2004). *Partnering to lead educational renewal: High-quality teachers, high-quality schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

²⁰ Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (Eds.). (2005). *A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve*, pp. 38-39. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

²¹ Grossman, P. (2010). *Learning to practice: The design of clinical experience in teacher preparation*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34:1, 3-26.

²² NCATE (2010).

²³ National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2008) *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

²⁴ NCATE (2010). pp. 5, 6.

²⁵ Howey, K. R. (2007). A review of urban teacher residencies (UTRs) in the context of urban teacher preparation, alternative routes to certification, and a changing teacher workforce. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

²⁶ Educational Testing Service [ETS]. (2004) *Where we stand on teacher quality: An issue paper* from ETS, p. 3. Princeton, NJ: Author. Retrieved on August 4, 2012, at http://www.ets.org/Media/Education_Topics/pdf/teacherquality.pdf

²⁷ NRC (2010).

STANDARD 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY

²⁸ National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2011). *American's high school graduates: Results of the 2009 NAEP high school transcript study*. NCES 20111462. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=20111462> The study shows high school grade point averages as 3.0 for “overall,” 2.79 for “core academic” subjects, and 3.14 for “other academic” subjects. SAT “top third” performance is about 1120, and ACT is about 22.8 for English and 23.0 for math. GRE top third on the new scale is about 154.6 for verbal and 154 for quantitative. The minimum criteria may change as standards for admission to teacher education programs become more competitive; the criteria should reflect high standards used by states and recommended by research.

²⁹ Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 60-70.

³⁰ NRC (2010), 181.

³¹ Morrell, J. (2010). Teacher preparation and diversity: When American preservice teachers aren't white and middle class. *Online Submission*. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/257521/_Teacher_preparation_and_diversity_when_American_preservice_teachers_aren_t_white_and_middle_class.

³² Boser, U. (2011). Teacher diversity matters: A state-by-state analysis of teachers of color. *Center For American Progress*. Retrieved from <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2011/11/09/10657/teacher-diversity-matters/>

³³ Dee, T. 2004. The Race Connection: Are Teachers More Effective with Students who Share their Ethnicity? *Education Next*. 4.2:52-59. Teachers, Race and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment. NBER Working Paper Series. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA. 41 Working Papers, August 2001. Goldhaber, D., & Hansen, M. (2010). Race, gender, and teacher testing: How informative a tool is teacher licensure testing?. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 218-251. Retrieved from <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/47/1/218.full.pdf> Hanushek, E., Kain, J., O'Brian, D., and S. Rivikin. 2005. The Market for Teacher Quality. Working Paper 11154. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w11154>

³⁴ Bireda, S. & Chait, R. (2011). Increasing teacher diversity: Strategies to improve the teacher workforce. *Center For American Progress*. Retrieved from: <http://www.americaprogress.org>

³⁵ National Collaboration on Diversity in the Teaching Force. (2004). *Assessment of diversity*

in America's teaching force: A call to action, p. 9. Retrieved from <http://www.ate1.org/pubs/uploads/diversityreport.pdf>

³⁶ National Collaboration on Diversity in the Teaching Force (2004) and Bireda and Chait (2011).

³⁷ Bireda and Chait (2011), 30.

³⁸ Feistritzer, C.E. (2011). *Profile of teachers in the U.S. 2011*. National Center for Education Information. Retrieved from http://www.ncei.com/Profile_Teachers_US_2011.pdf

³⁹ NCATE (2010).

⁴⁰ *Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing: 1990-1991 through 2012-2013*. (April 2012). U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html>

⁴¹ Bushaw, W., Lopez, L. (2011). *Betting on teachers: The 43rd annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of public's attitudes toward the public schools*. *Phi Delta Kappan* 93(1), 8-26.

⁴² American Federation of Teachers [AFT]. (2012), *Raising the bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the education profession*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

⁴³ Ball, D., Hill, H., Rowan, B. (2005). Effects of Teachers' Mathematical Knowledge for Teaching on Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*. 42(2), 371-406. Floden, R. & M. Maniketti. 2005. Research on the Effects of Coursework in the Arts and Sciences and in the Foundations of Education. In *Studying Teacher Education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Eds. Cochran-Smith, M. & K.

Zeichner. (Meta-analysis of previous research.) Wayne, A., and P. Young. (2003). Teacher Characteristics and Student Achievement Gains: A Review. *Review of Educational Research* 73(1). 89-122. (Meta-analysis of previous research.)

⁴⁴ Auguste, B., Kihn, P., & Miller, M. (2010). Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top-third graduates to careers in teaching: An international and market research-based perspective. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from <http://mckinseysociety.com/closing-the-talent-gap/>

⁴⁵ Whitehurst, G. (2002). *Strengthen teacher quality: Research on teacher preparation and professional development*. White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/admins/tchrqual/learn/preparing_teachers_conference/whitehurst.html NRC (2010).

⁴⁶ Levin, H. M. (1970). A cost-effectiveness analysis of teacher selection. *Journal of Human Resources*, 5(1), 24-33.

⁴⁷ Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2011). Can you recognize an effective teacher when you recruit one? *Education Finance and Policy*, 6(1), 43-74.

⁴⁸ Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1087-1101. Also see Haberman, M. (2000). What makes a teacher education program relevant preparation for teaching diverse students in urban poverty schools? (The Milwaukee Teacher Education Center Model). and Harding, H. (2012). Teach for America: Leading for change. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 58-61.

⁴⁹ Dobbie, W. (2011). Teacher characteristics and student achievement: Evidence from Teach for America. Harvard University. Retrieved from http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~dobbie/research/TeacherCharacteristics_July2011.pdf

⁵⁰ Danielson, C. (2009). A framework for learning to teach. *Educational Leadership*, 66. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/summer09/vol66/num09/A-Framework-for-Learning-to-Teach.aspx>

⁵¹ Ball, D. (2008). Mathematical Knowledge for Teacher and the Mathematical Quality of Instruction: An Exploratory Study. *Cognition and Instruction*. 26(4), 430-511.

⁵² Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2010). Working with teachers to develop fair and reliable measures of effective teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.metproject.org/downloads/met-framing-paper.pdf>

⁵³ Lemov, D. (2010). *Teach like a champion: 49 Techniques that Put Students on the Path to College (K-12)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

⁵⁴ Henry, T., et al. (2012). The effects of experience and attrition for novice high-school science and mathematics teachers. *Science*, 335, 1118-1121. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/335/6072/1118.full.pdf>

⁵⁵ Noell, G., & Burns, J. (2006). *Value-added assessment of teacher preparation: An illustration of emerging technology*. *Journal of Teacher Education* Vol. 57, 37-50. Retrieved from <http://jte.sagepub.com/content/57/1/37.full.pdf+html>

⁵⁶ Whitehurst (2002).

⁵⁷ NRC (2010) CCSSO (2011).

⁵⁸ CCSSO (2011).

⁵⁹ Danielson (2009).

⁶⁰ See, for example, Rodgers, C. & Raider-Roth, M. (2006), *Presence in teaching. Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice*, 12(3) 265-287. See also Barker, L. & Borko, H. (2011). Conclusion: Presence and the art of improvisational teaching. In Sawyer, R. K. (ed), *Structure and improvisation in creative teaching* (279-293). New York: Cambridge University Press. See also, Joint project of Stanford University and AACTE to develop a preservice education “teacher performance assessment.” See description at this URL: <http://edtpa.aacte.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/using-edTPA.pdf>

STANDARD 4: PROGRAM IMPACT

⁶¹ NRC (2010).

⁶² University of Wisconsin, Value Added Research Center (2013), Student Growth and Value-Added Information as Evidence of Educator Preparation Program Effectiveness: A Review, Draft prepared for CAEP.

⁶³ Ewell, P. (2013). *Report of the data task force to the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting*, CAEP. American Psychological Association (2013). *Applying Psychological Science to Using Data for continuous Teacher Preparation Program Improvement*, Draft, Report of a Board of Educational Affairs Task Force.

University of Wisconsin, Value Added Research Center (2013).

⁶⁴ Ferguson, Ronald F. (2012). Can student surveys measure teaching quality? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94:3, 24-28.

STANDARD 5: PROVIDER QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

⁶⁵ Ruben, B. R. (2010). *Excellence in higher education guide. An integrated approach to assessment, planning, and improvement in colleges and universities*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2011). *2011-2012 Education criteria for performance excellence*. Gaithersburg, MD: Author.

⁶⁶ The use of “development” is based on InTASC’s *Standard #1: Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.*

⁶⁷ NRC. (2010).

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & Lepage, P. (2005). In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world. What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 1- 39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zeichner, K. M., & Conklin, H. G. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

NCATE. (2010).

⁶⁸ Ewell, P. (2012). *Recent trends and practices in accreditation: Implications for the development of standards for CAEP*. Washington, DC: CAEP.

⁶⁹ Langley G.L., Nolan K.M., Nolan T.W., Norman C.L. & Provost L.P. (2009). *The improvement guide: A practical approach to enhancing organizational performance* (2nd

ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

⁷⁰ Bryk, A.S., Gomez, L.M. & Grunow, A. (2010). *Getting ideas into action: Building networked improvement communities in education*, Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Essay retrieved from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/spotlight/webinar-bryk-gomez-building-networked-improvement-communities-in-education>.