



Georgia Professional Standards Commission

Protecting Georgia's Higher Standard of Learning

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

**Effective September, 2016; Revised February, 2018;
Revised April, 2018 to include Service/Leader
Standards; Revised September, 2019 to reflect P-5
certificate title change to Elementary**

**Matt Arthur
Executive Secretary**

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	3
<u>Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</u>	4
<u>Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice</u>	10
<u>Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity</u>	15
<u>Standard 4: Program Impact</u>	21
<u>Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</u>	24
<u>Standard 6: Georgia Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs</u>	27
<u>Approval Review Requirements</u>	33
<u>Applicable Components for Leadership, Service, and Endorsement Reviews</u>	34
<u>GaPSC Glossary of Terms</u>	35
<u>Endnotes</u>	42
<u>Additional Resources</u>	47
<u>Addendum: Service/Leader Standards</u>	48

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* became effective September 1, 2016 and apply to all GaPSC-approved EPPs and their programs, as well as to out-of-state EPPs seeking to gain and/or maintain GaPSC approval of Educational Leadership programs.

The standards are:

- [Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge](#)
- [Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice](#)
- [Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity](#)
- [Standard 4: Program Impact](#)
- [Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement](#)
- [Standard 6: Georgia Requirements for Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs](#)

Georgia Standards for the Approval of Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs

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)¹ in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

Provider Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

Standard One Guidance

Students (B/P-12): Defined as children or youth attending B/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.

Candidates/Teacher Candidates: Individuals 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 B/P-12 schools. (The term *enrolled* is used in the GaPSC approval process to mean the candidate is admitted and taking classes.)

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.

Educator Preparation Provider: 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).

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.² 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. (InTASC is an acronym for the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, a consortium of the Council of Chief State School Officers). 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.² Research indicates that students learn more when their teachers have a strong foundation of content knowledge.³

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.

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; and
- An ongoing ability to learn to learn.⁴

Pedagogical content knowledge merges specific content knowledge and pedagogy. Discovering what students know (or think they know) and then using clear representations, accommodating resources, and choosing the most appropriate strategies is crucial for student understanding.

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.

Understanding of pedagogical content knowledge is complemented by the 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. 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.⁵ When teachers understand families and communicate and build relationships with them, students benefit. 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 development of this standard and its components was influenced especially by the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, the Common Core State Standards Initiative,⁶ and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' Five Core Propositions.⁷ Additionally, the work of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)⁸ and the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP)⁹ was used.

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

21 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

22 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

23 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.

Standard Two Guidance

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.

Clinical Experiences: An all-encompassing term that describes all experiences completed by a candidate outside of the EPP classroom (e.g., field experiences, clinical practice, internship).

Partner: Organization, business, community group, agency, school, district, and/or EPP specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing clinical experiences.

Partnership: A mutually beneficial relationship among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to the preparation of education professionals. Examples may include pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.

Stakeholder: Partner, organization, business, community group, agency, school, district, and/or EPP interested or participating in candidate selection, preparation, support, and ongoing development.

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*,¹⁰ 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 approval 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.¹¹ Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden¹² 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 point 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.¹³ *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice* (2010) 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.

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 conversations with students). Candidates observe, assist, tutor, instruct and may conduct research. 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, Georgia Standards of Excellence). 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.¹⁴ 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. Howey¹⁵ 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.”¹⁶ Although clinical experiences are critically important to teacher preparation, 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.

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 Educator Preparation 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 eligible 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 provider's addressing 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 the completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish its 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 (e.g., STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities).

Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement and Ability

3.2 The provider sets admission requirements, including all criteria from GaPSC Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates in a reporting year is a minimum of 3.0. For GaPSC approval, results of the administration of the Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Program Admission Assessment (PAA) will provide evidence of the academic achievement and ability of admitted candidates. Although candidates may exempt the assessment with appropriate SAT, ACT, or GRE scores, the demonstration of academic ability is a requirement prior to program admission. EPPs seeking CAEP accreditation will be expected to submit group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as SAT, ACT, or GRE, according to the guidance provided by CAEP for this

component.

Additional Selectivity Factors

33 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

34 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: Candidate Knowledge and Skills

35 Before the provider verifies that any candidate has completed a certification program, 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.

Selection at Completion: Expectations of the Profession

36 Before the provider verifies that any candidate has completed a certification program, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including the Georgia Code of Ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies.

Standard Three Guidance

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

Group GPA Average: The GPA 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 grades.

STEM: Science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Rationale

Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) have a critical responsibility to assure 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 individuals who have the potential to be effective teachers. Attracting able, high-quality candidates to teaching is a critical goal.¹⁷

The majority of American educators are white, middle class, and female.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ The mismatch has consequences. Dee; Goldhaber, and Hansen; and Hanushek and colleagues²⁰ 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,²¹

“teachers of color and culturally competent teachers must be actively recruited and supported.”²² 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.²³ “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.”²⁴ There is evidence that providers of alternative pathways to teaching have been more successful in attracting non-white candidates. Feistritzer reports alternative provider cohorts that are 30 percent non-white, compared with 13 percent in traditional programs.²⁵

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.²⁶ The U.S. Department of Education regularly releases lists of teacher shortages by both content-area specialization and state.²⁷ Some states also publish supply-and-demand trends and forecasts and other information on market needs. These lists could assist providers 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 poll²⁸ 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.”²⁹

Researchers such as Ball, Rowan, and Hill; Floden, Wayne, and Young³⁰ conclude that academic quality, especially in verbal ability and math knowledge, impacts teacher effectiveness. A study for McKinsey and Company³¹ found that high-performing countries had a rigorous selection process similar to that of medical schools. Whitehurst³² 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, Levin³³ 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.”³⁴

Providers did not all start at the same place in their history of recruiting an academically strong and/or diverse candidate pool. Some providers will need to set goals and move successively toward achieving them. This does not, however, reduce the provider’s responsibility to recruit a diverse candidate pool that mirrors the demography of the student population served. The provider should seek and gather input from P-12 partners to guide its recruitment of diverse candidates. The recruitment plan should demonstrate evidence of moving beyond institutional recruitment efforts to a more deliberate and focused outreach strategy specific to the selection and preparation of educators.

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.”³⁵

Danielson asserts that “teacher learning becomes more active through experimentation and inquiry, as well as through writing, dialogue, and questioning.”³⁶ 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.

Several pieces of research, including Ball's work in mathematics education,³⁷ the MET study on components of teaching,³⁸ and skills approaches such as Lemov's Teach Like a Champion,³⁹ assert there are important critical pedagogical strategies that develop over time. Henry,⁴⁰ Noell and Burns,⁴¹ and Whitehurst⁴² all found that, in general, teachers became more effective as they gained experience. Both research and professional consensus, as represented by the Council of Chief State School Officers' InTASC standards,⁴³ 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 tasks and artifacts created by the candidate.⁴⁴ These standards have a central focus on P-12 outcomes. Student learning and development should be a criterion for selecting candidates for advancement throughout preparation. 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)).

Measures of both academic and non-academic factors associated with high-quality teaching and learning need to be studied for reliability, validity, and fairness. Providers should make the case that the data used in decision-making are valid, reliable, and fair.

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/or 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.

Standard Four Guidance

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

Note: Standard 4 asks providers to demonstrate the results of their preparation and its impact on educators while they are on the job. Although this standard focuses on completers, programs preparing employed (certified) candidates may demonstrate that their preparation is job embedded, positively impacts P-12 student learning, and results in satisfactory evaluations by employers. Because GaTAPP programs require candidates to retain employment throughout the program, GaTAPP providers may use in-service candidate data as evidence in Standard 4. M.A.T. programs enrolling candidates who are employed as the teacher of record may also use in-service data; however, CAEP does not allow the use of candidate data for Standard 4.

Rationale

Standards 1 through 3 address the preparation experiences of candidates, their developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and their abilities to work with P-12 students up to the point of program completion. Candidate progress and provider conclusions about the readiness of candidates 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, ultimately, dependent on the impact completers have on-the-job with P-12 student learning and development.

Although the paramount goal of providers is to prepare educators who will have a positive impact on P-12 students, impact can be measured in many ways. One of those ways is through the Student Growth Percentile⁴⁵ of the students of program completers. Educator Preparation Providers may also work with partner schools and districts to conduct case studies of completers and the impact they have on their students' learning.

In addition to examining the impact completers have on student learning, providers must examine the teaching effectiveness of completers, as demonstrated by the Teacher

Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS)⁴⁶. These standards include planning, instructional delivery, assessment, learning environment, and professionalism and communication (which includes professional learning plans and goals).

Completers and their employers must describe their level of satisfaction with the preparation and training received. Georgia has developed a survey that is administered to inductees (completers who have been employed for one year in a Georgia public or public charter school). The State also administers a survey to the employers of the inductees.

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 program approval 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.

Standard Five Guidance

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.

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 Georgia Standards 2016. Evidence for Standards 1 through 4 constitutes a significant demonstration of the capabilities and performance of the quality assurance system. Additional evidence for Standard 5 unifies and gives purpose to evidence relevant to previous standards; and it includes documentation of how the provider collects, monitors, reports, and uses data.

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.⁴⁷

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.⁴⁸ Provider 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. To be approved, a preparation provider 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 provider 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 system, 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 reliability, validity, and fairness for each of the EPP's key assessments.⁴⁹

An effective continuous improvement system will enable programs to develop and test prospective improvements and employ those strategies throughout the organization. Providers are expected to use multiple measures within the quality assurance system; and by having multiple measures, providers are supporting continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based. Reflecting on data from multiple measures allows providers the opportunity to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and ultimately improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Standard 6:

Georgia Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs

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

6.1. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

6.1.1. **Approval.** The EPP and preparation programs must be approved by the GaPSC before candidates are formally admitted to programs and begin coursework.

6.1.2. **GPA.** GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates admitted to GaPSC-approved initial preparation programs at the baccalaureate level or higher 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.

6.1.3. **Program Admission 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.

For a prospective candidate who does not meet the exemption requirements above, passing two of the three tests can qualify the student for admission under the following minimum guidelines:

- a. The student must attempt *at least twice* the assessment component for which a waiver is sought.
- b. The student has an admission GPA of at least 3.0.

An EPP would be allowed to grant waivers for up to *a total of 5%* annually of its admission cohort for GACE Program Admission Assessment exemptions. EPPs that admit annual cohorts of less than 60 students will be allowed to have up to 3 exemptions per annual cohort.

EPPs that grant waivers must document plans for supporting the exempted candidates in the PAA test area not passed. Such plans do not need to include additional coursework, but should document the types of support services exempted students will receive. Evidence of implementation of such plans shall be provided during approval reviews.

6.1.4. Educator Ethics Assessment. Candidates entering initial teacher preparation programs at the baccalaureate level or higher must take the state-approved assessment of educator ethics prior to beginning program coursework. 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. Prior to program completion, candidates must take the state-approved assessment of educator ethics—program exit.

6.1.5. Criminal Record Check. 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. 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.

6.2. READING METHODS

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates in initial certification programs in the fields of Elementary Education, Middle Grades Education, and the special education fields of General Curriculum, Adapted Curriculum, and General Curriculum/Elementary Education (P-5) demonstrate competence in the knowledge of methods of teaching reading.

6.3. IDENTIFICATION AND EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates in all teaching fields, the field of educational leadership, and 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. In addition, candidates in all fields must have a working knowledge of Georgia's framework for the identification of differentiated learning needs of students and how to implement multi-tiered structures of support addressing the range of learning needs.

6.4. GEORGIA P-12 TESTING AND EDUCATOR EVALUATION

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates demonstrate an understanding of student testing rules and protocols, and demonstrate understanding of the requirements for and implementation of any state-mandated educator evaluation system.

6.5. PROFESSIONAL ETHICAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION AND EMPLOYMENT

651. 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.

652. 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.

6.6. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

661. 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.

662. 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.

663. GaPSC-approved EPPs shall offer clinical practice (residency/internships) in those fields for which the EPP has been approved by the GaPSC. Although year-long residencies/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 residencies or internships in regionally accredited schools. GaPSC preparation program rules may require additional clinical practice (reference Rules 505-3-.05 - .106).

67. 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.

67.1 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.

67.2 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.

68. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP REQUIREMENTS

68.1 GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure that Tier I Educational Leadership programs are addressing all aspects of the Tier I requirements in the current version of the [Educational Leadership Rule 505-3-.77](#).

68.2 GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure that Tier II Educational Leadership programs are addressing all aspects of the Tier II requirements in the of the current version of the [Educational Leadership Rule 505-3-.77](#).

6.9 EMBEDDED ENDORSEMENTS

GaPSC-approved EPPs offering endorsement programs that are embedded in initial preparation programs ensure that two of the following expectations are demonstrated:

- a. Option 1: Additional Coursework. Endorsement programs are typically comprised of three (3) or four (4) courses (the equivalent of nine (9) or twelve (12) semester hours). Although some endorsement standards may be required in initial preparation programs (e.g. Reading Endorsement standards must be addressed in Elementary Education programs) and in such cases some overlap of coursework is expected, it may be necessary to add endorsement courses to a program of study to fully address the additional knowledge and skills delineated in endorsement standards.
- b. Option 2: Additional Field Experiences. Endorsement programs require candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills in classroom settings via field experiences. Candidates completing an embedded endorsement program may be required to complete additional field experiences (above and beyond those required for the initial preparation program) specifically to address endorsement standards and requirements.
- c. Option 3: Additional Assessment(s). Candidates' demonstration of endorsement program knowledge and skills must be assessed by either initial preparation program assessments or via additional assessment instruments specifically designed to address endorsement program content.

Approval Review Requirements

	EPP and its existing programs	First Continuing Review of a Program or new program added to an approved EPP			
	Continuing Review	Initial Teaching Program	Leadership Program	Service Program	Endorsement Program
EPP Standards	Standards 1-5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Program Standards	Standards 1 and 6 <i>(see appropriate cell to the right for additional information regarding programmatic reviews)</i>	Standards 1 and 6	Standard 1 and applicable components from Standard 6 <i>(see chart on next page)</i>	Standard 1 and applicable components from Standard 6 <i>(see chart on next page)</i>	Standard 1 and applicable components from Standard 6 <i>(see chart on next page)</i>
Key Assessments	4 Key EPP Assessments across all initial teaching programs (GACE and edTPA are required; 2 EPP choice)	6 Key Program Assessments (4 related to InTASC Standards are required; 2 program choice assessments)	6 Key Program Assessments (GACE is required; 5 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)	4 Key Program Assessments (GACE is required; 3 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)	3 Key Program Assessments (3 program choice assessments demonstrating meeting standards)

Protocol for Reviews:

For Continuing Reviews, which include a review of the EPP and all of its existing programs, a site visit team will conduct an offsite review several months prior to the onsite review. This allows the EPP and program representatives to respond to formative feedback reports and provide additional evidence in the Provider Reporting System (PRS-II).

For Program-only Reviews, which might include a First Continuing Review of a program or a new program being added to the approved EPP, the visit, including interviews, will be conducted virtually. The opportunity to respond to formative feedback reports and provide additional evidence in PRS-II is also provided for these types of reviews.

Standard 6: Applicable Components for Leadership, Service, and Endorsement Reviews

Note: Cell contains a check (✓) when component is applicable. Otherwise, cell is blank.

Georgia Standards for the Approval of Educator Preparation Programs (2016)	Educational Leadership	Service Fields	Endorsements
6.1: Admission Requirements			
6.1.1. Approval	✓	✓	✓
6.1.2. GPA	✓	✓	
6.1.3. Program Admissions Assessment	✓	✓	
6.1.4. Educator Ethics Assessment	✓		
6.1.5. Criminal Record Check			
6.2: Reading Methods			
6.3: Identification and Education of Children with Special Needs	✓	(Media, School Counseling)	
6.4: Georgia P-12 Curriculum, Instruction, and Educator Evaluation	✓	✓	
6.5: Professional Ethical Standards and Requirements for Certification and Employment			
6.5.1. Professional Ethics	✓	✓	
6.5.2. Requirements for Certification	✓	✓	
6.6: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice			
6.6.1. Systematically Designed Field Experiences	✓	✓	✓
6.6.2. Appropriate Grade Bands	✓	✓	
6.6.3. Clinical Practice Requirements	✓	✓	
6.7: Content Coursework for Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), Instructional Technology (IT), and Teacher Leader (TL) Programs			
6.7.1. Master's Programs		Only C&I, IT, and TL	
6.7.2. Specialist/Doctoral Programs		Only C&I, IT, and TL	
6.8: Educational Leadership Requirements			
6.8.1. Tier I Programs	✓		
6.8.2. Tier II Programs	✓		
6.9: Embedded Endorsements			✓

GaPSC Glossary of Terms

Accreditation: (1) A process for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality through external, often voluntary, peer review. (2) A decision awarded and process certified by an accrediting organization. For the purposes of educator preparation provider (EPP) and program approval, GaPSC recognizes three types of accreditation: Regional Accreditation, National Accreditation, and Specialized Accreditation. Each type of accreditation is defined in subsequent definitions.

Advanced Preparation/Degree-Only Program: An educator preparation program at the post-baccalaureate level for the continuing education of educators who have previously completed initial preparation and are certified in the program's subject area or field of certification. Advanced preparation programs commonly award graduate credit and include masters, specialist, and doctoral degree programs. Although GaPSC-approved EPPs must provide data on advanced preparation programs in reports required by the state and for national accreditation, they are neither reviewed nor approved by GaPSC.

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

Approval Review: Examination of evidence and interviews of stakeholders conducted by GaPSC site visitors and sometimes CAEP site visitors either on-site at an institution/agency, or electronically through the use of Internet and telephone conferencing systems as part of a Developmental, First Continuing, Continuing, Focused, or Probationary Review. Although not an approval review, the Substantive Change process is used when certain changes are made to the design or operations of approved program. (See **Substantive Change Procedure**.)

B/P-12: Formerly P-12, the term B/P-12 references schools serving children aged birth to grade 12.

Branch Campus: A campus that is physically detached from the parent university or college and has autonomous governance. A branch campus generally has full student and administrative services with a CEO and is regionally accredited separately from the parent campus. For approval purposes, GaPSC considers branch campuses distinct from the parent institution and therefore a separate EPP. For approval purposes, a branch campus located in the state of Georgia having an original, or main, campus located in another state or country is considered an out-of-state institution and is therefore ineligible to seek GaPSC approval as an EPP.

Candidates/Teacher Candidates: Individuals 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 B/P-12 schools. (The term enrolled is used in the GaPSC approval process to mean the candidate is admitted AND taking classes.)

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.

Clinical Experiences: An all-encompassing term that describes all experiences completed by a candidate outside of the EPP classroom (e.g., field experiences, clinical practice, internship).

Clinical Practice: Culminating residency (formerly referred to as *student teaching*) or internship experiences with candidates placed in classrooms for at least one full semester where they experience intensive and extensive practices in which they are fully immersed in the learning community and provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. In initial preparation programs in Service and Leadership fields, candidates will complete such culminating residency or internship experiences in placements that allow the knowledge, skills, and dispositions included in the programs to be practiced and applied. In non-traditional preparation programs, such as GaTAPP, clinical practice is job-embedded as candidates must be hired as a classroom teacher to be admitted to the program.

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

Content Knowledge: The central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of a discipline (Source: CAEP Glossary).

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.

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 B/P-12 student learning. CAEP accredits educator preparation providers (EPPs).

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.

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 EPP through a contract with an outside vendor or configured as a consortium with other EPPs, as well as those offered solely by the provider.

Diverse: Showing a great deal of variety; very different as in, clinical placement (see Diversity) (Source: CAEP Glossary).

Diversity: Diversity is inclusive of individual differences and group differences. (1) Individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences); and (2) group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender, identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background) (Source: CAEP Glossary).

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

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).

Endorsement Program: A planned sequence of courses and experiences, typically three (3) to four (4) courses in length, designed to provide certified educators with an additional, specific set of knowledge and skills, or to expand and enhance existing 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 continuing education units, must be approved by the GaPSC and administered by a GaPSC-approved EPP, and may be offered as either a stand-alone program or unless otherwise specified in GaPSC Educator Preparation Rules 505-3-.82 through 505-3-.106, embedded in an initial preparation program. See GaPSC Rule 505-2-.14, ENDORSEMENTS.

Field Experiences: Activities that include organized and sequenced engagement of candidates in settings providing 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 requiring active professional practice or demonstration, and including substantive work with B/P-12 students and B/P-12

personnel as appropriate. In non-traditional preparation programs, such as GaTAPP, field experiences occur outside candidates' classrooms with students with diverse learning needs and varied backgrounds in at least two settings during the clinical practice.

First Continuing Review: Formerly called the *Initial Performance Review*, the First Continuing Review is conducted three years after a Developmental Review to determine if the EPP and program(s) have evidence of meeting all applicable standards. For EPPs seeking CAEP accreditation, the First Continuing Review will be conducted jointly by state and national (CAEP) site visitors in accordance with Georgia's State Partnership Agreement with CAEP.

Franchise Program: An endorsement program developed by and approved for one GaPSC-approved EPP (the franchise manager) and consequently shared with other GaPSC-approved EPPs operating as franchisees.

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

Grade Point Average (GPA): A quantitative indicator of candidate achievement. Letter grades are converted to numbers and averaged over a period of time.

Group GPA Average: The GPA 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 grades.

Induction: (1) The formal act or process of placing an individual into a new job or position and providing appropriate support during the first three years of employment. The Georgia Department of Education defines The Induction Phase Teacher as any teacher who has been hired into a new permanent position in any Georgia school. (2) A Georgia level of professional educator certification; for additional information see Rule 505-2-04, INDUCTION CERTIFICATE.

Information Literacy: An intellectual framework for understanding, finding, evaluating, and using information—activities which may be accomplished in part by fluency with information technology, in part by sound investigative methods, but most importantly, through critical discernment and reasoning (adopted from The Association of College and Research Libraries).

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.

Local Unit of Administration (LUA): A local education 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.). As referenced in GaPSC Certification Rule 505-2-.01, paragraph (2) (d) 1, for employment purposes GaPSC Certification Division staff consider all non-IHEs as LUAs.

Media Literacy: The ability to encode and decode the symbols transmitted via media and the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate information in a variety of forms, including print and non-print messages. Also known as the skillful application of literacy skills to media and technology messages (adopted from the National Association for Media Literacy Education).

National Accreditation: National accreditation is conducted by an accrediting organization which develops evaluation criteria and conducts peer evaluations to assess whether or not those criteria are met. National accrediting agencies operate throughout the country and review entire institutions. CAEP is an example of a national accrediting organization.

Nationally Recognized Program: A program that has met the standards of a national specialized professional association (SPA) that is a constituent member of CAEP. The term, National Recognition, signifies the highest level of SPA recognition awarded to programs.

Non-traditional Preparation Program (GaTAPP): A program designed to prepare individuals who at admission hold an appropriate degree with verified content knowledge through a major or its equivalent in the content field or a passing score on the state-approved content assessment in the content field. If the state-approved content knowledge was not required at admission, it must be passed for program completion. 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 unit of administration (school district or private school), a charter school approved by the Georgia State Charter School Commission, or a charter school approved by the Georgia Department of Education 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, skills, and dispositions 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).

Out-of-State Institution: An institution of higher education administratively based in a state within the United States other than Georgia, or another country.

Partner: Organization, business, community group, agency, school, district, and/or EPP specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing clinical experiences.

Partnership: A mutually beneficial relationship among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to the preparation of education professionals. Examples may include pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A core part of content knowledge for teaching that includes: core activities of teaching, such as determining what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks; and deciding among alternative courses of action and analyzing the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities (Source: adapted from the CAEP Glossary).

Pedagogical Knowledge: The broad principles and strategies of classroom instruction, management, and organization that transcend subject matter knowledge (Source: CAEP Glossary).

Pedagogical Skills: An educator's abilities or expertise to impart the specialized knowledge/content and skills of their subject area(s) (Source: CAEP Glossary).

Preconditions: Fundamental requirements that undergird the GaPSC standards that must be met as a first step in the approval process and before an EPP is permitted to schedule a Developmental Approval Review.

Preparation Program Effectiveness Measures (PPEMs): A set 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.

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

Regional Accreditation: Regional accreditation is conducted by an accrediting organization which develops evaluation criteria and conducts peer evaluations to assess whether or not those criteria are met. Six regional accreditors operate in the United

States to conduct educational accreditation of public, private, for-profit, and not-for-profit schools, colleges, and universities in their regions.

Specialized Accreditation: Specialized accrediting organizations operate throughout the country to review programs and some single-purpose institutions. Like national and regional accreditors, specialized accreditation organizations develop evaluation criteria and conduct peer evaluations to assess whether or not those criteria are met.

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.

Stakeholder: Partner, organization, business, community group, agency, school, district, and/or EPP interested or participating in candidate selection, preparation, support, and ongoing development.

STEM: Science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Students (B/P-12): Defined as children or youth attending B/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.

Substantive Change Procedure: Process used for EPPs to submit changes that are considered significant, including additional levels of program offerings and changes to key assessments or leadership personnel.

Technology Literacy: Using technology as a tool to research, organize, evaluate, and communicate information and understanding the ethical and legal issues surrounding the access and use of information.

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

Year-long Residency: An extended clinical practice lasting the entire length of the B/P-12 school year, in the same school, in which candidates have more time to practice teaching skills with students under the close guidance of experienced and effective B/P-12 teachers licensed in the content area the candidate is preparing to teach. Candidates fully participate in the school as a member of the faculty, including faculty meetings, parent conferences, and professional learning activities spanning, if feasible, the beginning (e.g. pre-planning) and ending (post-planning) of the academic year. (Candidates may participate in post-planning at the end of the junior year if it is not possible for them to participate at the end of the senior year). These extended residencies also include supervision and mentoring by a representative of the preparation program who, along with the B/P-12 supervisor, ensures the candidate is ready for program completion and is eligible for state certification.

Endnotes

STANDARD 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

¹ Progression levels are described in *InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0* (2011), pp. 16-47.

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ Darling-Hammond, L. Power Point presentation, "Supporting Deeper Learning." E. Elliot, personal communication, January 29, 2013.

⁵ 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>.

⁶ Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CoreFAQ.pdf>

⁷ NBPTS, *What teachers should know and be able to do*.

⁸ 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>

⁹ 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

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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.

¹² 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.

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ NCATE (2010). pp. 5, 6.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ 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

STANDARD 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY

¹⁷ National Research Council. (2010). Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy. *Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States, Center for Education*. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ 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/>

²⁰ 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>

- ²¹ Bireda, S. & Chait, R. (2011). Increasing teacher diversity: Strategies to improve the teacher workforce. *Center For American Progress*. Retrieved from: <http://www.americaprogress.org>
- ²² 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>
- ²³ National Collaboration on Diversity in the Teaching Force (2004) and Bireda and Chait (2011).
- ²⁴ Bireda and Chait (2011), 30.
- ²⁵ 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
- ²⁶ NCATE (2010).
- ²⁷ *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/oep/pol/tsa.html>
- ²⁸ 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.
- ²⁹ American Federation of Teachers [AFT]. (2012), *Raising the bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the education profession*. Washington, D. C.
- ³⁰ 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.
- ³¹ 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/>
- ³² 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).
- ³³ Levin, H. M. (1970). A cost-effectiveness analysis of teacher selection. *Journal of Human Resources*, 5(1), 24-33.

³⁴ 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.

³⁵ 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.

³⁶ 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>

³⁷ Ball, D. (2008). Mathematical Knowledge for Teacher and the Mathematical Quality of Instruction: An Exploratory Study. *Cognition and Instruction*. 26(4), 430-511.

³⁸ 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>

³⁹ Lemov, D. (2010). *Teach like a champion: 49 Techniques that Put Students on the Path to College (K-12)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

⁴⁰ 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>

⁴¹ 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>

⁴² Whitehurst (2002).

⁴³ CCSSO (2011).

⁴⁴ 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

⁴⁵ For more information on Georgia’s Student Growth Model, visit

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Assessment/Pages/Georgia-Student-Growth-Model.aspx>

⁴⁶ For more information on Georgia’s Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), visit

https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/FY15%20TKES%20and%20LKES%20Documents/TAPS_Reference_Sheet%206-5-14.pdf.

STANDARD 5: PROVIDER QUALITY AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

⁴⁷ 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.

⁴⁸ 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.*

⁴⁹ Ewell, P. (2012). *Recent trends and practices in accreditation: Implications for the development of standards for CAEP*. Washington, DC: CAEP.

Additional Resources

[CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level](#)

[GaPSC Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01](#)

GaPSC Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.02

[Guidance for Georgia Standards 2016](#)

[InTASC Standards](#)

For additional CAEP resources, please visit www.caepnet.org

Addendum: Service/Leader Standards

Introduction

The *Georgia Standards for the Approval of Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs* used to review providers and their initial teaching programs are not appropriate for reviewing service and leadership programs. Therefore, a group of stakeholders examined the *Standards for Advanced Programs* published by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and has recommended the adoption of those standards for use when the following fields are being reviewed:

- Curriculum and Instruction
- Instructional Technology
- Media Specialist
- Reading Specialist
- School Counselor
- School Nutrition
- School Psychologist
- Speech and Language Pathology
- Teacher Leadership
- Educational Leadership: Tier I and Tier II

These standards, referred to as the *Georgia Standards for the Approval of Service and Leadership Educator Preparation Programs* will be used for all service and leader reviews.

Service/Leader Standard 1:

CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their field of preparation and, by completion, are able to use professional specialty practices flexibly to advance the learning of all P-12 students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Service/Leader Component 1.1: Candidates in service and leader preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 students are enhanced, through:

- Applications of data literacy;
- Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies;
- Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;
- Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;
- Supporting appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization; and
- Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization.

Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty will be documented by state licensure test scores or other proficiency measures.

Professional Responsibilities

Service/Leader Component 1.2: Providers ensure that service and leader program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline

knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and standards of other accrediting bodies [e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs(CACREP)].

Service/Leader 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 appropriate for their professional specialty field.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

Service/Leader Component 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 service and leader program candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for program 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 service and leader program candidate outcomes.

Clinical Experiences

Service/Leader Component 2.2: The provider works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical settings that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the preparation emphasize. The opportunities lead to appropriate culminating experiences in which candidates demonstrate their proficiencies, through problem-based tasks or research (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, action) that are characteristic of their professional specialization as detailed in component Service/Leader Component 1.1.

Service/Leader Standard 3:

CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY

The provider demonstrates that the quality of service and leader program candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility so that completers are prepared to perform effectively and are eligible for certification.

Admission of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs

Service/Leader Component 3.1: The provider sets goals and monitors progress for admission and support of high-quality service and leader program 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 teacher pool and, over time, should reflect the diversity of P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in service and leader fields.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully

Service/Leader Component 3.2: The provider sets admissions requirements for academic achievement, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state's minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, and gathers data to monitor candidates from admission to completion. The provider determines additional criteria intended to ensure that candidates have, or develop, abilities to complete the program successfully and arranges appropriate support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a college grade point average of 3.0 or a group average performance on nationally normed assessments, or substantially equivalent state-normed or EPP administered assessments, of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021. The CAEP minimum criteria

apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

EPPs must continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends and patterns that should be addressed.

Selectivity during Preparation

Service/Leader Component 3.3: The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion.

Selection at Completion

Service/Leader Component 3.4: Before the provider verifies that any service or leader program candidate has completed a certification program, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization.

Service/Leader Standard 4:

PROGRAM IMPACT

The provider documents the satisfaction of its completers from service and leader preparation programs and their employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Satisfaction of Employers

Service/Leader Component 4.1: The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention.

Satisfaction of Completers

Service/Leader Component 4.2: The provider demonstrates that service and leader program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

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

Component 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 program approval standards.

Component 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

Component 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.

Component 5.4: Measures of completer outcomes are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. Outcomes for service and leader programs include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of specialty preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries.

Component 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.

Note Regarding Standard 5

Except for Component 5.4, the language for Standard 5 is the same as the language of Standard 5 for initial teaching fields. The EPP will only address Standard 5 once—not separately for initial teaching programs and then for service and leader programs. That means, for example, that when the EPP demonstrates its quality assurance system (for Component 5.1), the quality of its data (for Component 5.2), its continuous improvement efforts (for Component 5.3), or its stakeholder involvement (Component 5.5), its documentation should include measures used in service and leader programs, as well as documentation used for teaching fields.

Note that for Component 5.4, there is one additional sentence here that is not included in the initial teaching standards to clarify the intent. The measures to be reported in self-study reports are, explicitly, EPP measures for service and leader preparation completion rates, certification rates, employment rates in the field of specialty preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment, retention in the field of preparation, and leadership roles in schools. This language is intended to separate the program “impact” measures already included in Standard 4 from the annual EPP reporting measures, leaving only the program “outcomes” as the focus for Component 5.4.