# Georgia Professional Standards Commission

# Guidance for Program Approval Standards 2024
## (Standards Effective for Summative Reviews in Fall, 2024)
## Version 6.6

**January 2026**

# Table of Contents

# Introduction

The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) advances excellence in educator preparation through an evidence-based peer review approval process using the [Georgia Standards for the Approval of Educator Preparation Providers and Educator Preparation Programs](#). These revised standards were adopted in January 2024, and they will become effective for all approval reviews in Fall 2024 and beyond. The standards rely upon evidence, continuous improvement, innovation, partnerships, and clinical practice to ensure that approved Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs, also referred to as providers) in Georgia are preparing educators who are classroom-ready and equipped to impact student learning. Application of the new standards requires the use of quality evidence, as well as an analysis and explanation of the analyzed evidence, in the continuous improvement of educator preparation and the GaPSC approval process.

During an approval review, a provider uploads evidence and narratives into PRS-III, making the case that standards are met at both the provider and program levels. Reviewers (formerly referred to as "Site Visitors") then examine evidence for each component, determining if the evidence makes a case for meeting the overall standard. This document, created to help providers and Reviewers better understand the standards and components, **is not a CHECKLIST**. Guiding questions and descriptions of quality evidence with possible sources of evidence are not exhaustive as EPPs may have different ways to demonstrate meeting the standards based on the EPP's systems, structures, and mission. Possible examples are listed and serve only as guidance to help providers apply evidence to address the Georgia Standards 2024. Providers are encouraged to gather and analyze data from their programs and use this information to drive continuous program improvement and increase P-12 student learning.

***Note that this guidance is for providers seeking GaPSC approval and for Reviewers examining providers seeking GaPSC approval. Providers seeking national accreditation should also refer to guidance from those accrediting bodies.***

**REMINDER:** In most cases, a list of Possible Sources of Evidence provided is not intended to be used as a checklist but rather a guide to unpack the key concept with which it is aligned.

# Assessments/Program of Study *(New for PRS-III)*

## Key Assessments: Teaching Fields

- EPP Key Assessments: **3 key EPP assessments** across all initial <u>teaching</u> programs (GACE is required; 2 are determined by provider).

    o   Validity and reliability must be demonstrated for 2 out of 3 initial teaching key assessments at the EPP level.

    o   Referring to key assessment data in whole or in part throughout narratives is acceptable in disaggregated form.

    o   Additional signature assessments do not require validity and reliability; data from such assessments can serve as supplemental sources of information to accompany data from key assessments.

    o   Multiple key assessments can be used to show alignment for each component, Standards 1.1-1.4.

- Program Key Assessments: **5 key program assessments** for all initial teaching programs (3 at the provider level are required; 2 are determined by program).

    o   Validity and reliability must be demonstrated for 4 out of 5 initial teaching assessments at the program level.

- Endorsement Program Key Assessments (teaching endorsement fields): **3 key program assessments** for endorsement programs (3 assessments, determined by program, demonstrating meeting standards).

    o   Validity and reliability expectations are not required for endorsement programs.

## Key Assessments: Service/Leadership Fields

*Remember that although all six proficiencies identified in Service/Leader (S/L) Component 1.1 are addressed in service/leadership programs, at least three of those six proficiencies are measured by key assessment data.*

- Tier I Educational Leadership Program Key Assessments: **4 key program assessments** (GACE is required; other 3 are determined by program, demonstrating meeting standards and related to three of the six proficiencies identified in S/L Component 1.1).

    o   Validity and reliability must be demonstrated for 2 out of 4 key assessments for Tier I programs.

- Tier II Educational Leadership Program Key Assessments: **4 key program assessments** (GACE for Educational Leadership Tier II is required; other 3 are determined by program, demonstrating meeting standards and related to three of the six

proficiencies identified in S/L Component 1.1).

- o Validity and reliability must be demonstrated for 2 out of 4 key assessments for Tier II programs.

- Service Program Key Assessments: **4 key program assessments** (GACE is required; 3 are determined by program, demonstrating meeting standards and related to three of the six proficiencies identified in S/L Component 1.1).

- o Validity and reliability must be demonstrated for 2 out of 4 key assessments for service programs.

- Service Endorsement Program Key Assessments: **3 key program assessments** (determined by program, demonstrating meeting standards and related to three of the six proficiencies identified in S/L Component 1.1).

- o Validity and reliability expectations are not required for endorsement programs.

**Each key assessment must have one document with all of the following information included identified by the numbers provided:**

1. A copy of the assessment (except for GACE).

2. The instructions to candidates about the assigned task.

3. The purpose of the assessment.

4. Data tables showing results of this assessment for the last three cycles, an analysis of the findings, the interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. (This item does not apply to developmental programs.)

5. Statement of how the program assures that validity and reliability of the assessment have been met. (4 of 5 key assessments at the program level for teaching fields, 2 of 4 key assessments at the program level for service/leader fields.)

6. A brief description of how the assessment is used in this program, including how often and when it is administered, who administers it, and how this assessment is used to make decisions about candidates' progress through the program.

7. Scoring guides or criteria used to score candidates' responses to the task, including the required passing score. Also include what is expected when a candidate does not meet the required passing score.

## Program of Study

- Courses required for program completion.

- Curriculum map/matrix with an alignment to TAPS and program standards.

## Review Expectations for Endorsement-only Providers

Endorsement-only providers are those that only offer endorsements and do not offer initial teaching, service, or leadership programs. Due to the unique nature of these types of EPPs, endorsement-only providers will respond to the following:

- All Standard 1 components for each endorsement;

- Applicable components of Standard 6 (6.5 and 6.10) for each endorsement; and

- Components 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4 for the overall EPP.

# Teaching Standards

The following guidance is provided for all teaching fields in Georgia, as well as teaching endorsement fields. Guidance for Service/Leader fields can be found here.

## Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop an understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and facilitates candidates' reflection to increase their understanding and implementation of research-based practices. The provider is intentional in the development of their curriculum and clinical experiences for candidates to demonstrate their ability to effectively work with all P-12 students and their families. For each component in Standard 1, the provider ensures candidates demonstrate their knowledge and application of Georgia's Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS). Standard 1 evidence at the program level ensures that candidates demonstrate TAPS and content and/or program standards delineated in the rule.

*Note: While Standard 1 does not directly demonstrate continuous improvement efforts, EPPs must describe interpretations about the data and conclusions drawn from those interpretations. Analysis of data in Standard 1 is used to demonstrate components of Standard 5.*

| **Component 1.1: Professional Knowledge** |
|---|
| Standard 1 evidence at the program level ensures that candidates demonstrate TAPS and content and/or program standards delineated in the rule. |
| The provider ensures candidates demonstrate their understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences (Georgia TAPS Standard 1: Professional Knowledge). |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence that candidates are able to:<br><br>• Address appropriate curriculum standards and integrate key content elements, including knowledge of evidence-based literacy instruction.<br>• Demonstrate accurate, deep, and current knowledge of subject matter. |

- Facilitate students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction (connecting concepts; using differing perspectives; engaging learners in critical thinking, creativity and collaborative problem solving; encouraging learner exploration, discovery, and expression across content areas).
- Demonstrate ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.
- Exhibit pedagogical skills relevant to the subject area(s) taught and best practice based on current research.
- Base instruction on goals that reflect high expectations for all students and a clear understanding of the curriculum.
- Display an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.

## Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP know that candidates demonstrate curriculum understanding, subject content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and the ability to meet the needs of all students?
- What data demonstrate how/when these components are addressed and measured?
- How does the EPP know candidates are prepared to teach rigorous lessons which engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving?
- How does the EPP know candidates facilitate students' use of higher-level thinking skills?
- How does the EPP know candidates understand the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group?

## Quality Evidence: (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence demonstrates candidates can apply critical concepts and principles in their discipline and pedagogical knowledge in their content field.
- Data are disaggregated by program across three cycles of data to demonstrate candidate proficiency across programs.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability.
- Signature/critical assessments are aligned to standards (TAPS, content and program-level standards).
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*
o Key assessment data (e.g., GACE Content Assessment, GACE Literacy Assessment across EPP programs).
o Signature/critical assessments and accompanying data (unit plans or lesson plans demonstrating candidates' application of content knowledge).

- o Evidence that candidate lessons are rigorous and encourage higher-level thinking and problem-solving.
- o Portfolios.
- o Teacher Work Samples.
- o Observation data.
- o Video of Practice Reflections or Rubrics.

## Component 1.2: Instructional Practice

Standard 1 evidence at the program level ensures that candidates demonstrate TAPS and content and/or program standards delineated in the rule.

The provider ensures candidates plan using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students (Georgia TAPS Standard 2: Instructional Planning).

The provider ensures candidates promote student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students' acquisition of key knowledge and skills (Georgia TAPS Standard 3: Instructional Strategies).

The provider ensures candidates challenge and support each student's learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences. (Georgia TAPS Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction).

The provider ensures candidates systematically choose a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population (Georgia TAPS Standard 5: Assessment Strategies).

The provider ensures candidates systematically gather, analyze, and use relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents (Georgia TAPS Standard 6: Assessment Uses).

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of:
- Planning instruction that draws on content knowledge, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy to support every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.
- Research-based instructional strategies and technology resources to encourage learners to develop content knowledge and content connections to build skills and knowledge in meaningful ways.
- Differentiation to challenge and support each student's learning and success.
- Multiple methods of assessment to monitor learner progress and guide decision-making.
- Diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments to measure student progress, inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to students and parents.

| Guiding Questions |
|---|
| • How does the EPP know candidates plan for instruction to meet the needs of all students? <br> • How does the EPP know use student learning data to inform planning? <br> • How does the EPP know candidates use a variety of research-based instructional strategies and resources (including technology) to facilitate students' acquisition of key knowledge and skills? <br> • How does the EPP know that candidates align student assessment with the established curriculum and benchmarks? <br> • How does the EPP know candidates use formal and informal assessments for diagnostic, formative, and summative purposes? <br> • How does the EPP know candidates know how to share accurate results of student progress with students, parents, and key school personnel? <br> • How does the EPP know that candidates provide constructive and frequent feedback to students on their progress toward their learning goals? <br> • How does the EPP know that candidates know how to help students self-assess and use metacognitive strategies in support of lifelong learning? |

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence demonstrates candidates have developed proficiencies to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge effectively in instruction and other interactions with P-12 students.

- Evidence that indicates that candidates are proficient in the applications of technology for enhancement of P-12 learning.
- Data are disaggregated by program across three cycles of data to demonstrate candidate proficiency across programs.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Signature/critical assessments are aligned to standards (TAPS and program standards).
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*
o  Data from the following key assessments or signature/critical assessments:
  ▪ Teacher Work Samples.
  ▪ Unit Plan.
  ▪ Video of Practice Reflections or Rubrics
  ▪ Assessment projects using pre- and post- data to drive student learning.
  ▪ Identify technology as an important component of the P-12 classroom.
  ▪ Demonstrate candidates' ability to design and facilitate digital learning with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.
  ▪ Demonstrate candidates' ability to track and share student performance data digitally with performance at or above the acceptable level on rubric indicators.
  ▪ Demonstrate candidates' ability to plan and deliver rigorous and differentiated instruction to facilitate students' acquisition of key knowledge and skills.
o  Data from observations (e.g., Intern Keys/CAPS for traditional candidates, Danielson, Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS) for in- service candidates) that:
  ▪ Demonstrate candidates use student data to drive instruction.
  ▪ Include a technology component and evaluate how candidates use technology to enhance student learning.

## Component 1.3: Learning Environment

Standard 1 evidence at the program level ensures that candidates demonstrate TAPS and content and/or program standards delineated in the rule.

The provider ensures candidates provide a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all (Georgia TAPS Standard 7: Positive Learning Environment). The provider ensures candidates create a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners (Georgia TAPS Standard 8: Academically Challenging Environment).

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of:
- The learning environment (e.g., clear expectations, climate of trust and teamwork, individual and collaborative learning, positive interactions, active engagement in learning, self-motivation).
- Learner differences (e.g., individual differences, different communities, prior knowledge and experiences, multiple perspectives, language development).
- The learner and learning (e.g., candidates: believe all learners can achieve at high levels, persist in supporting and scaffolding all learners, respect learners as individuals, make learners feel valued; and promote respect among learners).
- Academic rigor (critical and creative thinking; academic risk taking; growth mindset; challenging material and assignments).

### Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP know candidates are prepared to teach all learners in the different situations they may encounter on the job?
- How does the EPP know candidates can create challenging and rigorous lessons that impact student learning?
- How does the EPP know candidates engage students in active learning and maintain interest?
- How does the EPP ensure that candidates have high expectations for all students?
- How does the EPP know candidates provide a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that meets the needs of all students?

### Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence documents candidates' understanding of human growth and development and of individual differences across cognitive, linguistic, social, and physical areas as well as individual differences and different cultures and communities.

- Data are disaggregated by program across three cycles of data to demonstrate candidate proficiency across programs.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability.
- Key assessments and signature/critical assessments are aligned to standards.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*
- Data from key assessments and signature/critical assessments demonstrating the candidate's ability to establish a well-managed, safe and orderly environment.
- Data from signature/critical assessments demonstrate the candidate's ability to plan and deliver rigorous instruction.
- Data shows that candidates use P-12 student data and characteristics for planning and differentiation.
- P-12 surveys from students in the classroom where clinical practice is being completed.
- Teacher Work Samples.
- Portfolios.
  - Observation data.
  - Unit/ lesson plans.
  - Video of Practice Reflections or Rubrics

## Component 1.4: Professionalism and Communication

Standard 1 evidence at the program level ensures that candidates demonstrate TAPS and content and/or program standards delineated in the rule.

The provider ensures candidates exhibit a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participate in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contribute to the profession (Georgia TAPS Standard 9: Professionalism).

The provider ensures candidates communicate effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning (Georgia TAPS Standard 10: Communication).

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of:
- Professional standards of practice, relevant laws and policies and codes of ethics.
- Collaboration and communication with learners, families, and colleagues and other school professionals to ensure learner growth.
- Engagement in ongoing professional learning.
- Data, evidence, and feedback to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community).
- Professional responsibility (e.g., adaption of practice to meet needs of each learner, taking responsibility of learning of all students; embracing challenge of continuous improvement and change).
- Deepening understanding of professional practice and learner success through reflection
- Adherence to school and district policies regarding communication of student information.

### Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP know candidates can use reflection and feedback to set goals for professional improvement?
- How does the EPP ensure candidates have knowledge of professional standards of practice, relevant laws, and policies and codes of ethics?
- How does the evidence demonstrate increasing complexity in candidate understanding and application of professional responsibility?
- How does the EPP know candidates participate in ongoing professional growth activities based on identified areas for improvement and incorporate this new learning into classroom activities?

- How does the EPP ensure that candidates can collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues and other school professionals to ensure learner growth?
- How does the EPP ensure candidates can communicate and share instructional goals, expectations, and student progress with families?

## Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence of candidate's understanding of professional standards of practice, relevant laws and policies and codes of ethics.
- Evidence of candidate's ability to communicate and collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues to ensure learner growth.
- Data are disaggregated by program across three cycles of data to demonstrate candidate proficiency across programs.Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability.
- Signature/critical assessments are aligned to standards.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*
- Key assessments and signature/critical assessments or course assignments/tasks.
- Data from dispositions assessment.
- Portfolios.
- Professional Learning Plans or Goals (Individualized Induction Plans) developed from assessment data, feedback and reflection.
- Reflections on improving one's professional practice.
- Data, reflections, and feedback demonstrate candidates' ability to take responsibility for student learning.
- Dispositional and/or professional responsibility data.
- Evidence of successful work with families and/or collaboration with colleagues.
- Participation in professional development opportunities.
- Participation in ethics training as required in Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01.

## Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

The provider ensures effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to candidate preparation. These experiences are designed to develop candidate's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, and to demonstrate positive impact on all students' learning and development. High quality clinical practice offers candidates experiences in different settings and modalities, as well as with different groups of P-12 students, schools, families, and communities. Partners share responsibility to identify and address real problems of practice candidates experience in their engagement with P-12 students.

| **Component 2.1: Partnerships for Clinical Preparation** |
|---|
| Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence:<br>• Partnerships have been established and maintained with schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations.<br>• P-12 schools and/or community partners and EPPs have both benefited from the partnership.<br>• All partners are active participants in the on-going, collaborative process to improve candidate preparation (co-construction). |
| **Guiding Questions** |
| • How does the EPP document partnerships?<br>• To what extent are the partnerships mutually beneficial?<br>• How does the EPP ensure all partners are involved – or have the opportunity to be involved – in the development, maintenance, and modification of the partnership? In other words, how does the EPP ensure that partnerships are co-constructed?<br>• How does the EPP engage P-12 partners in an on-going collaborative process? |

| Quality Evidence |
|---|
| The provider presents evidence that a collaborative process is in place with P-12 partners that is reviewed periodically and involves activities such as:<br><br>• Collaborative development, review, or revision of instruments and evaluations.<br>• Collaborative development, review, or revision of the structure and content of the clinical activities.<br>• Mutual involvement in ongoing decision-making about partnership structure and operations (e.g., MOUs, Partnership Agreements).<br>• Creation of opportunities for candidates to work with a variety of P-12 students who have differing needs.<br>• The EPP provides evidence that the P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefited from the partnership.<br>• Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.<br><br>*Possible Sources of Evidence*<br><br>o Documentation for collaboration (meeting agendas and decisions, meeting minutes, members), including Advisory Boards/Councils.<br>o Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with partners, including examples.<br>o Evidence that provider participates in P-20 Collaborative and uses feedback from those conversations to drive changes.<br>o Evidence that the provider regularly seeks input from P-12 teachers and/or educational leaders regarding candidate preparation, including developing or refining criteria for entry/exit into clinical experiences.<br>o Candidate Support Team Documentation. |

| Component 2.2: Clinical Educators |
|---|

Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, and support high-quality clinical educators, both provider and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development.

*Clinical educators refers to both provider- and school-based clinical educators.*

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence that the EPP and its partners (e.g., P-12, community, agency):
- Develop criteria for the co-selection of clinical educators that includes demonstrating a positive impact on candidate and /or P-12 student learning and development.
- Collaborate in the preparation and evaluation of clinical educators to ensure they are prepared for their roles and responsibilities.
- Collaborate to develop, review, and revise supports provided for clinical educators.

**Guiding Questions**

- How does the EPP work with partners to select clinical educators?
- How does the EPP prepare clinical educators for the roles and responsibilities in working with candidates?
- How does the EPP support clinical educators as they engage in the role of working with candidates?
- How does the EPP evaluate clinical educators and their impact on candidate success?
- How does the EPP engage partners in the data-informed decision-making for clinical educators?
- What features of partnerships, including clinical educator participation, selection, or training, have had positive effects on candidate development?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence documents that clinical educators receive feedback on their experiences.
- Evidence documents that the EPP and its P-12 partners participate in the selection of, design and training for clinical educators.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).
- o Process documents and training materials for clinical educators.
- o Professional development for clinical educators.
- o Feedback tools for clinical educators.
- o Job descriptions and expectations for clinical educators.
- o Meeting decisions/active discussions for partnership.
- o Evidence that training and coaching of clinical educators is available in person and/or online.
- o Provider-conducted surveys of clinical educators and candidates that provides evidence of quality and consistency.
- o Documented evidence of criteria for selection of clinical educators.

| Component 2.3: Clinical Experiences |
|---|
| The provider works with partners to design and implement clinical experiences, utilizing various modalities, of sufficient depth, breadth, coherence, and duration to ensure candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on P-12 students' learning and development as presented in Standard 1. |

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence that:
- Clinical experiences are designed and implemented jointly by the EPP and its partners and ensure candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development.
- These clinical experiences are designed and implemented to include:
  - **Depth:** the intentional programmatic design for the relations between clinical experiences, coursework, and candidates.
  - **Breadth:** the opportunities candidates are provided within clinical experience to observe and practice within a wide variety of settings.
  - **Coherence:** the sequence of experiences is deliberate, purposeful, sequential, and is assessed using performance-based protocols.
  - **Duration:** the appropriate time for candidates to demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact.
  - **Modality:** the opportunity to demonstrate their effectiveness and positive impact in a variety of delivery methods.
- They document clinical experience goals/outcomes and operational design along with evidence that clinical experiences are being implemented as described.
- The EPP demonstrates that their candidates engage in high-quality clinical experience including various modalities (e.g., virtual instruction, hybrid, face to face).

**Guiding Questions**

- What opportunities have candidates had to participate in a wide variety of school settings and to work with students having different needs?
- What features of clinical experiences (e.g., depth, breadth, coherence, duration) has the EPP studied – through comparisons across preparation programs, or more formal investigations – to improve candidate outcomes?
- What clinical experiences have enhanced completer's knowledge of current education issues and their readiness to use that knowledge in teaching situations?

- What applications of technology have prepared completers for the responsibilities on the job?
- How are clinical experiences effective in preparing candidates for initial employment in education in their field of specialization?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence documents that all candidates have active clinical experiences in a variety of settings and experiences with P-12 students (which may be in the same or different schools), including early field experiences, observations, and culminating clinical practices such as student teaching/internship.
- Evidence is provided that clinical experiences are assessed using performance-based criteria.
- Attributes (e.g., depth, breadth, coherence, duration) are linked to student outcomes and candidate performance.
- Evidence shows that candidates have purposefully assessed impact on student learning using both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting and have:
  o Used the impact data to guide instructional decision-making.
  o Modified instruction based on impact data.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Signature/critical assessments are aligned to standards.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

  o Evidence that EPPs track field and clinical experiences in a variety of settings (e.g. field placement chart, including demographics and range of experiences).
  o Evidence that candidates are assessed throughout the program with data supporting increasing levels of candidate competency.
  o Performance-based assessment data.
  o Portfolio of clinical experiences.
  o TAPS data (for employed candidates).
  o Proprietary assessment to demonstrate a positive impact on student learning in clinical experiences (e.g., MAP testing, Milestones, End of Course tests, AP exams).

## Standard 3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

The provider demonstrates the quality of candidates is a continuous and purposeful focus from recruitment through completion. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation and provides support services (such as advising, remediation, and mentoring) in all phases of the program so candidates will be successful.

| **Component 3.1: Recruitment** |
|---|
| The provider presents goals aligned with its mission and evidence of progress for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and populations. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address local, state, regional, or national needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. Goals and evidence address progress towards a candidate pool that reflects the population of America's P-12 students. |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence of: <br> • Goals towards admitting high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and populations. <br> • Routinely monitoring the employment landscape to identify shortage areas, openings, and related information in the community, state, regional or national markets for which it is preparing completers. <br> • Recording, monitoring, and using recruitment results to plan and, as appropriate, modify recruitment strategies and goals. <br> • Descriptions of strategies and actions in place to achieve the EPP's goals together with periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of those strategies. |
| **Guiding Questions** |
| • How does the EPP recruit an increasingly stronger pool of candidates? <br> • How have the recruitment strategies and actions, as well as the implementation of those strategies and actions, moved the EPP toward meeting its goals? <br> • How do the recruitment strategies and actions align with the mission of the EPP? <br> • How does the EPP determine the success of its recruitment efforts? <br> • How are recruitment efforts supported as evidence-informed, meaningful, and feasible given the context of the EPP? <br> • How do the recruitment strategies and actions meet the needs of employers for which the EPP prepares candidates? |

- In what ways do disaggregated data on candidates (admitted and enrolled candidates by a broad range of backgrounds and populations) inform decisions that align with the EPP mission and the goals of achieving a highly qualified candidate pool?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence documents the EPP's periodic examination of the employment landscape in order to identify shortage areas, openings, and related information in the community, state, regionals, or national market for completers.
- Evidence documents baseline points and longitudinal data on current measures of academic achievement.
- Evidence documents measurable target outcomes and timeline for achievement.
- Evidence documents that the EPP monitors annual progress toward admission goals and fields where there are employment opportunities. Data are disaggregated to describe populations, including gender, ethnicity, academic achievement, and/or candidate preparedness for high-need areas or communities and trends are analyzed.
- Evidence documents that admissions data are disaggregated for enrolled candidates by relevant demographics, branch campuses, and individual programs.
- Evidence documents strategies and actions specifically for the EPP and its programs.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Basic descriptive information such as baseline points and numerical goals.
- o Results from annual monitoring of academic achievement, as well as employment needs aligned with recruitment goals.
- o Results of EPP's monitoring of progress towards recruitment goals.
- o Response to statewide shortage reports.
- o EPP's interpretation of its progress and revising goals.

| Component 3.2: Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression |
|---|

The provider creates and monitors transition points from admission through completion that indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical skills, critical dispositions, professional responsibilities, and the ability to integrate technology effectively in their practice. The provider tracks each cohort aggregate GPA to monitor all changes in these data, documenting any point when the cohort GPA is less than 3.0, and analyzes the data to identify the potential need for candidate support. The provider ensures knowledge of and progression through transition points are transparent to candidates. The provider plans and documents the need for candidate support, as identified in disaggregated data by race and ethnicity and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission, so candidates meet milestones. The provider has a system for effectively maintaining records of candidate complaints and document resolutions.

## Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence of:
- Criteria for transition points from admission through completion.
- Monitoring progression from admission through completion, including attention to how candidates develop:
  - Content knowledge.
  - Pedagogical knowledge.
  - Pedagogical skills.
  - Critical dispositions.
  - Professional responsibilities.
  - Ability to integrate technology effectively.
- Transition points and related criteria are shared with candidates.
- Using disaggregated data to advise and support candidates who may not progress (categories may include but are not limited to age, race, ethnicity, native language, gender, etc., in accordance with the mission and vision of the EPP's institution).
- Documenting any point when the cohort GPA is less than 3.0 and analyzing the data to identify the potential need for candidate support.
- A system for tracking and resolving candidate complaints.

## Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP monitor candidate progress, including performance on non-academic factors like dispositions and professional responsibilities?
- How does the EPP communicate with candidates the progress monitoring points and requirements for each point?
- How does the EPP collect and respond to complaints/appeals?
- How is the evidence for monitoring progression from admission through completion identified in Standard 1 connected to identified transition points?
- Identify and describe the support mechanisms for candidates not meeting program expectations (e.g., advising, remediation, or mentoring) that are available and how recommendations occur.
- How are support mechanisms (e.g., remediation and mentoring) differentiated to assist all candidates in the programs?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence documents performance reviews, remediation efforts, and/or provisions illustrating that the EPP sets goals for candidate support and monitors progress towards goals of providing sufficient support to candidates to facilitate successful program completion.
- Disaggregated data by preparation program, race/ethnicity, and other demographic items highlighted in 3.1 show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence that actions are taken when there are problems with the progression of individual candidates.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Crosswalk/curriculum map of key evidence from Standard 1 aligned with transition points.
- o Assessments used at key points during the program, including data and analyses.
- o Documentation of complaints/appeals (no identifying names) and demographics of those submitting complaints/appeals.
- o Description of support services available, frequency of use, and results (e.g., supporting candidates toward completion or counseling them out of the program).
- o Evidence of documented transition points (formative and summative) throughout program progression, such as:
  - Admission requirements data.
  - Ethics data.

- Candidate Support Team (CST) data (or mentor/cooperating teacher and college supervisor data).
- Observational data.
- Data from field experiences.
- Key assessment data.
  - o Explicit criteria for monitoring/assessing with a focus on candidate development throughout preparation.
  - o Professional Growth Plans for candidates who are not demonstrating the knowledge, skills, or dispositions necessary to be successful in the classroom.

| Component 3.3: Competency at Completion |
|---|
| The provider ensures candidates possess academic competency to teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development through application of content knowledge, foundational pedagogical skills, and technology integration in the field(s) of certification sought. Multiple measures are provided and data are disaggregated and analyzed based on race, ethnicity, and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission. |

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence of:
- Using disaggregated data to verify candidate competency at completion to teach P-12 students (categories may include but are not limited to age, race, ethnicity, native language, gender, etc., in accordance with the mission and vision of the EPP's institution).
  - Candidates demonstrating the expected level of proficiency at completion in the following areas:
    - Content knowledge.
    - Pedagogical skills.
    - Critical dispositions.
    - Professional responsibilities.
  - Candidates' ability to integrate technology effectively.
  - Candidates illustrating proficiency at completion in the areas identified.
  - Documentation of candidates' effective teaching, including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

### Guiding Questions

- What evidence does the EPP use to ensure by the end of the program a candidate is ready to move into the profession?
- How does the EPP use multiple sources of evidence to triangulate that candidates are prepared for certification at completion?
- How does the EPP ensure candidates are proficient in effective teaching and have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development?
- How does the EPP disaggregate completion data and what they have learned from the analysis across demographic groups?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Disaggregated data by preparation program, race/ethnicity, and other demographic items highlighted in 3.1 show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence that actions are taken when there are problems with the progression of individual candidates.
- Evidence is triangulated so there is more than one source that demonstrates candidates are proficient in the areas identified.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- Crosswalk/curriculum of key evidence from Standard 1 aligned with transition points.
- Progression level threshold/criteria for success at completion.
- GACE Content Assessment pass rates (Induction and Professional levels).
- Student teaching evaluation instruments (e.g., Intern Keys).
- Danielson Rubric data.
- TAPS data (for employed candidates).
- Dispositions/non-academic assessments.

## Standard 4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the effectiveness of its completers' instruction, P-12 student learning and development, and completer and employer satisfaction with the relevance and effectiveness of preparation.

*Underlying Concepts and Considerations for Standard 4*

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

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

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

| Component 4.1: Completer Effectiveness |
|---|
| The provider demonstrates that program completers:<br>• Effectively contribute to P-12 student-learning growth; and<br>• Apply in P-12 classroom the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.<br>In addition, the provider includes a rationale for the data elements provided. |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence of:<br>• Completers having a positive impact on P-12 student-learning growth with impact data from a representative sample of completers and programs.<br>• Completers applying the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions corresponding with teaching effectiveness. |

| Guiding Questions |
| --- |
| <ul><li>How does the EPP demonstrate completer impact on P-12 student learning and development?</li><li>How is the EPP's sample of completers and measures used to show its completers have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development?</li><li>How does the EPP measure completer teaching effectiveness in the classroom?</li><li>What is the rationale for the measures chosen to measure impact?</li><li>How does the EPP ensure a representative sample, inclusive of certification areas, will be enlarged over time?</li><li>How does the EPP ensure completers are effective in contributing to P-12 student learning growth?</li></ul> |

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Data are disaggregated by program across three cycles of data to demonstrate candidate proficiency across programs.
- Rationale/methodology for selection of impact measures used.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

o Contribute to P-12 student-learning growth.
- State-level data on student performance (e.g., student growth measures, value-add measures).
- Performance portfolios.
- Case study.
o Apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the P-12 classroom.
- TAPS/TKES data for completers.
- TAPS/TKES data for in-service candidates.
o Focus groups with detailed methodology.
- Completers.
- P-12 students.
o Observations of completers.
o Surveys.
o Interviews.
o P-12 student awards (e.g., first place in science fair, all-state music participation).
o Completer awards (e.g., Teacher of the Year).

## Component 4.2: Satisfaction of Employers

The provider demonstrates employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for working with P-12 students and their families.

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence:
- From employers that completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- From a representative sample of employers.
- Employers are satisfied with completers' preparation to work with P-12 students and their families.

### Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP measure satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers?
- How does the EPP ensure a representative sample, inclusive of most certification areas, will be enlarged over time?
- How does the EPP ensure instruments/methods elicit responses specific to the criteria in Standard 1 (e.g., professional knowledge, instructional practice, learning environment, professionalism and communication)?

### Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence should include data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.
- Evidence should demonstrate a representative sample (in one cycle of data or over multiple cycles of data).
- EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- Employer satisfaction surveys.
- Focus groups or interviews with detailed methodology.
- Employer satisfaction case study.
- PPEM Survey data.

| Component 4.3: Satisfaction of Completers |
|---|
| The provider demonstrates completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encounter on the job, and that their preparation was effective. |

## Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence:
- That completers perceive their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- From a representative sample of completers.
- That completers are satisfied with their preparation to work with P-12 students and their families.

## Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP measure satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers?
  - How does the EPP ensure instruments/methods elicit responses specific to the criteria in Standard 1 (e.g., professional knowledge, instructional practice, learning environment, professionalism and communication)?
- How does the EPP ensure all of the programs are included within the data cycles?

## Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Data are disaggregated by program across three cycles of data to demonstrate candidate proficiency across programs. Evidence should demonstrate a representative sample (in one cycle of data or over multiple cycles of data).
- EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Completer/Alumni Satisfaction survey data.
- o Focus groups or interviews with detailed methodology.
- o PPEM Survey data.

## Standard 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system consisting of valid data from multiple measures and supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based. The system is developed and maintained with input from internal and external stakeholders. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements, and highlight innovations.

| Component 5.1: Quality Assurance System |
|---|
| The provider has developed, implemented, and modified, as needed, a functioning quality assurance system that ensures a sustainable process to document operational effectiveness. The provider documents how data enter the system, how data are reported and used in decision-making, and how the outcomes of those decisions inform programmatic improvement. |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence:<br>• Of a functioning quality assurance system documenting operational effectiveness.<br>• Of a rationale for the selection of the multiple measures.<br>• That the quality assurance system data are used in decision making.<br>• Of a responsive quality assurance system with the ability to provide data relevant for aspects of the EPP's context.<br>• Of how outcomes of quality assurance system data analysis are used for program improvement. |
| **Guiding Questions** |
| • How does the EPP maintain a functioning quality assurance system capable of providing data that enables quality control and continuous improvement?<br>• How are data describing the EPP's effectiveness (as provided for Standards 1 – 4) collected, analyzed, monitored, and reported?<br>• What are examples of questions the system is called on to answer that make use of the system capabilities to combine data from various sources and/or disaggregate data by different categories?<br>• How is the system used by the EPP to provide information for review and decision-making?<br>• Can the faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders articulate their roles and engagement in the quality assurance system? |

| Quality Evidence |
| --- |
| • Overview or flow chart demonstrating (at a high level) the entire quality assurance system that includes roles and responsibilities of those responsible for the data collection, monitoring, analysis, and reporting.<br>• Evidence provided that the EPP regularly reviews system operations and data (e.g., timelines, schedules).<br>• The provider demonstrates the quality assurance system has the capacity to collect, analyze, monitor, and report data/evidence from Standards 1-4 and Standard 6.<br>• The provider's quality assurance system supports the disaggregation of data by certification field/program, race/ethnicity, and other relevant dimensions identified by the EPP.<br>• Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.<br><br>*Possible Sources of Evidence*<br><br>    o Graphic representation of the quality assurance system.<br>    o Quality assurance manual.<br>    o Crosswalk of all measures included in the quality assurance system.<br>    o Verification of the quality assurance system through demonstration. |

| Component 5.2: Data Quality |
|---|

The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures to ensure interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence:
- Of a clear link between what is being measured and what the EPP intends to measure *(relevant)*.
- That measures/results can be confirmed or substantiated (e.g., key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity) *(verifiable)*.
- Encompassing candidates and completers from all initial preparation programs *(representative)*.
- Measuring candidate or EPP performance results across successive administrations (e.g., three cycles of data) *(cumulative)*.
- Of a clear link between the measures and EPP action taken as a result of the measures *(actionable)*.

**Guiding Questions**

- What strengths and weaknesses in the quality assurance system are discovered by faculty when they use data and analyses from the system?
- How are the data relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable?
- How are validity and reliability demonstrated in data quality?
- What procedures does the EPP take in design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure its validity?
- What procedures does the EPP take in design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure its reliability?
- Can findings be triangulated with multiple data points, so they can be confirmed or found conflicting?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Distinguish between EPP-created assessment/instruments and proprietary assessments/instruments.
- Documentation of steps taken to establish instrument validity and reliability.
- Documentation of steps taken to demonstrate that data resulting from key assessments are valid and reliable.
- Description of modifications to instruments based on feedback, as well as validity and reliability processes.
- The provider's quality assurance system supports the disaggregation of data by certification field/program, race/ethnicity, and other dimensions identified by the EPP.

- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- Reliability and validity process documentation and data.
  - Sampling procedures.
  - Documentation of instrument revision with timeline.

## Component 5.3: Stakeholder Involvement

The provider includes relevant internal (e.g., EPP administrators, faculty, staff, candidates) and external (e.g., alumni, practitioners, school and community partners, employers) stakeholders in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes.

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence of:
- Internal and external stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, and continuous improvement process.

### Guiding Questions

- What EPP process is used to involve stakeholders in data-driven decision-making?
- How and when do external partners participate in the EPP's continuous improvement process?
- How are clinical partners (external stakeholders) included in the continuous improvement process?
- In what ways are stakeholders involved in program design?
- In what ways are stakeholders involved in evaluation?
- In what ways are stakeholders involved in continuous improvement?

### Quality Evidence

- Evidence identifies examples of input from stakeholders and uses of that input.
- Evidence that stakeholder groups include members with a variety of roles and responsibilities.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o MOUs/partnerships.
- o Advisory Board/Council feedback/input, including documentation of meetings and decisions.
- o Co-construction of assessments/surveys.

| Component 5.4: Continuous Improvement |
|---|
| The provider regularly, systematically, and continuously assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, and documents modifications and/or innovations and their effects on EPP outcomes. |

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence:
- That the EPP assesses performance in relation to its goals and standards.
- Documenting performance results over time.
- Documenting modifications and tracing the effects over time.
- That information from the quality assurance system is the basis for a continuous improvement function.
- That the EPP documents regular and systematic data-driven changes grounded in:
  - Data analyses and interpretations from it quality assurance system.
  - Changes linked to its goals and relevant standards.
- Program decisions are directly supported by data, and/or contradictory data are explained.

**Guiding Questions**

- How does the EPP support continuous improvement through procedures that gather, input, analyze, interpret and use information from the quality assurance system effectively?
- What actions has the EPP taken to pilot specific program improvements and study their effectiveness?
- What examples of changes in courses, clinical experiences, or other candidate experiences represent the effectiveness of continuous improvement efforts?

**Quality Evidence**

- The examples indicate that changes are clearly connected to evidence, and provider performance is systematically assessed against goals.
- Written documentation confirms that the EPP regularly and systematically reviews, analyzes and interprets quality assurance system data, identifies patterns across programs, and uses data for continuous improvement and innovative modifications.

- Not all changes need to lead to improvement, as data-driven experimentation is encouraged, but changes should trend toward improvement.
- The EPP examines the outcomes currently achieved and identifies gaps between current results and established standards, examining why these results occur.
- EPP documents the process of examining results and decisions made (e.g., keep, modify, discontinue).
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

o Meeting minutes that highlight data review and decisions.
o Decision grid that includes the question asked, data used to respond to the question, the stakeholder group examining the data, and the decision(s) made.
o Outcomes of changes/modifications (what happened after changes were made).
o Goals crosswalk table (goals and where the EPP is in the process).

## Standard 6: Special Georgia Requirements

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-.01 505-3-.02, and 505-3-.03, and to guide Approval Review Teams in properly evaluating programs. All GaPSC programs leading to certification are expected to meet the applicable elements of this standard.

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

| Component 6.1: Admission Requirements |
|---|
| **6.1.1: Content Knowledge for Post-Baccalaureate and CTAE Candidates (N/A Baccalaureate and Endorsement Programs)** |
| 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. CTAE candidates must hold a high school diploma or GED, or an associate's degree or higher in the teaching field of Professional certification sought, as delineated in applicable Certification Rules. CTAE candidates who enter with a high school diploma or GED must complete both the associate's degree and initial teaching preparation program for completion and recommendation for the Professional teaching certificate. The preparation program must be completed within three years; an additional year is allowable if needed to complete the associate's degree. |
| **Possible Sources of Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results) |
| • Documentation of requirements that must be met prior to enrollment (e.g., handbook/catalog). |
| **6.1.2: Educator Ethics Assessment (N/A Endorsement Programs)** |
| Candidates entering traditional or non-traditional initial teacher or leader preparation programs at the baccalaureate level or higher must pass the state-approved assessment of educator ethics prior to enrollment. |

| Possible Sources of Evidence |
| --- |
| • Documentation of candidates passing the Educator Ethics Assessment. |

| 6.1.3: Criminal Record Check (N/A Endorsement Programs) |
| --- |
| GaPSC-approved EPPs shall require at or prior to admission to traditional 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 or Provisional Certificate and to participate in field and clinical experiences in Georgia P-12 schools. |

| Possible Sources of Evidence |
| --- |
| • Documentation of Criminal Record Check for all candidates. |

| Component 6.2: Identification and Education of Children with Special Needs (N/A Endorsement Programs) |
|---|

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.

**Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Often called the "exceptional child" requirement, the special education requirement is satisfied by completing a course in the identification and education of children who have special educational needs for grades P-12. The course (in fulfillment of House Bill 671) is a general introductory survey course emphasizing the characteristics of all exceptionalities (behavioral, developmental, and learning disabilities, deaf education, physical and health disabilities, and visual impairment, as well as gifted) with the appropriate identification and the educational programming for such. Completing a Special Education program also satisfies this requirement.
- Those completing the special education course on or after July 1, 2019 must have made a grade of B or better.
- Syllabus for special education course.

| Component 6.3: Georgia P-12 Testing and Educator Evaluation (N/A Endorsement Programs) |
|---|
| 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. |
| **Possible Sources of Evidence** |
| <ul><li>Evidence that candidates have participated in training related to student testing rules.</li><li>Evidence that candidates have had training in ethical decision making and how to apply ethical principles.</li><li>Evidence that candidates understand the requirements for and implementation of the state-mandated evaluation system.</li></ul> |

| Component 6.4: Professional Ethical Standards and Requirements of Certification and Employment |
|---|
| **(N/A Endorsements)** |

**6.4.1: Ethics**

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 EPPs shall assess candidates' knowledge of professional ethics and the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators either separately or in conjunction with assessments of dispositions.

**Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Evidence of training candidates in the application of professional ethics and social behavior appropriate for school and community.
- Evidence of training candidates in the application of ethical decision-making skills.
- Evidence of Code of Ethics training.

**6.4.2: Certification and Employment (N/A for programs that require simultaneous employment for admission)**

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.

**Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Evidence that information on criminal background checks, tiered certification, professional learning, and employment options are shared with candidates.

## Component 6.5: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

### 6.5.1: Field Experiences

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.

Although field experiences in specific grade bands are not required for endorsement programs, candidates must have substantive opportunities to demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in endorsement standards in carefully planned and scaffolded experiences in fieldwork in as many settings as necessary to demonstrate competence with children at all developmental levels applicable for the endorsement program.

### Possible Sources of Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- A description of the sequencing of field experiences.
- Evidence that candidates are provided with opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards.
- Evidence that experiences are systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with P-12 students.

### 6.5.2: Grade Level Requirements-(N/A Endorsements)

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates complete supervised field experiences consistent with the grade levels and field(s) of certification sought. Candidates for Birth Through Kindergarten certification must complete field experiences at three (3) levels: with children aged 0 to 2, 3 to 4, and in a kindergarten classroom. Candidates for Elementary certification must complete field experiences at three (3) levels: in grades PK-K, 1-3, and 4-5. Candidates for Middle Grades certification must complete field

experiences at two (2) levels: in grades 4-5 and 6-8. Candidates for P-12 certification must complete field experiences at four (4) levels: in grades PK-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Candidates for certification in secondary (6-12) fields must complete field experiences at two (2) levels: in grades 6-8 and 9-12.

EPPs must ensure that educators are able to demonstrate an understanding of how to teach the content at all levels. A document that states that all grade bands were addressed is not required; however, sufficient field experience to demonstrate competence at all levels will be required. (P-12 endorsements-Reading, ESOL, will have various strategies across all grade levels.)

**Possible Sources of Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- A description of the grade band requirements (e.g., Teacher Education Handbook).
- A tracking system for documenting when individual candidates complete each grade band requirement.
- Specific grade bands are not required for endorsements. However, candidates must have substantive opportunities to demonstrate key endorsement teacher practices in carefully planned and scaffolded experiences in fieldwork across as many settings as necessary to demonstrate understanding of the developmental levels of all students.

### 6.5.3: Clinical Practice (N/A Endorsements)

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 and in the grade level(s) and/or field(s) of certification sought. GaPSC preparation program rules may require additional clinical practice (see Rules 505-3-.13 through 505-3-.112).

**Possible Sources of Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- A description of the expectations for clinical practice (e.g., in Teacher Education Handbook).
- Documentation of number of hours candidates complete during the clinical practice experience.
- Criteria for schools in which clinical practice candidates are placed.

**6.6: Preparation for the Teaching of Reading, Literacy, and Language (NA/Endorsements)**

GaPSC-approved EPPs offering programs leading to initial certification in a Teaching (T) field shall ensure candidates meet the applicable content and pedagogical standards delineated in GaPSC Rule 505-3-.03, Foundations of Reading, Literacy, and Language.

### 6.6.1 Program of Study/Curriculum

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure candidates complete a well-articulated sequence of courses and/or experiences to address the knowledge and skills associated with the teaching of reading, as specified for all applicable programs in Rule 505-3-.03, Foundations of Reading, Literacy, and Language. EPPs are expected to provide evidence that the standards delineated in Rule 505-3-.03 are being met in coursework and, as applicable, in field and clinical experiences.

**Required Evidence**

- Program of Study: a well-developed curriculum that requires a candidate to demonstrate competency in the specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions described in Rule 505-3-.03. A series of courses, seminars, modules, online training, or other educational programs designed to prepare candidates in the foundations of reading, literacy, and language.

**Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Standards Alignment Chart
- Curriculum Map showing scope of program
- Literacy course syllabi that include texts, assignments, assessments, materials
- Lists of Materials Used
- Selected Curriculum Modules or Presentations

### 6.6.2 Candidate Assessments

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure that in all applicable programs, assessment data from coursework, and field and clinical experiences, as applicable, demonstrate candidates' acquisition of the knowledge and skills delineated in Rule 505-3-.03, Foundations of Reading, Literacy, and Language.

**Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Key Assessments or Program Assessments that address standards
- Disaggregated data from GACE Literacy Assessments appropriate for each program
- Course Assignments aligned with standards
  - Exams, quizzes, essays, lesson plans, unit plans, case studies
  - Assessments from modules or other external resources
- EPPs may add narrative with descriptions or data from *supplemental assessments as desired.*

**6.6.3 Knowledge of Dyslexia (N/A Endorsements)**

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall require candidates seeking teacher certification to demonstrate knowledge of the definitions and characteristics of dyslexia and other related disorders; competence in the use of evidence-based instruction, structured multisensory approaches to teaching language and reading skills, and accommodations for students displaying characteristics of dyslexia and/or other related disorders; and competence in the use of a multi-tiered systems of support framework addressing reading, writing, mathematics, and behavior, including: (i) Universal screening; (ii) Scientific, research-based interventions; (iii) Progress monitoring of the effectiveness of interventions on student performance; (iv) Data-based decision making procedures related to determining intervention effectiveness on student performance and the need to continue, alter, or discontinue interventions or conduct further evaluation of student needs; and (v) Application and implementation of response-to-intervention and dyslexia and other related disorders instructional practices in the classroom setting.

**Possible Sources of Evidence**

- Courses/seminars with syllabi demonstrating exposure to topics listed.
- Embedded in the Exceptional Child Course or another course.

- Embedded throughout reading courses.
- Online modules.
- Evidence from coursework/modules (e.g., course assignments, assessments) that demonstrates candidates have obtained the required knowledge.

## 6.6.4 Faculty Resources

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure that faculty have the knowledge and skills necessary to address the standards delineated in Rule 505-3-.03, Foundations of Reading, Literacy, and Language.

## Possible Sources of Evidence

- Evidence that reading instructors have sufficient knowledge to teach scientifically based reading instruction.

- Additional professional learning for current faculty not knowledgeable in the science of reading.

- Ongoing opportunities for faculty training and professional learning.

- Possible Artifacts:

  - Learning modules from other organizations (LETRS, Cox Campus, Sandra Dunagan Deal Center for Early Language and Literacy, Reading Rockets, etc.)

  - Professional learning experiences

  - Book club discussion summaries

  - P-12 Partnership literacy experiences

  - Documentation of external training (certificates, transcripts, etc.)

  - Literacy consortium or advisory group meeting minutes

## Component 6.7: Educational Leadership Requirements

### 6.7.1: Tier I

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure that Tier I Educational Leadership programs address all requirements for Tier I programs specified in Rule 505-3-.76 or 505-3-.77.

#### 6.7.1.1: Program Admission

EPPs shall determine admission requirements for Tier I entry-level preparation programs in addition to the minimum requirements established in Rule 505-3-.76 or 505-3-.77.

#### 6.7.1.2: Partnerships

A partnership agreement shall be established with LUAs, agencies, or other organizations for the purposes of collaboratively ensuring program curricula and clinical experiences address LUA leadership preparation needs, and for continuously examining program effectiveness. Such partnerships shall permit candidate self-selection for traditional Tier I programs provided the partner LUA has the capacity to mentor the candidate and the candidate meets program admission criteria. A regular and systematic plan agreeable to partner LUAs and the EPP shall be established for updating partnership agreements to ensure continuous improvement of the preparation program.

#### 6.7.1.3: Candidate Support

At a minimum, Tier I candidates shall receive mentoring by a leader who is actively employed in a leadership position in the P-12 school or LUA where the candidate is employed and who has been trained on leader mentoring. In addition, candidates shall receive EPP support through group coaching or other means whereby candidates have opportunities to interact with program staff and other candidates for reflection, feedback, and support related to their performances in the field.

#### 6.7.1.4: Clinical Practice

Tier I Clinical Practice shall include the designated minimum time requirements (250 clock hours for Ed Leadership or half-day for a full 12-month cycle for Alt Leadership) in addition to performances required in courses and shall consist of significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge, and practice and develop the skills identified in the standards through field experiences cooperatively developed by the candidate, mentor, and EPP advisor. Field experiences shall engage candidates in substantial, standards-based work in various settings. In Tier I programs candidates shall, at a minimum, observe leaders at all levels—elementary, middle, high school, and central office.

| Possible Sources of Evidence |
| --- |
| • Evidence that the partnerships between the EPP and the local school districts where educational leadership candidates complete clinical experiences are of sufficient depth such that candidates have opportunities to obtain the experiences needed to become effective school/district leaders.<br>• Evidence that clinical experience performances are planned cooperatively by the candidate support team, to include input from the employing school or district.<br>• Evidence that candidates complete a minimum of 250 hours of clinical experiences.<br>• Evidence that the types of clinical experiences are appropriate for all of the standards and elements to be addressed.<br>• Key assessments are aligned to the standards and elements, and data demonstrate that candidates are prepared to lead schools.<br>• Evidence that mentors and coaches are trained to provide leader candidates with meaningful and actionable feedback on their clinical experience performances.<br>• Evidence that leader candidate support teams work together to meet the individual learning needs of candidates.<br>• Evidence that the EPP engages P-12 partners in regularly assessing the effectiveness of the program. |

## 6.7.2: Tier II

GaPSC-approved EPPs shall ensure that Tier II Educational Leadership programs address all requirements for Tier II programs specified in Rule 505-3-.76 or 505-3-.77.

### 6.7.2.1: Program Admission

EPPs shall require potential candidates to: (i) Hold Tier I entry level certification or hold a Tier II certificate if that certificate is based on completion of an Educational Leadership program that led to a Georgia L or PL certificate; (ii) Serve in a leadership position at either the P-12 school or LUA level (or agency or organization equivalent to LUA level) that will enable the candidate to fully meet the program's clinical requirements. Candidates in traditional preparation programs who do not serve in a leadership position may be enrolled if the EPP and employer establish a formal, written agreement specifying the candidate will be released from other responsibilities for two full days per week or the equivalent to allow the candidate sufficient time to participate in and successfully complete clinical work. Employees of state education or human service agencies, RESAs, universities or technical colleges, and employees of education or human service non-profit organizations may also pursue Tier II Educational Leadership certification as long as the employer has established a partnership with a GaPSC-approved EPP and in the partnership agreement agrees to meet all requirements and guidelines

accompanying Rules 505-3-.76 and 505-3-.77; and (iii) Meet program admission criteria, and admission criteria specified by the EPP and in the partnership agreements with employers of potential candidates.

*6.7.2.2: Partnerships*

A partnership agreement shall be established with the employing LUA, agency, or organization of each candidate for the purpose of ensuring candidates will be able to meet Tier II level clinical requirements. Partnership agreements: (i) Shall be developed collaboratively by the LUA, agency, or organization and the program provider; (ii) Shall establish mutually agreed upon responsibilities; and (iii) Shall be regularly and systematically updated to ensure continuous improvement of the preparation program and its partnerships.

*6.7.2.3: Candidate Support*

The clinical work of each Tier II candidate shall be supervised by a candidate support team. At a minimum, the candidate support team shall be composed of the candidate, a trained and qualified leadership coach, a trained P-12 school or LUA mentor, and an EPP representative. (The leadership coach may serve as both the coach and the EPP representative provided the coach is employed by the EPP.)

*6.7.2.4: Clinical Practice – Residency*

Tier II programs shall be performance-based, and as such, shall be designed around leadership performances. Courses shall be designed to support performances. Candidates in Tier II preparation programs shall participate in performance-based experiences in courses as well as during an extended residency consisting of 750 clock hours of extended, job-embedded residency work. In non-traditional Alternative Preparation for Leadership programs, the extended residency shall be job embedded, as candidates must be employed in a leadership position for at least a half day every day for a minimum of a 12-month cycle. This work provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge, and practice and develop the skills identified in the standards through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings in real time (actual P-12 school and LUA settings or similar settings for candidates employed in agencies or organizations not classified as P-12 schools or LUAs). Such a residency shall be planned and guided cooperatively by the EPP and LUA or employer through candidate support teams that develop and manage individual induction plans for each candidate.

## Possible Sources of Evidence

- Evidence that the candidates are employed in positions of leadership prior to enrollment, or a stipulated partnership agreement describes allowances for those who are not in those positions.

- Evidence that the partnerships between the EPP and the local school districts where educational leadership candidates complete clinical experiences are of sufficient depth such that candidates have opportunities to obtain the experiences needed to become effective school/district leaders.
- Evidence that clinical experience performances are planned cooperatively by the candidate support team, to include input from the employing school or district.
- Evidence that candidates complete a minimum of 750 hours of clinical experiences.
- Evidence that the types of clinical experiences are appropriate for all of the standards and elements to be addressed.
- Key assessments are aligned to the standards and elements, and data demonstrate that candidates are prepared to lead schools.
- Evidence that mentors and coaches are trained to provide leader candidates with meaningful and actionable feedback on their clinical experience performances.
- Evidence that leader candidate support teams work together to meet the individual learning needs of candidates.
- Evidence that the EPP engages P-12 partners in regularly assessing the effectiveness of the program.

| **Component 6.8: Content Coursework Requirements for Service Programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Technology,** |
|---|
| **6.8.1: Master's Degree Requirements** |
| Curriculum and Instruction programs resulting in a Master's degree shall require a minimum of six (6) 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. For degree-granting Instructional Technology programs, the required number of semester hours in the specific content field is six (6). For degree-granting Teacher Leadership programs, the required number of semester hours in the specific content field is six (6). Candidates enrolled in certificate-only (non-degree) programs are not required to complete the content/content pedagogy requirement. All content 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 semester hours may be satisfied through a thesis directly focused on the content of a certificate field held by the educator. |
| **6.8.2: Specialist and Doctoral Degree Requirements** |
| Curriculum and Instruction programs resulting in Specialist or Doctoral degrees shall require a minimum of six (6) 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. For degree-granting Instructional Technology programs, the required number of semester hours in the specific content field is six (6). For degree-granting Teacher Leadership programs, the required number of semester hours in the specific content field is six (6). Candidates enrolled in certificate-only (non-degree) programs are not required to complete the content/content pedagogy requirement. All content 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. |
| **Possible Sources of Evidence** |
| • Programs of study demonstrating the required number of content hours.<br>• Aligned curriculum crosswalks. |

| Component 6.9: Embedded Endorsements |
|---|
| Embedded endorsements are defined as endorsements that are offered as a part of the program of study for an initial preparation program. EPPs offering initial preparation programs with embedded endorsements must demonstrate that field experience requirements are met, requiring candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skills in classroom settings. Candidates completing an embedded endorsement program will be required to complete additional field experiences (above and beyond those required for the initial preparation program) specifically to address endorsement standards and requirements, and/or any additional grade levels addressed by the endorsement program. Although field experiences in specific grade levels are not required for endorsement programs, candidates must have substantive opportunities to demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in endorsement standards in carefully planned and scaffolded experiences in fieldwork in as many settings as necessary to demonstrate competence with children at all developmental levels applicable for the endorsement program. <br><br>**In addition, EPPs must ensure that one of the following options is included in each embedded endorsement:** <br> 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). To fully address the additional knowledge and skills delineated in endorsement standards, it may be necessary to add endorsement courses to a program of study. <br> b. Option 2: Additional Assessments(s). Candidates' demonstration of endorsement program knowledge and skills must be assessed by either the initial preparation or advanced/degree-only program assessments or via additional assessment instruments specifically designed to address endorsement program content. |

**Required Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Description of additional field experiences for the embedded endorsement that go beyond the requirements for the initial teaching program.

**One of the following is also required:**
- Program of study indicating coursework for the embedded endorsement which goes beyond the coursework required for the initial teaching program.
- Evidence of additional assessments for the endorsement that are beyond the assessments required for the initial teaching program.

| Component 6.10: Faculty Resources |
|---|
| Through scholarship or experience, the EPP has professional education faculty that qualifies them for their assignments. The EPP provides adequate resources and opportunities for professional development of faculty, including training in the use of technology and online delivery of courses.<br><br>*Essential Question: How do we know that the EPP's faculty have the knowledge and skills that qualify them for their assignments (e.g., teaching, evaluating, and supervising)? How do we know that the EPP provides opportunities for professional development for faculty, including training in the use of technology?* |
| **Possible Sources of Evidence** |
| <ul><li>Chart with faculty credentials (e.g., number of years of experience in a P-12 setting, degrees, additional training).</li><li>Review program-specific rule requirements for clinical practice supervision.</li><li>Description of training for faculty (e.g., technology usage, pedagogy professional learning, training on current standards).</li><li>Vitae for each faculty member.</li></ul> |

# Service/Leader Standards

The following guidance is provided for all service and leader fields in Georgia: Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Technology, Media Specialist, School Counselor, School Nutrition, School Psychologist, Speech and Language Pathology, Teacher Leadership, and Educational Leadership Tier I and Tier II. In addition, there are five service endorsements: Coaching Endorsement, Teacher Support and Coaching Endorsement, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Facilitator Endorsement, Teacher Leader Endorsement, and Work-based Learning Endorsement.

## Service/Leader Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates for professional specialties develop an understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and facilitates candidates' reflection to increase their understanding and implementation of research-based practices. The provider is intentional in the development of their curriculum and clinical experiences for candidates to demonstrate their ability to work effectively with other educators, all P-12 students, and their families.

| Service/Leader Component 1.1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions |
|---|
| Candidates in service and leader preparation programs 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:<br>• Applications of data literacy;<br>• Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed methods research methodologies;<br>• Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;<br>• Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;<br>• Supporting appropriate applications of technology for their field of specialization; and<br>• Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics, and professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization. |

## Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence that service/leader candidates:
- Can identify the different types of data that exist, evaluate the appropriateness and sufficiency of the data, and analyze and synthesize data into meaningful forms that guide decision making.
- Identify problems and employ one or more research methodologies to develop solutions or understandings.
- Use research and data to improve teaching and learning.
- Demonstrate application of professional standards of practice, relevant laws, and policies and codes of ethics.

## Guiding Questions

- How does each specialty program address each of the six identified proficiencies within their program?
- Of the six addressed, how does each specialty program assess the three most applicable to their specialized field, as determined by the provider?
- How does the EPP know candidates have developed proficiencies expected of professionals in their specialized field?
- How does the EPP know candidates are able to apply their skills effectively to enhance learning and development opportunities for all P-12 students?

## Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Most service/leader program candidates perform adequately or better on at least three of the six generic knowledge and skill abilities that are most relevant for the professional specialty field.
- Evidence contains more than "coverage of skills" in course materials—it demonstrates candidate performance on generic advanced level skill areas.
- Disaggregated data by preparation program show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence should include data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence:*

- o Course assignments or tasks, including problem-based projects/group projects
- o GACE assessment scores
- o Professional portfolio/Tasks in field of specialization
- o Synthesis and interpretation of research relevant to a specialty specific problem
- o Action research project, thesis, or dissertation
- o Number of completers who have won awards from specialized area organizations (e.g., AERA, APA, NAESP, NASSP, ASCD)

## Service/Leader Component 1.2: Provider Responsibilities

Providers ensure that service and leader program candidates have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. Evidence of candidate content knowledge appropriate for the professional specialty should be documented.

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence of candidate understanding and application of:
- Central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of discipline specific to content.
- Accessible and meaningful learning experiences to ensure mastery of content.
- Content-specific pedagogy (e.g., connecting concepts, using differing perspectives, engaging learners in critical thinking, creativity and collaborative problem solving; encouraging learner exploration, discovery, and expression across content areas).
- Content knowledge (e.g., intentional design and implementation of curriculum, awareness of content knowledge from multiple perspectives, promoting critical analysis, examining authentic issues).

### Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP know candidates know the specialized content of their field?
- How does the EPP know candidates are able to apply their specialized knowledge effectively in education settings?
- What evidence does the EPP have that candidates in service and leader fields are able to work effectively with all students and colleagues to create effective learning environments for all P-12 students?

### Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Demonstrate a majority of candidates in service and leader fields understand critical concepts and principles for their specialized field of study in the following ways:
  - High level of proficiency on key assessments.
  - Disaggregated data by preparation program show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
  - Evidence should include data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.

- o Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Key assessment data, including EPP-created assessments.
- o Proprietary measures (e.g., GACE content assessment).

## 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.

| Service/Leader Component 2.1: Partnerships for Clinical Preparation |
|---|
| Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of service and leader candidate preparation. |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence of:<br>• Establishing and maintaining partnerships with schools and school districts, as well as other appropriate organizations.<br>• P-12 schools and/or community partners and EPPs have mutually beneficial partnerships.<br>• All partners as active participants in the on-going, collaborative process to improve candidate preparation (co-construction). |
| **Guiding Questions** |
| • How does the EPP document partnerships?<br>• How are partnerships mutually beneficial?<br>• How does the EPP ensure all partners are involved - or have the opportunity to be involved - in the development, maintenance, and modification of the partnership? In other words, how does the EPP ensure partnerships are co-constructed?<br>• How does the EPP engage P-12 partners in an on-going collaborative process? |
| **Quality Evidence** |
| • The provider presents evidence that a collaborative process is in place with P-12 partners that is reviewed periodically and involves activities such as:<br>   o Collaborative development, review, or revision of instruments and evaluations.<br>   o Collaborative development, review, or revision of the structure and content of the clinical activities.<br>   o Mutual involvement in ongoing decision-making about partnership structure and operations. |

- Agreed upon provisions to ensure a variety of clinical settings.
- Creation of opportunities for candidates to work with P-12 students who have differing needs.
- The EPP provides evidence that the P-12 schools and EPPs have both benefited from the partnership.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- 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.
- Documentation of collaboration (meeting decisions, agenda topics).
- MOUs.
- Advisory Board Membership.

## Service/Leader Component 2.2: Clinical Experiences

The provider works with partners to design varied and developmental clinical experiences that allow opportunities for candidates to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that the courses and other experiences of the service/leader preparation program 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 Service/Leader Component 1.1.

### Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence:
- Clinical experiences are designed by both the provider and its partners and are varied and developmental in nature.
- Candidates have opportunities to practice applications of content knowledge and skills that their preparation emphasizes.
- Candidates engage in a culminating experience to demonstrate the proficiencies identified in S/L 1.1.
- Candidates engage in problem-based tasks or research that are characteristic of their professional specialization.

### Guiding Questions

- What opportunities have candidates had to prepare in various settings and to work in their specialized field of study?
- What features of clinical experiences allow candidates to demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research?
- How has the EPP studied clinical experience data to improve candidate outcomes?
- What clinical experiences have enhanced completers' understanding of current educational issues and their readiness to use that understanding in employment situations?
- How are clinical experiences effective in preparing candidates for the chosen proficiencies in S/L 1.1?

### Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence describes the role of clinical practice in the service/leader program, including campus-based and field-based activities that involve practical applications of knowledge and skills appropriate for the specialty field.
- Evidence shows that the EPP and its partners ensure service and leader clinical experiences are planned, purposeful, and sequential.
- Evidence shows that clinical experiences are designed to help candidates grow and develop in the practice of the knowledge

and skills that make up the service/leader preparation program; and are assessed with performance-based protocols.

- Evidence shows that candidates engage in a culminating experience and are able to demonstrate their proficiencies through problem-based tasks or research that are characteristic of their professional specialization.
- Disaggregated data by preparation program show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence includes data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Artifacts or completed assignments that are reflective of on-the-job tasks for the specialized field.
- o Candidate evaluation of their preparatory activities for clinical practice.

## Service/Leader Standard 3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

The provider demonstrates that the quality of service and leader program candidates is an ongoing and intentional focus so that completers are prepared to perform effectively and are eligible for certification.

| Service/Leader Component 3.1: Recruitment |
|---|
| The provider presents goals and progress evidence for recruitment of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and populations that align with their mission. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields. The goals and evidence should address progress towards a candidate pool which reflects the population of America's P-12 students. |
| **Key Concepts** |
| The provider presents evidence of:<br>• Goals towards admitting high-quality service/leader candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and populations.<br>• Routinely monitoring the employment landscape to identify shortage areas, openings, and related information in the community, state, regional, or national markets for which it is preparing completers.<br>• Recording, monitoring, and using recruitment results to plan and, as appropriate, modify recruitment strategies and goals.<br>• Descriptions of strategies and actions in place to achieve the EPP's goals together with periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of those strategies.<br>• Recruitment results disaggregated by demographic groups and provides an analysis of the EPP's findings. |
| **Guiding Questions** |
| • How does the EPP engage in recruitment efforts to recruit a strong pool of candidates?<br>• How do recruitment strategies respond to and serve employer needs?<br>• How does the EPP determine the success of recruitment efforts?<br>• How are recruitment efforts supported as evidence-informed, meaningful, and feasible given the context of the EPP?<br>• How do the recruitment strategies and actions meet the needs of employers for which the EPP prepares candidates?<br>• How do the recruitment strategies and actions align with the mission of the EPP?<br>• How have recruitment strategies and actions and their implementation moved the EPP toward meeting its goal of |

| strengthening the pipeline? |
|---|
| **Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results) |
| <ul><li>Evidence documents the EPP regularly examines the employment landscape in order to identify shortage areas, openings, and related information in the community, state, regional, or national market for completers.</li><li>Evidence is disaggregated on applicants, those admitted, and enrolled candidates by a broad range of backgrounds and populations that align with the EPP mission.</li><li>Evidence documents baseline points and longitudinal data on current measures of academic achievement.</li><li>Evidence documents measurable target outcomes and timeline for achievement.</li><li>Evidence documents that the EPP monitors annual progress toward admission goals and fields where there are employment opportunities.</li><li>Data are disaggregated to describe demographic information, including gender, ethnicity, academic achievement, and/or candidate fit for high-need areas or communities, and trends are analyzed.</li><li>Evidence documents that admissions data are disaggregated for enrolled candidates by relevant demographics, branch campuses, and individual programs.</li><li>Evidence documents strategies and actions specifically for the EPP and its programs. While this can be part of an institution recruitment strategy, the evidence must document recruitment for specific EPP programs and the EPP's input opportunities to the institutional goals.</li><li>Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.</li></ul> *Possible Sources of Evidence* <ul><li>Basic descriptive information such as baseline points and numerical goals.</li><li>Results from annual monitoring of characteristics related to academic achievement, as well as employment needs.</li><li>Results of EPP's monitoring of progress towards goals.</li><li>EPP's interpretation of its progress and revising goals, as needed.</li></ul> |

**Service/Leader Component 3.2: Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully**

The provider sets admissions requirements for academic achievement. These include GaPSC's minimum criteria described in EDUCATOR PREPARATION RULE 505-3-.01 (passing the Georgia Educator Ethics Assessment), or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest. The provider gathers data to monitor candidates from admission to completion.

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents:
- Descriptions of its criteria used to ensure that candidates are likely to complete preparation successfully, together with its analysis of the efficacy of the criteria used.

**Guiding Questions**

- How does the EPP define cohorts?
- If the EPP uses GPA to demonstrate academic achievement, when is GPA measured?
- Does the EPP have additional admission requirements for academic achievement? If so, please describe them and explain how the EPP uses that data in admission decisions.

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence of disaggregated results by cohort.
- Evidence demonstrates support for candidates admitted using the Limited Flexibility Exemption.
- Disaggregated data by preparation program, and other demographic items highlighted in S/L 3.1 show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- Program admission requirements.
- Enrolled candidates' admission data.

| Service/Leader Component 3.3: Monitoring and Supporting Candidate Progression |
|---|
| The provider creates criteria for program progression and uses disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. The provider ensures that knowledge of and progression through transition points are transparent to candidates. The provider plans and documents the need for candidate support, as identified in disaggregated data by gender, race, and ethnicity and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission, so candidates meet milestones. The provider has a system for effectively maintaining records of candidate complaints, including complaints made to GaPSC, and documents the resolution. |

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence of:
1. Support for candidates who are at risk with the intent to provide support towards their successful program completion.
2. Criteria for program progression by way of transition points from admission through completion.
3. Monitoring progression from admission through completion, including attention to how candidates develop in their specialized field.
4. Transition points and related criteria are shared with candidates.
5. Using disaggregated demographic data to advise and support candidates who may not progress.
6. A system for tracking and resolving candidate complaints/appeals.

**Guiding Questions**

- How does the EPP monitor candidate progress through transitions points in the program?
- How does the EPP communicate with candidates the criteria required for each transition point?
- How does the EPP collect and respond to complaints/appeals?
- How does the EPP demonstrate the transition point process is followed with fidelity within the EPP (e.g., how does the EPP ensure there are no loopholes to work around the system)?
- Identify and describe the support mechanisms for candidates not meeting program expectations (e.g., advising, remediation, or mentoring) that are available. How do recommendations occur?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence documents performance reviews, remediation efforts, and/or provisions illustrating that the EPP sets goals for candidate support and monitors progress towards goals of providing sufficient support to candidates to facilitate successful program completion.
- Disaggregated data by preparation program, race/ethnicity, and other demographic items highlighted in S/L 1.1 show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence should include data and subsequent analyses of any transition point assessment and results.
- Evidence that actions are taken when there are problems with the progression of individual candidates.
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- Crosswalk/curriculum with transition points that includes where six skills from S/L 1.1 are addressed and assessed.
- Assessments used at key points during the program, including data and analyses.
- Documentation of complaints/appeals (no identifying names) and demographics of those submitting complaints/appeals.

| Service/Leader Component 3.4: Competency at Completion |
|---|
| The provider ensures candidates demonstrate expected levels of content knowledge to help facilitate learning with positive impacts on all P-12 student learning and development through the application of content knowledge, data literacy and research-informed decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, application of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization. Multiple measures are provided and data are disaggregated and analyzed based on race, ethnicity, and such other categories as may be relevant for the EPP's mission. |

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence of:
- Using disaggregated data to verify candidate quality at completion for the specific field of specialization.
- Candidates reaching a high standard in the following areas:
  - Content knowledge.
  - Data literacy.
  - Research-driven decision making.
  - Effective use of collaborative skills.
  - Applications of technology.
  - Applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards.
- Illustrating proficiency at completion in the areas identified.

**Guiding Questions**

- How does the EPP support candidates who may not meet the expected level of proficiency in each of the areas by completion?
- How does the EPP disaggregate the completion data, and what has been learned from analysis across demographic groups?
- How does the EPP use multiple sources of evidence to triangulate that candidates are prepared for certification at completion?
- What evidence does the EPP use to ensure that by the end of the program, a candidate is ready to move into the specialized field?

| **Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results) |
|---|
| <ul><li>Disaggregated data by program, and other demographic items highlighted in S/L 3.1 show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.</li><li>Evidence that actions are taken when there are problems with the progression of individual candidates.</li><li>Evidence is triangulated so that there is more than one source that demonstrates candidates are proficient in the areas identified. Evidence includes data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.</li><li>Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.</li><li>Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.</li></ul>*Possible Sources of Evidence*<br><ul><li>EPP-created measures, including dispositions or non-academic assessments.</li><li>GACE Content Assessment</li></ul> |

# Service/Leader Standard 4: Satisfaction with Preparation

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

| Service/Leader Component 4.1: Satisfaction of Employers |
|---|
| The provider demonstrates that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities. |

**Key Concepts**

The provider presents evidence:
- From employers that completers' preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Of data from a representative sample of employers.
- That employers are satisfied with completers' preparation to work with P-12 students and their families.

**Guiding Questions**

- How does the EPP measure satisfaction with preparation as viewed by employers?
- How does the EPP ensure a representative sample inclusive of most certification fields or a purposive sample to be enlarged over time?
- How does the EPP ensure instruments/methods elicit responses specific to the criteria in Standard 1 (e.g., data literacy, use of research methodologies, employment of data analysis, collaboration, technology, professional dispositions)?

**Quality Evidence** (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Evidence should include data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.
- Evidence should demonstrate a representative sample (in one cycle of data or over multiple cycles of data).
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*

- o Employer satisfaction surveys.
- o Focus groups or interviews with detailed methodology.

| Service/Leader Component 4.2: Satisfaction of Completers |
|---|

The provider demonstrates that service and leader program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they encounter on the job, and their preparation was effective.

## Key Concepts

The provider presents evidence:
- From completers that their preparation was sufficient for their job responsibilities.
- Of data from a representative sample of completers.
- Completers are satisfied with their preparation to work with P-12 students and their families.

## Guiding Questions

- How does the EPP measure satisfaction with preparation as viewed by completers?
- How does the EPP ensure instruments/methods elicit responses specific to the criteria in Standard 1 (e.g., data literacy, use of research methodologies, employment of data analysis, collaboration, technology, professional dispositions).
- How does the EPP ensure all programs are included within data cycles?

## Quality Evidence (includes three cycles of evidence/data and subsequent analyses of the results)

- Disaggregated data by program and other demographic items show no or few disparities, or disparities are identified and explained, including steps to remedy them.
- Evidence should include data and subsequent analyses of the assessment results.
- Evidence should demonstrate a representative sample (in one cycle of data or over multiple cycles of data).
- Key EPP-created assessments have demonstrated validity and reliability, and EPP-created surveys have demonstrated content validity.
- Evidence that most compellingly demonstrates the EPP's case, including what was learned from the evidence and what conclusions and interpretations have been made.

*Possible Sources of Evidence*
- Completer/Alumni Satisfaction surveys.
- Focus groups or interviews with detailed methodology.

# Appendix A
## Summary of Guidance Document Version Updates

**Version 6.6-Published January 16, 2026**

Minimal edits were made to increase clarity of guidance and to remove redundancy.

**Version 6.5-Published April 2, 2025**

The revisions in the version are related to the following:

1. Addition of language in Standard 1.1 to include GACE Literacy Assessments in addition to GACE Content Assessments
2. Addition of language in Standard 6.6.2 to include disaggregated GACE literacy assessments by program

**Version 6.4-Published January 16, 2025**

The revisions in the version are related to the following:

3. Addition of language in Standard 1.4 to include concepts related to TAPS Standard 10: Communication
4. Addition of categories in Standards 3.2 and 3.3 that refer to disaggregated data.

**Version 6.3 – Published August 16, 2024**

The revisions in the version are related to the following:

5. Addition of language to clarify requirements for non-traditional Alternative Preparation for Educational Leadership programs related to job embedded clinical practice.
6. Streamlining guidance related to quality evidence that is repetitive and redundant.

**Version 6.2 – Published March 25, 2024**

The revisions in this version are related to the following:

1. Removal of references to "race/ethnicity" in standards and elements where those designations are not present in the wording of the standard.

**Version 6.1 – Published February 22, 2024**

The revisions in this version are related to the following:

1. Removal of the guidance from Service/Leader Standards that states *these standards apply to those endorsements, as well,* referencing the service/leader standards applicable to all five service endorsements listed: Coaching Endorsement, Teacher Support and Coaching Endorsement, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Facilitator Endorsement, Teacher Leader Endorsement, and Work-based Learning Endorsement. The EPP should consult with the assigned Education Specialist for guidance on the applicable component(s) for these service/leader endorsements.

**Version 6 – Published January 10, 2024**

The revisions in this version are related to the following:

1. Addition of the focus on literacy aligned to Rule 505-3-.03, Foundations of Reading, Literacy, and Language.

2. Addition of Component 6.6: Preparation for the Teaching of Reading, Literacy, and Language and subcomponents related to Program of Study, Candidate Assessments, Knowledge of Dyslexia, and Faculty Resources.

3. Addition of Required Evidence in Component 6.6 for Program of Study and Candidate Assessments.

4. Addition of guidance for analyzing key assessment data, and the alignment of key assessments to TAPS Standards (Big Buckets) for Standards 1.1 to 1.4.

5. Addition of guidance for signature assessments as supplemental sources.

**Version 5 – Published July 7, 2023**

The revision in this version is a note added to Standard 4 allowing the use of *candidate* data for employed candidates for GaPSC reviews.

**Version 4 – Published May 18, 2023**

The revisions in this version are related to the following:

1. Revision of alignment in Standard 1 from InTASC Standards to TAPS Standards (pages 6-14)

2. Addition of the reading focus to be aligned with the "science of reading" (page 45)

**Version 3 – Published September 1, 2022**

The revisions in this version are related to the following:

1. Removal of required minimum 2.5 GPA at admission and Program Admission Assessment (page 36)
2. Additional sentence to address the foundations of reading (page 44)

**Version 2 – Published February 23, 2022**

The revisions in this version are related to the following:

1. Review Expectations of Endorsement-only Providers (page 5)
2. Clarification of reviews of embedded endorsement requirements (page 50)

**Version 1 – Published January 31, 2022**