

**Program Report for the
Initial Preparation of Middle Level Educators
National Middle School Association (NMSA)**

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

C O V E R S H E E T

Institution: The University of Georgia

State: GA

Date submitted: 9-15-05

Name of Preparers: Gayle Andrews and Denise Muth Glynn

Phone #: 706-542-4244 **Email:** gandrews@uga.edu

Program documented in this report:

Name of institution's program: Middle School Education

Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared: Grades 4-8

Degree or award level¹ Bachelor of Science in Education

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes No

List the sites at which the program is offered _____

Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

*Middle School Education

Program report status:

Initial review

Rejoinder

Response to national recognition with conditions

State licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

Yes **No**

¹ This will be a dropdown list of possible degrees/awards that could be selected; multiple selections can be made.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The following directions are designed to assist institutions as they complete this web-based program report. To complete the report, institutions must provide data from 6-8 key assessments related to SPA standards to answer the following questions:

- Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the subjects they will teach or the jobs they will perform?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
- Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they plan their teaching?
- Can candidates apply their knowledge in classrooms and schools?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

- I. Contextual Information** – provides the opportunity for institutions to present general information to help reviewers understand the program
- II. Assessments and Related Data** - provides the opportunity for institutions to submit 6-8 assessments, scoring guides or criteria, and assessment data as evidence that standards are being met.
- III. Standards Assessment Chart** - provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine if candidates meet program standards.
- IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards** – provides the opportunity for institutions to discuss the assessments and assessment data in terms of standards
- V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty is using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and effects on student learning.

Page limits are specified for each of the narrative responses required in Sections IV and V of the report, with each page approximately equivalent to one text page of single-spaced, 12-point type. Each attachment required in Sections I and II of the report should be kept to a maximum of five text pages. Although attachments longer than five pages will be accepted electronically, NCATE staff will require institutions to revise reports submitted with lengthy attachments.

Except for the required attachments, institutional responses can be entered directly onto the web-based form or written in a standardized word processing format (e.g., Word or Word Perfect) and later cut and pasted into the web-based form. The respondent will be able to save the responses as a draft and return to the web-based form later to complete. When the report has been completed, the institution will mark it as finished and submit it for review. Specific directions are included at the beginning of each section.

SECTION I—CONTEXT

Provide the following contextual information:

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of SPA standards.

The state of Georgia offers middle grades certification for grades 4-8 such that program completers focus on two areas of specialization chosen from among four content areas: language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Program completers must comply with the ethical standards of the profession and successfully complete coursework in special education, instructional technology, educational psychology, educational foundations, the teaching of reading and writing, middle school education, and two areas of specialization.

The middle school education program at the University of Georgia is administered by the College of Education. The program is housed in the Department of Elementary and Social Studies Education and is supported by other departments inside and outside of the college (e.g., Departments of Language and Literacy Education, Mathematics and Science Education, Special Education, English, Geology, History, Mathematics, Chemistry). Fifty candidates are admitted to the program every fall semester.

The professional sequence of teacher education coursework is 2 years in length and follows the 2 years of core coursework mandated by the Board of Regents. Figures 1-4 are the advisement sheets (program of study) for the 12 combinations of areas of specialization for the candidates in the program. Table C-1 indicates the relation between coursework and program standards (i.e., the Middle School Education standards of the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and the National Middle School Association). To be certified by the state of Georgia, program completers must also pass the PRAXIS II exam in relevant content areas. Table C-2 indicates the relation between coursework and topics in the Praxis II examinations for middle school education certification (grades 4-8) in Georgia.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships.

Middle school education program completers engage in a minimum of 800 hours of field and clinical experiences; beginning fall semester 2006, the number of hours in field experiences will increase to a minimum of 835. Table C-3 (EDMS Field Experiences-Initial) summarizes the field and clinical experiences required; these experiences are described below.

Prior to admission to the middle school program, applicants complete a minimum of 100 hours of documented preprofessional experience. Program applicants must engage in at least two different experiences; approximately half of the required 100 hours must be in an instructional setting where young adolescents (ages 10-15) are present, and one experience must be in a diverse setting with learners whose backgrounds differ from the applicant's own, such as geographic location (e.g., rural, urban); cultures (e.g., Hispanic, southern, northern); and/or race, ethnicity, and language. For detailed information about the preprofessional experience, please see <http://www.coe.uga.edu/esse/middleschool/earlyexp/>

In Educational Psychology (EPSY) 2020/2020L, teacher candidates engage in a community outreach project, ranging from 10-30 hours, with children in educational settings. Candidates present their outreach projects through a paper, making connections between their experiences and the ideas presented in class. For detailed information about the community outreach project, please see the EPSY 2020/2020L syllabus at <http://www.coe.uga.edu/epit/>.

During their professional sequence of teacher education coursework, candidates engage in three field experiences in diverse placements: EDMS 5020L, EDMS 5030L, and EDMS 5460. Over the course of these three field experiences, candidates are placed in classrooms at varying grade levels within grades 4-8 and in varied school and community contexts. In EDMS 5020L, candidates spend a minimum of 105 hours in a middle grades school setting (grades 4-8) planning and teaching in their second area of specialization. In EDMS 5030L, candidates spend a minimum of 105 hours in a middle grades school setting planning and teaching in their first area of specialization. Beginning fall semester 2006, candidates will spend at least 140 hours in middle grades school settings during the EDMS 5030L field experience. Candidates are formally observed, using the Post-Observation Discussion Guide (see Figure 6), by their university supervisor a minimum of one time during EDMS 5020L and a minimum of two times during EDMS 5030L.

In EDMS 5460, Student Teaching in the Middle School, candidates spend a minimum of 12 weeks (approximately 480 hours) in a middle grades classroom planning and teaching in their first area of specialization. Candidates are expected to teach full time, taking on all the responsibilities of their mentor teachers, for at least 4 of the 12 weeks. Candidates must develop and teach a unit plan that will require at least 2 weeks to teach. Candidates are formally observed, using the Post-Observation Discussion Guide (see Figure 6), by their university supervisor a minimum of 4 times and by their mentor teacher a minimum of 2 times. Throughout their student teaching, candidates maintain a reflection journal to which university supervisors respond weekly. For detailed information about student teaching, please see the EDMS 5460 syllabus at www.coe.uga.edu/esse

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program.

The criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the Middle School Education Program are summarized in attached Table C-4, EDMS Data Points at Assessment Points-Initial. Candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, professional skills, dispositions, and student learning are assessed at six points: application to the program, entrance to the program (before EDMS 5020), before EDMS 5030, before EDMS 5460 (Student Teaching), student teaching and exit from the program, and follow-up. As delineated in Table C-4, applicants must have a minimum overall and cumulative GPA of 2.75 for admission to the program and must maintain a 2.75 GPA throughout the program. Candidates must receive a grade of "C" or above in all preprofessional and professional courses.

4. Description of the relationship² of the program to the unit's conceptual framework.

According to the conceptual framework of the professional education unit of the University of Georgia, "the College of Education prepares exemplary, reflective professionals to serve a diverse global community; it achieves that end through teaching, scholarship, outreach, and partnership at the local, national, and international levels." The evidence in this report shows that the middle school education program embodies the conceptual framework by preparing the kind of professionals that the unit values.

Exemplary professionals have both a deep knowledge of the subject matter they are expected to teach and the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are required to make subject matter developmentally accessible, meaningful, and useful for students. Standardized measures, course grades, and evaluations from mentor teachers, university supervisors, and the candidates themselves make clear that candidates in the middle school program display the characteristics of exemplary professionals. Teacher candidates enter the program with as strong a background in subject matter as any candidates to teach middle grades education in the country, as reflected in their SAT and ACT scores and performance in the core curriculum. Their continuing study of subject matter in their methods courses and in their Arts and Sciences courses in their two areas of specialization enhance their subject matter knowledge, while the EDMS course sequence and 800 hours of field experiences in diverse placements helps them develop the pedagogical content knowledge and other professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for exemplary teaching.

² This response should describe the program's conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit's conceptual framework.

Reflective professionals think and act in ways that demonstrate their commitment to their own learning and to the learning of their students. They develop habits of mind that compel them to assess the effects of their actions on student learning and to reconstruct their work on the basis of such evidence. In their ratings of candidates in the middle school program in the areas of planning, providing instruction, dispositions, and effect on student learning, university supervisors and mentor teachers confirm that these candidates have developed the characteristics of reflective professionals who learn in order to enhance the learning of their own students. The self-ratings of middle school education candidates also demonstrate their ability to reflect on their own teaching and identify areas where they need to focus on their learning and that of their students.

The unit's conceptual framework and the middle school program's Belief Statements About Diversity (see <http://www.coe.uga.edu/esse>) also emphasize the importance of candidates being prepared to work in diverse communities, which means candidates must be disposed to act in ways that demonstrate the belief that all students can learn, even those students who have historically not been served well in schools. As indicated in Table C-5, Middle School Education Field Experiences: Indicators of Diversity, candidates are placed for their field experiences in schools with diverse populations. As important, they are supported by mentor teachers and university supervisors to respond appropriately to the unique needs of individual young adolescents. Candidates therefore develop the belief that all students can learn—as indicated by university supervisor, mentor teacher, and the candidates' own ratings—because they are placed in situations where they see such learning occur and see their own positive effects on the learning of young adolescents with a variety of backgrounds and characteristics. In addition, middle school education candidates' performance in their special education class indicates that they have developed the ability to support the learning of young adolescents with special needs.

The middle school education program, therefore, supports the conceptual framework of the professional education unit by preparing exemplary and reflective professionals who appreciate the diversity of young adolescents and who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all young adolescents learn.

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system.³

Each of the data points for the middle school education in Table C-4 EDMS Data Points at Assessment Points-Initial reflects an assessment of candidates at a particular transition point. The assessments common to all unit programs include Passing Scores on Praxis I Tests or Standardized Test Equivalent, Approval of Courses Each Term by

³ This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

Advisor, Completion of Required Coursework Prior to Entrance to the Program, Admission to Teacher Education, Completion of Required Coursework, Completion of Required Course Hours, Grade of Satisfactory in Field Experience, Completion of Required Clock Hours of Field Experiences, Successful Criminal Background Check within 6 months of Beginning Student Teaching, Completion of Field Experiences in Diverse Placements, Completion of Professional Coursework, Completion of Diversity Requirement, Passing Scores on Praxis II Subject Area Tests, and Georgia Guarantee.

Assessments in the middle school education program, but not all other unit programs, include Overall GPA at Least 2.75, Cumulative GPA at Least 2.75, Signed Statement of Understanding of Program Requirements, Successful Completion of Preprofessional Experience, Grades of C or Above in Preprofessional and Professional Courses, Problem Identification, Completion of Field Experiences in Areas of Specialization, Approval for Graduation by Advisor, Certification Awarded, Teaching Position Acquired. Information on candidates is also collected from specific items on university supervisor ratings, mentor teacher ratings, and candidates' self-ratings.

Attach the following contextual information:

1. A program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)
2. Chart with the number of candidates and completers.⁴
3. Chart on program faculty expertise and experience.⁴

(response limited to 6 pages, not including attachments)

⁴ NCATE will provide links to tables to be completed (see Attachments A & B).

SECTION II— ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED DATA⁵

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the NMSA standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program. For each assessment listed, you will be prompted to attach the following:

1. The assessment, including the instructions to candidates about the assigned task;
2. Scoring guides or criteria used to score candidate responses on the assessment; and
3. A table with the aggregated results of the assessment providing, where possible, data for each of the most recent three years. Data should be organized according to the categories used in the scoring guide/criteria. Provide the percentage of candidates achieving at each category.

In the three columns for attachments, click in the box for each attachment to be included with the report. Each attachment should be no longer than five pages. When you click in the box on the web-based program report, you will be prompted to attach the appropriate document. The three attachments related to each assessment must be included for the program report to be complete. The report will not be reviewed until it is complete.

	Name of Assessment ⁶	Type or Form of Assessment ⁷	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁸	Attachments		
				Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
1	Praxis II	State Content Knowledge Assessment	Student teaching, Exit from Program, and Certification (See Table 2.0.1)	N/A	N/A	Table 1
2	Content Knowledge: (2.1) Overall GPA, Cumulative GPA	GPA Course grades Performance	(2.1) Before EDMS 5030, Before Student Teaching,	(2.1) N/A (2.2) N/A	Course Grades A=4.00	Table 2.1 Table 2.2.a

⁵ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

⁶ Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

⁷ Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

⁸ Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses, or completion of the program).

Name of Assessment ⁶	Type or Form of Assessment ⁷	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁸	Attachments		
			Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
(2.2) GPA in upper-level courses in specialization areas (2.2.a) Mathematics specialization MATH 5020, MATH 5030 (2.2.b) Science specialization GEOL 4750, CHEM 1060 (2.2.c) Social studies specialization ESOC 4400 (2.2.d) Language arts specialization ELAN 5210, ELAN 5220 (2.3) Candidates' ratings of content knowledge on the COE exit survey	Evaluation Instrument	During Student Teaching and Exit from Program (2.2) Before EDMS 5030, Before Student Teaching (2.3) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	(2.3) Figure 5	B=3.00 C=2.00 D=1.00 F=0.00 (2.3) Figure 5	Table 2.2.b Table 2.2.c Table 2.2.d Table 2.3
3 Planning: (3.1) Planning Ratings: University Supervisor Ratings During Student Teaching (3.2) Planning Ratings: Candidate Self-Reports on Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (3.3) GPA in EDMS Courses: EDMS 5020-Educating Young Adolescents, EDMS 5030-The Middle School Curriculum (3.4) Candidates' self-ratings on COE Exit Survey	Performance Evaluation Instruments, GPA	(3.1) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (3.2) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (3.3) Before Student Teaching (3.4) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	(3.1) Figure 6 (3.2) Figure 7 (3.3) N/A (3.4) Figure 5	(3.1) Figure 6 (3.2) Figure 7 (3.3) Course Grades A=4.00 B=3.00 C=2.00 D=1.00 F=0.00 (3.4) Figure 5	(3.1) Tables 3.1.a, 3.1.b, 3.1.c (3.2) Table 3.2 (3.3) Table 3.3 (3.4) Table 3.4
4 Student Teaching: (4.1) Mentor Teacher Ratings on End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form	Performance Evaluation Instruments	(4.1) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	(4.1) Figure 8 (4.2) Figure	(4.1) Figure 8 (4.2) Figure 8 (4.3) Figure 7	(4.1) Table 4.1 (4.2) Table

Name of Assessment ⁶	Type or Form of Assessment ⁷	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁸	Attachments		
			Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
(4.2) University Supervisor Ratings on End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form (4.3) Candidate Self-Reports on Middle School Education Program Exit Survey		(4.2) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (4.3) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	8 (4.3) Figure 7		4.2 (4.3) Table 4.3
5 Student Learning: (5.1) Mentor Teacher Ratings During Student Teaching (5.2) University Supervisor Ratings During Student Teaching (5.3) Candidate Self-Reports on Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (5.4) Candidate Self-Reports on College of Education Exit Survey	Performance Evaluation Instruments	(5.1) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (5.2) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (5.3) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (5.4) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	(5.1) Figure 6 (5.2) Figure 6 (5.3) Figure 7 (5.4) Figure 5	(5.1) Figure 6 (5.2) Figure 6 (5.3) Figure 7 (5.4) Figure 5	(5.1) Table 5.1.a; 5.1.b; 5.1.c; 5.1.d; 5.1.e; 5.1.f; 5.1.g; 5.1.h; 5.1.i; 5.1.j; 5.1.k; 5.1.l; 5.1.m; 5.1.n; 5.1.o; 5.1.p; 5.1.q; 5.1.r; 5.1.s; 5.1.t; 5.1.u;

Name of Assessment ⁶	Type or Form of Assessment ⁷	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁸	Attachments		
			Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
					5.1.v (5.2) Table 5.2.a; 5.2.b; 5.2.c; 5.2.d; 5.2.e; 5.2.f; 5.2.g; 5.2.h; 5.2.i; 5.2.j; 5.2.k; 5.2.l; 5.2.m; 5.2.n; 5.2.o; 5.2.p; 5.2.q; 5.2.r; 5.2.s; 5.2.t; 5.2.u; 5.2.v (5.3) Table 5.3 (5.4) Table 5.4
6 NMSA Standard 6: Family and Community Involvement	Performance Evaluation	(6.1) Student Teaching and Exit	(6.1) Figure 7	(6.1) Figure 7	(6.1) Table 6.1

Name of Assessment ⁶	Type or Form of Assessment ⁷	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁸	Attachments		
			Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
Community Involvement (6.1) Candidate Self-Reports on Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (6.2) Candidate Self-Reports on College of Education Exit Survey	Instruments	Teaching and Exit from Program (6.2) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	7 (6.2) Figure 5	(6.2) Figure 5	6.1 (6.2) Table 6.2
7 NMSA Standard 3: Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment, Knowledge #5: Fluent in integration of technology in curriculum planning and Knowledge #8: Understand the integrated role that technology plays in a variety of student assessment measures NMSA Standard 4: Middle Level Teaching Fields, Knowledge #4: Understand how to integrate state-of-the-art technologies...into teaching fields (7.1) Candidates' Grades in Technology Course, EDIT 2000 (7.2) Candidate Self-Reports on Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (7.3) Candidate Self-Reports on College of Education Exit Survey	Course Grade, Performance Evaluation Instruments	(7.1) Entrance to Program (7.2) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (7.3) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	(7.1) N/A (7.2) Figure 7 (7.3) Figure 5	(7.1) Course Grades A=4.00 B=3.00 C=2.00 D=1.00 F=0.00 (7.2) Figure 7 (7.3) Figure 5	(7.1) Table 7.1 (7.2) Table 7.2 (7.3) Table 7.3
8 NMSA Standard 7: Middle Level	Performance	(8.1) Student	(8.1) Figure	(8.1) Figure 6	(8.1) Table

Name of Assessment ⁶	Type or Form of Assessment ⁷	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁸	Attachments		
			Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
Professional Roles (8.1) Mentor Teacher Ratings During Student Teaching (8.2) University Supervisor Ratings During Student Teaching (8.3) Candidate Self-Reports on Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (8.4) Candidate Self-Reports on College of Education Exit Survey	Evaluation Instruments	Teaching and Exit from Program (8.2) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (8.3) Student Teaching and Exit from Program (8.4) Student Teaching and Exit from Program	6 (8.2) Figure 6 6 (8.3) Figure 7 (8.4) Figure 5	(8.2) Figure 6 (8.3) Figure 7 (8.4) Figure 5	8.1.a; 8.1.b; 8.1.c (8.2) Table 8.2.a; 8.2.b; 8.2.c (8.3) Table 8.3 (8.4) Table 8.4

SECTION III—STANDARDS ASSESSMENT CHART

For each NMSA standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address each standard. One assessment may apply to multiple NMSA standards. In Section IV you will describe these assessments in greater detail and summarize and analyze candidate results to document that a majority of your candidates are meeting NMSA standards. To save space, the details of the NMSA standards are not identified here, but are available by clicking on the link to the full set of standards below. The full set of standards provides more specific information about what should be assessed.

NMSA STANDARD ⁹	Content Knowledge	Pedagogical/ Professional KSD ¹⁰	Effect on Student Learning ¹¹	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
Programmatic Standards				
1. Middle Level Courses and Experiences. Institutions preparing middle level teachers have courses and field experiences that specifically and directly address middle level education.	—	—	—	Information is provided in Section I, Context.
2. Qualified Middle Level Faculty. Institutions preparing middle level teachers employ faculty members who have middle level experience and expertise.	—	—	—	Information is provided in Section I, Context.
Performance-based Standards				
1. Young Adolescent Development. Middle level teacher candidates understand the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to young adolescent development, and they provide opportunities that support student development and learning.	—	—	—	_#1 _#2 X#3 X#4 X#5 X#6 _#7 _#8
2. Middle Level Philosophy and School Organization. Middle level teacher candidates understand the major concepts, principles, theories, and research underlying the philosophical foundations of developmentally responsive middle level programs and schools, and they work successfully within these organizational components.	—	—	—	_#1 _#2 X#3 X#4 X#5 _#6 _#7 _#8
3. Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment. Middle level teacher candidates understand the major concepts, principles, theories, standards, and research related to middle level curriculum and assessment, and they use this knowledge in their practice.	—	—	—	_#1 _#2 X#3 X#4 X#5 _#6 X#7 _#8

⁹ NCATE will provide a link to the full set of SPA standards, including indicators/elements/dimensions and supporting explanations.

¹⁰ KSD = knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

¹¹ Student learning refers to students in middle level classrooms and includes creating environments that support learning.

NMSA STANDARD⁹	Content Knowledge	Pedagogical/ Professional KSD¹⁰	Effect on Student Learning¹¹	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>4. Middle Level Teaching Fields. Middle level teacher candidates understand and use the central concepts, tools of inquiry, standards, and structures of content in their chosen teaching fields, and they create meaningful learning experiences that develop all young adolescents' competence in subject matter and skills.</p>	—	—	—	<p>X_#1 X2 X#3 X#4 X#5 _#6 X#7 X#8</p>
<p>5. Middle Level Instruction and Assessment. Middle level teacher candidates understand and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to effective instruction and assessment, and they employ a variety of strategies for a developmentally appropriate climate to meet the varying abilities and learning styles of all young adolescents.</p>	—	—	—	<p>_#1 X#2 X#3 X#4 X#5 _#6 _#7 _#8</p>
<p>6. Family and Community Involvement. Middle level teacher candidates understand the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to working collaboratively with family and community members, and they use that knowledge to maximize the learning of all young adolescents.</p>	—	—	—	<p>_#1 _#2 X#3 X#4 X#5 X#6 _#7 _#8</p>
<p>7. Middle Level Professional Roles. Middle level teacher candidates understand the complexity of teaching young adolescents, and they engage in practices and behaviors that develop their competence as professionals.</p>	—	—	—	<p>_#1 _#2 X#3 X#4 X#5 _#6 _#7 X#8</p>

SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: Information on the 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II and their findings must be reported in this section. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. In this web-based report, the standards have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE's unit Standard 1:

1. Content knowledge
2. Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions
3. Effects on student learning¹²

The specific information to be submitted for the state licensing test results is outlined in #1. For all other areas, provide the following evidence, plus any additional information requested in the applicable assessment area:

1. Indicate the assessment(s) from Section II that provides information about the area and describe how it addresses the applicable program standards.
2. Summarize the data presented in the table(s) related to the assessment submitted in Section II and interpret the results in terms of the standards.

Responses must be submitted for six of the areas in this section. The institution may respond to the final two areas to provide additional evidence that its program prepares candidates to meet the program standards.

#1 (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge.¹³ NMSA standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge.

Submit the following information:

1. The names of all licensure tests or professional examinations required by the state for content and pedagogical or professional knowledge.¹⁴
2. Description of the alignment between licensure test data and applicable NMSA standards.
3. Aggregated pass rates for each year over the past 3 years, including the most recent academic year.¹⁵ Data must be presented on all completers, even if there were fewer than 10 test takers during a single year. Eighty percent of program completers¹⁶ who have taken the **content** test must pass the applicable state licensure test if the state has such a test.

¹² Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning.

¹³ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

¹⁴ For example, Praxis II Middle School: Content Knowledge.

¹⁵ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

¹⁶ NCATE uses the Title II definition for *program completers*. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are

4. The mean and range of sub-scores for the most recent academic year.

1. Candidates in the middle school education program take Praxis II subject assessments in relevant areas of specialization—language arts, mathematics, science, and/or social science. Candidates are advised to take the examinations during the student teaching semester or immediately following the student teaching experience. Not all candidates who complete the program take a teaching position in a middle grades school immediately after graduation. A number of candidates from the program choose to enter graduate school full-time or engage in other experiences (e.g., international travel, missionary work) after graduation from the initial certification program.

2. The Praxis II examinations address “Standard 4: Middle Level Teaching Fields” of the NMSA/NCATE standards. The Praxis II examinations assess the candidates’ depth and breadth of knowledge in their relevant areas of specialization, which are broad, multidisciplinary, and encompass the major areas within those fields (e.g., students take a Praxis II examination in science, not separate exams in biology, chemistry, physics).

3. Data are available for all cohorts that entered and completed the middle school education initial certification program between fall 2001 and spring 2005. Three cohorts completed the program within that time frame.

C. Of the 47 candidates in the middle school initial certification program who began the 4-semester sequence of professional education coursework and field experiences in fall 2001 (and completed the program in spring 2003), 26 candidates took the Praxis II Content Area test in English Language Arts. All candidates in the fall 2001 cohort who took the Praxis II English Language Arts test passed. From the fall 2002 cohort, 24 of the 45 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework took the Praxis II English Language Arts test. All candidates in the fall 2002 cohort who took the Praxis II English Language Arts test passed. From the fall 2003 cohort, 27 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework took the Praxis II English Language Arts test. All candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II English Language Arts test passed.

Of the 47 candidates in the middle school initial certification program who began the 4-semester sequence of professional education coursework and field experiences in fall 2001 (and completed the program in spring 2003), 19 candidates took the Praxis II Content Area test in Mathematics. All candidates in the fall 2001 cohort who took the Praxis II Mathematics test passed. From the fall 2002 cohort, 15 of the 45 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework took the Praxis II Mathematics test. All candidates in the fall 2002 cohort who took the Praxis II

documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program’s requirements.

Mathematics test passed. From the fall 2003 cohort, 17 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II Mathematics test. 93.1% (16 of 17) of the candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II Mathematics test passed.

Of the 47 candidates in the middle school initial certification program who began the 4-semester sequence of professional education coursework and field experiences in fall 2001 (and completed the program in spring 2003), 21 candidates took the Praxis II Content Area test in Science. 90.5% (19 of 21) of the candidates in the fall 2001 cohort who took the Praxis II Science test passed. From the fall 2002 cohort, 15 of the 45 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework took the Praxis II Science test. All candidates in the fall 2002 cohort who took the Praxis II Science test passed.

From the fall 2003 cohort, 12 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II Science test. 91.7% (11 of 12) of the candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II Science test passed.

Of the 47 candidates in the middle school initial certification program who began the 4-semester sequence of professional education coursework and field experiences in fall 2001 (and completed the program in spring 2003), 21 candidates took the Praxis II Content Area test in Social Studies. 95.7% (22 of 23) of the candidates in the fall 2001 cohort who took the Praxis II Social Studies test passed. From the fall 2002 cohort, 30 of the 45 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework took the Praxis II Social Studies test. All candidates in the fall 2002 cohort who took the Praxis II Social Studies test passed. From the fall 2003 cohort, 29 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II Social Studies test. 93.1% of the candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II Social Studies test passed.

4. From the fall 2003 cohort, 26 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II English Language Arts test. The mean score for this cohort was 171.00 (SD=13.49), with the minimum score by any one candidate of 153 and a maximum score of 195. All candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II English Language Arts test passed.

From the fall 2003 cohort, 16 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II Mathematics test. The mean score for this cohort was 168.33 (SD=23.98), with the minimum score by any one candidate of 128 and a maximum score of 192; 93.1% of the candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II Mathematics test passed.

From the fall 2003 cohort, 12 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II Science test. The mean score

for this cohort was 152.67 (SD=8.08), with the minimum score by any one candidate of 144 and a maximum score of 160. 91.7% of the candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II Science test passed.

From the fall 2003 cohort, 29 of the 50 candidates who began the 4-semester sequence of professional coursework candidates took the Praxis II Social Studies test. The mean score for this cohort was 160.67 (SD=16.57), with the minimum score by any one candidate of 137 and a maximum score of 183. 93.1% of the candidates in the fall 2003 cohort who took the Praxis II Social Studies test passed.

The results from the Praxis II tests in the areas of specialization indicate that candidates in the middle school program have met NMSA Standard 4, Teaching Fields.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#2 (Required)-CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in the middle level education. NMSA standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, GPAs or grades,¹⁷ content major,¹⁸ and portfolio tasks.¹⁹ For post-baccalaureate teacher preparation, include an assessment used to determine that candidates have adequate content background in the subject to be taught.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

This assessment comprises three grade point averages: overall GPA, cumulative GPA, and GPA in courses related to candidates' areas of specialization (Mathematics: MATH 5020, MATH 5030; Science: GEOL 4750, CHEM 1060; Social studies: ESOC 4400; Language arts: ELAN 5210 and ELAN 5220) and candidates' ratings of content knowledge on the College of Education Exit Survey (Figure 5).

1. The overall and cumulative GPAs address all middle school education initial certification standards of National Middle School Association and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. The GPA in courses related to candidates' two areas of specialization address NMSA Standard 3: Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment; and Standard 4: Middle Level Teaching Fields. The GPA in courses related to candidates' areas of specialization and the candidates' ratings of content knowledge on the College of Education Exit Survey address the following specific elements within

- NMSA Standard 3: Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment, Knowledge,

¹⁷ If grades are used as the assessment or included in the assessment, provide information on the criteria for those grades and describe how they align with the specialty standards

¹⁸ If completion of a content major is used as the assessment or included in the assessment, describe how the program of study aligns with the SPA standards.

¹⁹ For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included are discrete items. In this case, some of the artifacts included in the portfolio may be considered individual assessments.

Middle level teacher candidates (3.) possess a depth and breadth of content knowledge; (4.) understand multiple assessment strategies that effectively measure student mastery of the curriculum; and (11.) understand the key concepts within the critical knowledge base and know how to design assessments that targets them.

- NMSA Standard 4: Teaching Fields, Knowledge: Middle level candidates (1.) possess a depth and breadth of knowledge in two content areas which are broad; (2.) Know how to use content knowledge to make interdisciplinary connections; and (3.) are knowledgeable about teaching and assessment strategies that are especially effective in their teaching fields.

2. Data on overall and cumulative GPA (Table 2.1) are presented for four middle school program cohorts: the Fall 2001 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2003), the Fall 2002 cohort (that completed the program in fall 2004), the Fall 2003 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2005) and the Fall 2004 cohort (that will complete the program in spring 2006).

The Fall 2001 middle school program cohort had a mean overall GPA (where the highest possible GPA is 4.00) of 3.43 (SD=.24). The lowest overall GPA in the cohort was 3.04 and the highest was 4.00. The mean cumulative GPA in the Fall 2001 cohort was 3.46 (SD=.24), with the lowest GPA being 3.09 and the highest being 4.00.

The Fall 2002 middle school program cohort had a mean overall GPA (where the highest possible GPA is 4.00) of 3.38 (SD=.24). The lowest overall GPA in the cohort was 2.77 and the highest was 3.82. The mean cumulative GPA in the Fall 2002 cohort was 3.49 (SD=.30), with the lowest GPA being 2.64 and the highest being 4.00.

The Fall 2003 middle school program cohort had a mean overall GPA (where the highest possible GPA is 4.00) of 3.45 (SD=.28). The lowest overall GPA in the cohort was 2.78 and the highest was 4.00. The mean cumulative GPA in the Fall 2003 cohort was 3.52 (SD=.27), with the lowest GPA being 2.75 and the highest being 4.00.

The Fall 2004 middle school program cohort had a mean overall GPA (where the highest possible GPA is 4.00) of 3.46 (SD=.26). The lowest overall GPA in the cohort was 2.91 and the highest was 3.97. The mean cumulative GPA in the Fall 2004 cohort was 3.46 (SD=.29), with the lowest GPA being 2.70 and the highest being 4.00.

Tables 2.2.a, 2.2.b, 2.2.c, and 2.2.d provide data on candidates' grades in

courses related to their areas of specialization. The Fall 2001 middle school program cohort had a mean GPA of 3.44 (SD=.51) in mathematics content courses, a mean GPA of 3.31 (SD=.46) in science content courses, a mean GPA of 3.96 (SD=.20) in social studies content courses, and a mean GPA of 3.96 (SD=.20) in language arts content courses.

The Fall 2002 middle school cohort had a mean GPA of 3.60 (SD=.39) in mathematics content courses, a mean GPA of 3.46 (SD=.45) in science content courses, a mean GPA of 3.70 (SD=.61) in social studies content courses, and a mean GPA of 3.93 (SD=.17) in language arts content courses.

The Fall 2003 middle school cohort had a mean GPA of 3.39 (SD=.50) in mathematics content courses, a mean GPA of 3.57 (SD=.51) in science content courses, a mean GPA of 3.94 (SD=.24) in social studies content courses, and a mean GPA of 3.98 (SD=.09) in language arts content courses.

The Fall 2004 middle school cohort had a mean GPA of 3.39 (SD=.49) in mathematics content courses, a mean GPA of 3.63 (SD=.40) in science content courses, a mean GPA of 3.97 (SD=.17) in social studies content courses, and a mean GPA of 3.96 (SD=.20) in language arts content courses.

The Fall 2003 middle school cohort (N=49) provided self-ratings of their content knowledge on the College of Education Exit Survey. 96% of the candidates agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "I am knowledgeable of the subject-specific content that I plan to teach."

Like the results from the Praxis II examinations, the overall and cumulative GPAs, GPAs in upper-level courses in specialization areas, and candidates' ratings of content knowledge on the COE exit survey indicate that middle school program candidates have met NMSA standard 4, Teaching Fields.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#3 (Required)-PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction.²⁰ NMSA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 3, 4, and 5. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

²⁰ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

1. This assessment comprises planning ratings of candidates from university supervisors at the end of student teaching, self-ratings of planning from the candidates on two instruments, and candidates' GPA in EDMS 5020: Educating Young Adolescents and EDMS 5030: The Middle School Curriculum.

University supervisors use the Post-Observation Discussion Guide (PODG, Figure 6) after all observations of candidates. The section of the PODG called "Preparation of Lesson" includes three items related specifically to planning: candidate provided completed lesson plan that includes all components of the Middle School Program's lesson design, the lesson plan reflects developmentally appropriate practice, and the resources needed for successful implementation of the plan are organized and available. The Middle School Program's lesson design requires candidates to consider what they have learned regarding young adolescent development (NMSA Standard 1), middle level philosophy and organization (NMSA Standard 2), middle level curriculum and assessment (NMSA Standard 3), their relevant teaching fields (NMSA Standard 4), middle level instruction and assessment (NMSA Standard 5), and family and community involvement (NMSA Standard 6). For more information on how the Middle School Program's lesson design incorporates these NMSA standards, please see the Middle School Program's lesson/unit plan design on the Middle School Program web site. Within NMSA Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development, planning ratings on the PODG address the following standards under Performances: (2.), (3.), (4.), (5.), (7.), (8.), and (10.) Within NMSA Standard 2: Middle Level Philosophy and Organization, planning ratings on the PODG address one standards under "Performances" regarding applying their knowledge of the philosophical foundations of middle level education. Within NMSA Standard 3: Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment, planning ratings on the PODG address several standrds under Performances: (2.), (3.), (4.), and (9.). Within NMSA Standard 4: Teaching Fields, planning ratings on the PODG addresses two standards under Performances: (1.) and (5.). Within NMSA Standard 5: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment, planning ratings on the PODG addresses three standards under Performances: (2.), (3.), and (6.). Within NMSA Standard 5: Family and Community Involvement, planning ratings on the PODG address two standards under Performances: (3.) and (4.).

The candidates provide self-ratings of their knowledge and skills related to planning on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (MSEPEs). The Middle School Education Program Exit Survey includes 3 items related to planning and how well prepared candidates feel to plan well: (3.) Incorporating students' ideas and interests; (4.) Planning middle grades curriculum; and (10.) Responding to students' cultural/linguistic diversity.

Candidates' GPA in EDMS 5020 and EDMS 5030 address all of National Middle School Association standards for initial certification. These two courses form the core of the middle school education program.

2. Data on planning ratings by university supervisors on the Post Observation Discussion Guide items related to planning (see Tables 3.1.a, 3.1.b, and 3.1.c) are presented for three middle school program cohorts: the Fall 2001 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2003), the Fall 2002 cohort (that completed the program in fall 2004), and the Fall 2003 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2005).

Data from university supervisors for the Fall 2001 cohort indicate that in the EDMS 5460 student teaching experience, 87.2% of candidates were given the highest rating for their lesson plans (including all aspects of lesson plan design), 87.2% of candidates were given the highest rating for the quality of their lesson plan, particularly as it related to developmental appropriateness, organization and sequence, and appropriate instructional activities and materials, and 89.4% of candidates received the highest ratings on organization of resources.

Data from university supervisors for the Fall 2002 cohort indicate that in the EDMS 5460 student teaching experience, 77.3% of candidates were given the highest rating for their lesson plans (including all aspects of lesson plan design), 81.8% of candidates were given the highest rating for the quality of their lesson plan, particularly as it related to developmental appropriateness, organization and sequence, and appropriate instructional activities and materials, and 86.4% of candidates received the highest ratings on organization of resources.

Data from university supervisors for the Fall 2003 cohort indicate that in the EDMS 5460 student teaching experience, 80% of candidates were given the highest rating for their lesson plans (including all aspects of lesson plan design), 86% of candidates were given the highest rating for the quality of their lesson plan, particularly as it related to developmental appropriateness, organization and sequence, and appropriate instructional activities and materials, and 80% of candidates received the highest ratings on organization of resources.

In Table 3.2, data on candidates' perceptions of their own planning skills are provided for the middle school program cohorts from Fall 1998, Fall 1999, Fall 2000, Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003. This summary focuses on the last three cohorts: Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003. When asked to rate themselves on a scale of 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating) regarding their ability to incorporate students' ideas and interests into their lesson plans, the 2001 candidates rated themselves a 4.20, the 2002 candidates rated themselves a 4.10, and the 2003 candidates rated themselves a 4.21. When asked to rate themselves regarding their ability to plan middle grades curriculum, the 2001 candidates rated themselves a 4.22, the 2002 candidates rated themselves a 4.10, and the 2003 candidates rated themselves a 4.19. When asked to rate themselves regarding their ability to respond to students' cultural and linguistic diversity, the 2001 candidates rated themselves a 3.54, the 2002 candidates

rated themselves a 3.70, and the 2003 candidates rated themselves a 3.60.

In Table 3.3, data are provided on candidates' cumulative grade point average in EDMS 5020 and EDMS 5030. The data for four cohorts appears in Table 3.3: Fall 2001, Fall 2002, Fall 2003, and Fall 2004. Across all four cohorts, the mean GPAs for EDMS 5020 range from 3.85 (Fall 2004) to 3.98 (Fall 2003). The mean GPAs for EDMS 5030 are included from three cohorts; the fall 2004 cohort is currently enrolled in EDMS 5030. The mean GPAs for EDMS 5030 range from 3.76 (Fall 2002) to 3.96 (Fall 2003).

Data on candidates' self-ratings on planning appear in Table 3.4 for the Fall 2003 cohort. The data are drawn from the College of Education Exit Survey (Figure 5), which was first used with spring 2005 graduates. The candidates rated themselves on planning skills having to do with their preparedness to (a) make connections to authentic or real-world experiences, (b) integrate multiple content areas, (c) develop units and lessons that reflect state and national standards, (d) create learning environments in which students assume responsibility, and (e) use assessment results to plan instruction. Candidates anonymously responded with Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree to indicate whether they had acquired the given quality. Data were summarized by the college as the percent of candidates responding in each category. For 3 of the 5 items, 98-100% of candidates agreed or strongly agreed that they had the described quality. On 2 items, 88% of candidates agreed or strongly agreed that they had the described quality. On no item did any candidate strongly disagree about holding the quality.

Data from the university supervisor ratings related to planning, candidates' self-reports of their abilities related to planning, candidates' grade point averages in the two middle school program methods courses that focus most on planning, and candidates' self-ratings of their preparedness related to planning all seem to indicate that middle school program candidates meet the NMSA standards related to planning, including NMSA Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#4 (Required)- PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice.²¹ NMSA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 1-7. The assessment instrument used in student teaching or internship should be submitted.

²¹ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

1. This assessment comprises ratings at the end of student teaching on the overall quality of the candidates' performance during student teaching (Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor) from mentor teachers on the End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form (Figure 8) and from university supervisors on the End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form. The rating on the End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form is an indication of the candidate's progress toward becoming a qualified classroom teacher. This assessment also includes self-ratings from the candidates on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey. One item on the exit survey allows candidates to rate how well the student teaching experience prepared them to teach in the middle grades (i.e., their perceptions of their ability to apply their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in middle grades classrooms). The mentor teacher and university supervisor ratings on the End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form and the candidates' self-ratings of how well the student teaching experience prepared them to teach in the middle grades address all of the NMSA standards.

2. Data from three cohorts—Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003—are presented in Table 4.1, Overall Student Teaching by Mentor Teacher. The data from mentor teachers' ratings regarding candidates' progress toward becoming a qualified classroom teacher indicate that 100% of candidates in all three cohorts were rated either as Excellent or Good, with no candidates rated as Fair or Poor.

Data from three cohorts—Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003—are presented in Table 4.2, Overall Student Teaching by University Supervisor. Using the same End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form used by the mentor teachers, university supervisors rated 100% of candidates in all three cohorts as either excellent or good regarding their progress toward becoming a qualified classroom teacher.

Missing data in both Tables 4.1 and 4.2 are attributed primarily to either forms not being returned by the mentor teacher or university supervisor or the item was left blank.

Data on candidates' perceptions of how well their student teaching experience prepared them for teaching in the middle grades appear in Table 4.3 for six middle school program cohorts: Fall 1998, Fall 1999, Fall 2000, Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003. On a scale of 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating), candidates consistently rate student teaching as very important to their preparation to teach in the middle grades. The Fall 2001 cohort's rating for student teaching is 4.87; the Fall 2002 cohort's rating is 4.94, and the Fall 2003 cohort's rating is 5.00.

Data from the mentor teacher and university supervisor ratings on the End-of-Term Decision Documentation Form, and candidates' perceptions of the value of their student

teaching experience in preparing them to teach in the middle grades all indicate that the middle school program's student teaching experience prepares candidates well for teaching in the middle grades.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING:²² Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning. NMSA standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 3 and 4. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

1. This assessment comprises ratings of candidates' performance in supporting student learning from mentor teachers and university supervisors during student teaching on the Post Observation Discussion Guide (PODG, Figure 6) and self-ratings of capacity to support student learning from the candidates on two instruments: the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (Figure 7) and the College of Education Exit Survey (Figure 8).

Mentor teachers and university supervisors both use the Post Observation Discussion Guide (PODG) to evaluate candidates' performance in the classroom. Two sections of the PODG are relevant particularly to student learning: the section called "Delivery of Lesson" and the section called "Management of Classroom Environment." The "Delivery of Lesson" section assesses candidates' ability to provide developmentally appropriate and academically rigorous curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and The "Management of Classroom Environment" section measures candidates' ability to establish and maintain an effective classroom learning environment. The "Delivery of Lesson" section focuses mentor teachers and university supervisors on, for example, the candidates' demonstrated depth and breadth of content knowledge (NMSA Standard 4: Middle Level Teaching Fields), provision of clear directions and expectations and evidence candidates check for understanding (NMSA Standard 5: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment), stated purpose and relevance of lesson (NMSA Standard 3: Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment), and provision of appropriate modifications and accommodations based on individual student needs (NMSA Standards 3, 4, and 1: Young Adolescent Development). The section called "Management of Classroom Environment" includes, for example, monitoring student involvement in the lesson

²² Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning.

(NMSA Standards 1 and 4) and addressing management dilemmas appropriately (NMSA Standards 1 and 4).

On the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey, candidates provide self-ratings regarding their perceived knowledge and ability related to supporting student learning.

2. Data are presented for three of the middle school program cohorts: the Fall 2001 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2003), the Fall 2002 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2004), and the Fall 2003 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2005). The Fall 2004 cohort has not yet reached the student teaching experience in which the ratings from mentor teachers and university supervisors will be collected. The self-ratings from that Fall 2004 cohort will be collected when the candidates exit the program.

Data from mentor teachers for the Fall 2001 cohort indicate that all but one of the candidates were given the highest rating on every item having to do with the candidates' effect on student learning, which included (a) controlled voice, (b) demonstrated depth and breadth of content knowledge, (c) provided clear directions and expectations and checked for understanding for all activities and homework, (d) provided initiating activity, (e) related lessons to prior learning, (f) stated purpose and relevance of lesson clearly for all activities and homework, (g) provided time parameters to students, (h) provided explanations, examples, and clarifications, (i) included appropriate transitions, (j) paced lesson well, (k) assessed students' learning of knowledge and skills in each activity, (l) assessed students' learning of knowledge and skills in relation to overall lesson's goals and objectives, (m) questioned students appropriately, (n) provided appropriate feedback, (o) provided appropriate modifications and accommodations based on student needs, (p) provided or facilitated both content and procedural closure, (q) greeted students, (r) started class promptly, (s) moved around room purposefully during teacher-directed instruction, (t) moved around the room purposefully during independent or group work, (u) monitored student involvement in the lesson, (v) addressed management dilemmas appropriately. The one candidate who did not receive the highest rating on every item did receive the highest rating on all but a few items (f., l., s., and t.)

Data from mentor teachers for the Fall 2002 cohort similarly reflect the highest ratings for all but 1 candidate on every item. The one candidate who did not receive the highest rating on every item did receive the highest rating on all but a few items (b., f., g., j., k., o., s., and t.).

Data from the mentor teachers for the Fall 2003 cohort also indicate that all but one to two of the candidates received the highest rating on every item having to do with the candidates' effect on student learning. The one to two candidates received a rating of "needs improvement" on only a few items (c., g., i., j., m., o., p., s., t., u., and v.).

The apparent pattern in the items on which a few candidates received ratings of “needs improvement” from mentor teachers seems to be a connection to managing the classroom environment (e.g., items s., t., u., and v.).

Data from university supervisors for the Fall 2001 cohort indicate that all but one to two of the candidates were given the highest rating on every item having to do with the candidates’ effect on student learning. The one to two candidates who received ratings of “needs improvement” received that rating on only a few items (e., f., g., k., l., m., o., p., r., s., t., u., v.).

Data from university supervisors for the Fall 2002 cohort indicate that all but one to two of the candidates were given the highest rating on every item having to do with the candidates’ effect on student learning. The one to two candidates who received ratings of “needs improvement” received that rating on only a few items (c., f., g., h., i., j., o., p., s., t.).

Data from university supervisors for the Fall 2003 cohort indicate that all but one to two of the candidates were given the highest rating on every item having to do with the candidates’ effect on student learning. The one to two candidates who received ratings of “needs improvement” received that rating on only a few items (a., b., c., e., f., g., j., m., n., p., s., u., v.).

The apparent pattern in the items on which a few candidates received ratings of “needs improvement” from mentor teachers seems to be a connection to making the purpose and relevance of the lesson clear (f.), providing time parameters to students (g.), pacing the lesson well (j.), and the items related to managing the classroom environment (e.g., items s., t., u., and v.).

Data are provided on candidates’ perceptions of their influence on student learning from the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey from cohorts beginning in 1998 through 2003 (see Table 5.3). The three key cohorts for purposes of this report are the Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003 cohorts. Items are rated on a scale of 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating), and candidates respond anonymously to the Exit Survey. Items include (1) meeting development needs, which shows a rating of 4.40+ for the three key cohorts; (2) using effective instructional techniques, which shows a rating of 4.20+ for the three key cohorts; (3) incorporating students’ ideas and interests with ratings of 4.10+ for the three key cohorts; (4) planning middle grades curriculum with rankings of 4.10+ for the three key cohorts; (5) assessing students’ performance with ratings of 3.70+ for the three key cohorts; (6) using effective grouping practices with ratings of 3.90+ for the three key cohorts; (7) teaching on an interdisciplinary team with ratings of 4.04+ for the three key cohorts; (8) differentiating for instructional needs with ratings of 3.96+ for the three key cohorts; (9) responding to students’ cultural/linguistic diversity with ratings of 3.54+ for the three key cohorts; and (10) managing the classroom environment with ratings of 3.63+ for the three key cohorts.

The pattern from candidates' perceptions of their influence on student learning reveals many strengths of their preparation especially in relation to NMSA Standards 1, 2, 3, and 5, though the strength related to Standard 5, Middle Level Instruction and Assessment, is tempered by the relatively lower rating for managing the classroom environment.

Data are provided on the Fall 2003 middle school program candidates' self-ratings on student learning from the College of Education Exit Survey, which was administered for the first time in spring 2005. Candidates were asked to express whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with such items as "I am knowledgeable of individual differences in human motivation and behavior;" "I am prepared to adapt instruction based on students' age and learning style;" and "I am an advocate for learning environments that support the diverse needs of all students." On almost every item, 100% of the candidates in the Fall 2003 cohort either agreed or strongly agreed with the statements regarding their preparedness and ability to support student learning. A single item, "I am able to use the prior experience and culture of my students in order to make connections with schools, families, and communities," had 94% agreement, the lowest rating but still relatively high. That said, section V on program improvements will reference strengthening the middle school program's efforts related to diversity of experience and culture and making connections to families and communities.

Data from the mentor teacher and university supervisor ratings on items related to student learning from the Post-Observation Discussion Guide and candidates' self-ratings of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to supporting student learning all indicate that the middle school program effectively prepares candidates to support the learning of all young adolescents, thus addressing all of the NMSA standards. That said, although ratings from mentor teachers and university supervisors were uniformly positive, when mentors or supervisors gave ratings less than the highest possible, they most often did so on an item having to do with managing the classroom environment or providing appropriate modifications and accommodations, which both appear to be areas in which candidates would benefit from further study. Though it is difficult to draw conclusions from the self-ratings provided by candidates, it is true that items having to do with managing the classroom environment and making connections to students based on their prior experiences and cultures represent those on which candidates most frequently used a response other than Strongly Agree or Agree to describe whether or not they had that ability. The program views as a positive indicator of the reflective ability of candidates that they could make distinctions among specific skills in supporting student learning and identify areas in which they wanted to improve. Again, as was true of the candidates' planning skills, it is clear that the middle school program is meeting the needs of candidates in the area of supporting student learning.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#6 (Required): Additional assessment that addresses NMSA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

1. This assessment comprises self-ratings of capacity to support family involvement in supporting student learning from the candidates on two instruments: the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey (Figure 7) and the College of Education Exit Survey (Figure 8). These self-ratings address NMSA Standard 6: Family and Community Involvement.

2. Data are provided on candidates' perceptions of family involvement from the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey from cohorts beginning in 1998 through 2003 (see Table 6.1). This summary of key data focuses on the Fall 2001 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2003), the Fall 2002 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2004), and the Fall 2003 cohort (that completed the program in spring 2005). Items are rated on a scale of 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating), and candidates respond anonymously to the Exit Survey. One item on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey relates to family involvement, asking whether candidates feel well prepared to communicate with parents. The mean for the Fall 2001 cohort on this item is 3.85. The mean for the Fall 2002 cohort on this item is 4.00, and the mean for the Fall 2003 cohort on this item is 3.70.

Data are provided in Table 6.2 from the Fall 2003 cohort's responses on the College of Education Exit Survey, which was administered for the first time in spring 2005. Candidates were asked to express whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with such items as "I understand how factors in the environment, inside and outside of school, influence students' lives and learning" (100% of candidates agreed or strongly agreed); "I am sensitive, alert, and respectful regarding all aspects of a child's well being" (100% of candidates agreed or strongly agreed); and "I am prepared to establish respectful and productive relationships with families" (98% of candidates agreed or strongly agreed). A majority of candidates agreed or strongly agreed with statements reflecting their preparedness to make connections to and involve families. A couple of items point to a need for further study: "I understand laws related to rights and responsibilities of students, educators, and families" (75% agreed or strongly agreed) and "I know how to identify school, district, and community resources available to teachers" (71% of candidates agreed or strongly agreed).

The perceptions and ratings of candidates related to family involvement were quite positive, and the results indicate that the middle school program is clearly supporting candidates' preparedness to work effectively to involve families.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#7 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses NMSA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

1. This assessment consists of candidate grades in their technology course, EDIT 2000 and candidate self-reports on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey and the College of Education Exit Survey.

Candidates' grades in EDIT 2000 and their perceptions and self-ratings related to incorporating technology into instruction address NMSA Standard 3: Middle Level Curriculum and Assessment, Knowledge #5: Fluent in integration of technology in curriculum planning and knowledge and Knowledge #8: Understand the integrated role that technology plays in a variety of student assessment measures and NMSA Standard 4: Middle Level Teaching Fields, Knowledge #4: Understand how to integrate the state-of-the-art technologies...into teaching fields.

2. Data are provided on candidates' grades in EDIT 2000 from the Fall 2001, Fall 2002, Fall 2003, and Fall 2004 cohorts. The mean GPA for the Fall 2001 cohort in EDIT 2000 was 4.00 (SD=0). The mean GPA for the Fall 2002 cohort in EDIT 2000 was 3.97 (SD=.17). The mean GPA for the Fall 2003 cohort in EDIT 2000 was 3.96 (SD=.20). The mean GPA for the Fall 2004 cohort in EDIT 2000 was 3.98 (SD=.14).

Data are provided on middle school program cohorts from 1998 to 2003 regarding candidates' perceptions of their preparedness to use technology to improve instruction, drawn from their responses to item #7 on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey. The ratings are on a scale from 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating). The data from the three key cohorts for purposes of this report—Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003—are featured here. The Fall 2001 cohort's mean on this item was 3.97. The Fall 2002 cohort's mean on this item was 4.20. The Fall 2003 cohort's mean on this item was 3.74.

Data are provided for the Fall 2003 cohort's self-ratings regarding technology drawn from the College of Education Exit Survey. Items included "I had access to technology resources" (94% agreed or strongly agreed); "I am able to effectively integrate technology into my teaching" (88% agreed or strongly agreed); and "The faculty in my program integrated technology throughout their teaching" (88% agreed or strongly agreed). A couple of items deserve further study: "Faculty showed me how to integrate technology into my teaching" (75% agreed or strongly agreed), and "I know how to identify school, district, and community resources available to teachers" (71% agreed or strongly agreed).

Candidates' consistently high GPA in EDIT 2000 and their positive perceptions and self-ratings indicate that the middle school program is clearly supporting candidates' preparedness to integrate technology into middle level curriculum, instruction, and assessment. That said, program faculty have begun a concerted effort to integrate technology more effectively into the program through the use of LiveText, a web-based resource for coursework, lesson planning, and portfolio development.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#8 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses NMSA standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

1. This assessment comprises mentor teacher and university supervisor ratings during student teaching and candidate self-reports on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey and the College of Education Exit Survey. The targeted mentor and supervisor ratings and the candidates' self-ratings on particular items from the two exit surveys address NMSA Standard 7: Professional Roles.
2. Data are provided on the Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003 middle school program cohorts regarding mentor teacher ratings on the Post-Observation Discussion Guide (Figure 6) related to professional roles, including four items: (a) interacted professionally, (b) punctual, (c) attired appropriately, and (d) used appropriate language.

All candidates in the Fall 2001 cohort were rated by their mentor teachers as satisfactory on all four items related to professional roles. All candidates in the Fall 2002 cohort were rated by their mentor teachers as satisfactory on all four items related to professional roles. All but one of the candidates from the Fall 2003 cohort were rated by their mentor teachers as satisfactory on all four items related to professional roles. One candidate received a "needs improvement" for punctuality.

Data are provided on the Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003 middle school program cohorts regarding university supervisor ratings on the Post-Observation Discussion Guide (Figure 6) related to professional roles, including four items: (a) interacted professionally, (b) punctual, (c) attired appropriately, and (d) used appropriate language.

All candidates in the Fall 2001 cohort were rated by their university supervisors as satisfactory on all four items related to professional roles. All but one of the candidates in the Fall 2002 cohort were rated by their university supervisors as

satisfactory on all four items related to professional roles. One candidate received a "needs improvement" rating related to using appropriate language. All but one to two of the candidates from the Fall 2003 cohort were rated by their university supervisors as satisfactory on all four items related to professional roles. One to two candidates received a "needs improvement" for appropriate language.

Data are provided on middle school program cohorts from 1998 to 2003 regarding candidates' perceptions of items related to professional roles on the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey. The ratings are on a scale from 1 (lowest rating) to 5 (highest rating). The items included #8 "Teaching on an interdisciplinary team," #12 "Communicating with parents," and #13 "Meeting paperwork and other non-instructional responsibilities." The data from the three key cohorts for purposes of this report—Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003—are featured here. The Fall 2001 cohort's mean on the item related to interdisciplinary teams was 4.04. The Fall 2001 cohort's mean on the item related to communicating with parents was 3.85. The Fall 2001 cohort's mean on the item related to managing paperwork and other non-instructional responsibilities was 3.56. The Fall 2002 cohort's mean on the item related to interdisciplinary teams was 4.10. The Fall 2002 cohort's mean on the item related to communicating with parents was 4.00. The Fall 2002 cohort's mean on the item related to managing paperwork and other non-instructional responsibilities was 3.70. The Fall 2003 cohort's mean on the item related to interdisciplinary teams was 4.10. The Fall 2003 cohort's mean on the item related to communicating with parents was 3.70. The Fall 2003 cohort's mean on the item related to managing paperwork and other non-instructional responsibilities was 3.63.

Data are provided for the Fall 2003 cohort's self-ratings regarding professional roles drawn from the College of Education Exit Survey. Items included "I am prepared to create learning environments in which students assume responsibility" (100% agreed or strongly agreed); "I am prepared to join and actively participate in professional organizations" (96% agreed or strongly agreed); and "I am prepared to become an active colleague and/or leader in my school" (100% agreed or strongly agreed).

Data from the mentor teacher and university supervisor ratings on items related to professional roles from the Post-Observation Discussion Guide and candidates' self-ratings of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to professional roles all indicate that the middle school program effectively prepares candidates to take on professional roles in their own classroom, in keeping with NMSA Standard 7. A couple of issues warrant further consideration: the use of appropriate language and candidates' preparedness to take on the paperwork and other non-instructional responsibilities of the profession.

(response limited to 2 pages)

SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) effects on student learning and on creating environments that support learning.

Since the last NMSA/NCATE accreditation process in 2001, the middle school program has actively engaged in refining its assessment system. This process has included enhancing the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey and administering it to candidates each year, aligning Middle School Program courses more closely with NMSA standards for initial certification, and expanding field experiences. Results from the Middle School Education Program Exit Survey and the College of Education Exit Survey have been used systematically to assess candidate outcomes and identify areas that need to be addressed to improve the preparation of candidates to become exemplary middle grades teachers. The following are the principal findings from the assessments described in Section IV, the faculty interpretation of the findings, and the changes made in or planned for the middle school program.

(1) Content Knowledge

All middle school program completers have been certified to teach in the state of Georgia. Almost all candidates in the Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003 who took a Praxis II exam in language arts, mathematics, science, and/or social studies passed the exam. The mean overall and cumulative GPAs of all the middle school program cohorts who have begun their professional coursework and field experiences since fall 2001 have been 3.38 or greater. The mean GPAs in upper level courses in candidates' areas of specialization have been consistently above 3.31.

As reflected in their Praxis II scores, their overall and cumulative grade point averages, and their grades in upper-level courses in their areas of specialization, candidates in the middle school program have demonstrated the content knowledge expected of middle school education professionals. No significant changes have been made or planned for the middle school program on the basis of these assessments.

In order to better track candidate performance in specific content areas, the middle school program faculty are contemplating the benefits and problems that might be associated with requiring all candidates to take the Praxis II tests and to provide a copy of the results to the

program as a condition of graduation. Almost all program graduates take two Praxis II tests, but there may be some benefits to securing results from all candidates, and to distinguish between those candidates taking a Praxis II exam in one of their two identified areas of specialization versus those taking a Praxis II exam in an area of specialization that has not been central to their preparation through the middle school program.

(2) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Almost all middle school program candidates received the highest possible ratings from their mentor teachers and university supervisors in the areas of planning, student teaching, and student learning. When candidates received something other than the highest rating on an item, it was most often in the area of managing the classroom environment, making appropriate accommodations and modifications, and finding ways to draw on students' backgrounds, experiences, and skills to make content relevant to students and instruction and assessment more meaningful.

Candidates, in their self-ratings, indicated that they were satisfied with their skills in planning, their experiences in student teaching, and their preparedness to support student learning. In the rare instances when a few candidates did not agree that they had developed a particular ability, it was most likely that the item had to do with understanding of laws related to education or having knowledge of available resources.

The results of the assessments related to family involvement, technology, and professional roles all indicate that the middle school program has prepared candidates well to demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for success as middle grades education professionals.

There are, however, issues for the middle school program faculty to consider. Mentor teachers, university supervisors, and the candidates themselves have indicated that candidates need more support in developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to effectively manage the classroom environment, draw upon families in general and cultural and linguistic diversity in particular as resources for student learning, and differentiate instruction to meet the learning needs of all students. The middle school program faculty has been in discussion with faculty in the special education program regarding developing a cross-listed course (EDMS/SPED) that would focus on managing the classroom environment, collaborative teaching with special education professionals, and differentiating instruction to better meet students' diverse learning needs. Candidates' ratings of their preparedness related to family involvement, though high, do warrant further analysis. The middle school program faculty have invited parent panels to present to the EDMS 5040 (student teaching seminar) students, giving candidates' ample opportunities to both hear from parents and raise questions. In like fashion, candidates' ratings related to their knowledge of legal issues related to teaching have led to two improvements in the program: EDMS 5030, the course just before the student teaching semester, now includes a workshop on school law and a session focused on the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators, and EDMS 5040 now includes a panel of education and law professors who share their expertise related to legal issues and respond to questions from candidates, questions that often revolve around situations they have experienced during student teaching.

Candidates' ratings related to technology have led faculty to incorporate a new instructional technology resource, LiveText, into all of the initial certification methods courses taught directly by middle school program faculty (EDMS 5020 and 5020L, EDMS 5030 and 5030L, EDMS 5460, and EDMS 5040), effective fall 2005. In addition to better integrating technology into the university courses, LiveText is a valuable tool for lesson planning and curriculum development that candidates can take into middle grades classrooms during and after their participation in the program.

(3) Effects on Student Learning and on Creating Environments that Support Learning

Almost all middle school program candidates received the highest possible ratings from their mentor teachers and university supervisors on items having to do with candidates' effect on student learning and ability to create environments that support learning. On no item did more than 2 candidates receive a rating other than the highest one. These results would not seem to call for significant program changes in this area. That said, the middle school program faculty have already sought and received approval for increasing the number of hours candidates are in the field, from the current 800 hours to 835. The aforementioned middle school/special education course would also have great potential to positively impact candidates' effects on the learning of every student and their preparedness to create environments that support all students' learning.

(response limited to 3 pages)

ATTACHMENT A Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Please report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master’s, doctorate) being addressed in this report.

Program: Middle School Education: Initial		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers²³
2003-2004	50 (includes 3 candidates at the graduate level)	46 (includes 2 candidates at the graduate level)
2002-2003	45 (includes 5 candidates at the graduate level)	40 (includes 4 candidates at the graduate level)
2001-2002	47 (includes 2 candidates at the graduate level)	45 (includes 2 candidates at the graduate level)

²³ NCATE uses the Title II definition for *program completers*. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program’s requirements.

ATTACHMENT B Faculty Information

Directions: Complete following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University ²⁴	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member ²⁵	Faculty Rank ²⁶	Tenure Track (Yes/No)	Scholarship, ²⁷ Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: ²⁸ List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years ²⁹	Teaching or other professional experience in The middle grades ³⁰
Gayle Andrews	PhD., Social Foundations of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Middle School Program Coordinator	Assistant Professor	Yes	Scholarship: Co-author and co-editor of 4 books on middle grades research and schooling 1. <i>Encyclopedia of Middle Grades Education</i> , co-editor, in press, Information Age 2. <i>Making the Most of Middle School</i> , co-author, 2004, Teachers College Press 3. <i>Research & Resources in</i>	Yes

²⁴ e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska

²⁵ e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair

²⁶ e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor, administrator

²⁷ *Scholarship* is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

²⁸ *Service* includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

²⁹ e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program

³⁰ Briefly describe the nature of recent experience (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

					<p><i>Support of This We Believe</i>, co-author, 2003, National Middle School Association</p> <p>4. <i>Leaders for a Movement: Professional Preparation of Middle Level Teachers and Administrators</i>, co-editor, 2003, Information Age.</p> <p>Leadership in Professional Associations:</p> <p>Research Advisory Board, National Middle School Association</p> <p>Board of Directors, National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform</p> <p>Leadership Council, Middle Level Education Research Special Interest Group (MLER-SIG), American Educational Research Association</p> <p>Service:</p> <p>Presentation proposal reviewer, MLER-SIG, NMSA</p> <p>Journal reviewer: <i>Research in Middle Level Education</i></p> <p>Professional development for teachers from 7 districts in northeast Georgia</p>	
Denise Muth Glynn	Ph.D., Reading	Middle School	Professor	Yes	Muth, K. D., & Glynn, S. M. (2002). Middle school literacy. In	Yes

	Education	Faculty			<p>B. J. Guzzetti (Ed.), <u>Literacy in America: An encyclopedia of history, theory, and practice</u> (pp. 348-351). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc. 383-398). New York: Plenum.</p> <p>Ference, R. A., & Muth, K. D. (2004). Helping middle school females form healthy self-perceptions through team sports and exercise. <u>Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal</u>, <u>13</u>, 28-35.</p> <p>Pate, P. E., & Muth, K. D. (2003). Perspectives on the middle school movement: Snapshots from the past. <u>Middle School Journal</u>, <u>35</u>, 15-22.(1993).</p> <p>Muth, K. D., Weaver, D., Bickmore, D., & Glynn, S. M. (November, 2005). Boys go to school, too. Paper to be presented at the meeting of the National Middle School Association, Philadelphia.</p>	
Katherine F. Thompson	Ph.D., Middle Grades	Instructor, Clinical supervisor	Public Service Associate	No	Scholarship: Pate, P.E., & Thompson, K.F. (2003). Effective professional development: What is	Yes

	Education, The University of Georgia				<p>it? In V.A. Anfara & P.G. Andrews (Eds.), <i>Handbook of research in middle level education, Leaders for a movement: Professional preparation and development of middle level teachers and administrators</i> (pp. 123-143). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.</p> <p>Service: Co-Directed the League of Professional Schools, a university-public school collaboration in Georgia P-12 schools</p> <p>Scholarship: Thompson, K.F. & Homestead, E. (2004c). Middle school curriculum, instruction, and assessment through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. <i>Middle School Journal</i>, 35(5), 56-60.</p>	
Audra Parker	Ph.D., Elementary Education, University of Georgia	Instructor	Temporary Assistant Professor	No	NMSA (2002)and AERA Presentations (2003) AERA Reviewer (2003, 2005)	Yes