

If you need this content in an alternate format for accessibility (e.g. Braille, large print, audio, etc), please contact [Kathy.Moody@ung.edu](mailto:Kathy.Moody@ung.edu) at 706-864-1757.



University of North Georgia  
Traditional Report AY 2016-17  
Georgia



REPORT COMPLETE  
STATUS: CERTIFIED

## Institution Information

### ADDRESS

82 College Circle

### CITY

Dahlonega

### STATE

Georgia

### ZIP

30597

### SALUTATION

Dr.

### FIRST NAME

Sheri

### LAST NAME

Hardee

### PHONE

(706) 864-1672

### EMAIL

sheri.hardee@ung.edu

Is your institution a member of an HEA Title II Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Education?

<https://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>

- Yes  
 No

If yes, provide the following:

AWARD YEAR

GRANTEE NAME

PROJECT NAME

GRANT NUMBER

LIST PARTNER DISTRICTS/LEAS (ONE PER LINE)

LIST OTHER PARTNERS (ONE PER LINE)

PROJECT TYPE

- Residency
- Pre-baccalaureate
- Both Residency and Pre-baccalaureate

# List of Programs

On this page, review the list of teacher preparation programs offered by your institution of higher education (IHE) or organization. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this list of programs is pre-loaded from your prior year's report. If your IHE offers both traditional and alternative programs, be sure to enter the programs in the appropriate reports. For the traditional report, list all traditional programs within the IHE. For the alternative report, list all alternative programs within the IHE. You may edit, delete, and insert new rows as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page. The system will automatically total the number of programs for you.

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Program Information](#)

## Program Information

List each teacher preparation program included in your traditional route. Indicate if your program or programs participate in a Teacher Quality Partnership Grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Education as described at <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/awards.html>.

Teacher Preparation Programs	Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Member?	Update
Art	No	
Biology	No	
Biology (CCG)	No	
Birth to Five	No	
Broad Field Science	No	
Chemistry	No	
Curriculum and Instruction	No	
Early Childhood Education	No	
Educational Leadership	No	
English	No	
Health and Physical Education	No	
History	No	
Interrelated Special Education/ECE	No	
Mathematics	No	
Middle Grades	No	

Total number of teacher preparation programs: 21

Teacher Preparation Programs	Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Member?	Update
Middle Grades (CCG)	No	
Music	No	
Physics	No	
Post-Baccalaureate Initial Teacher Certification	No	
Spanish	No	
Special Education-Early Childhood Education (CCG)	No	

**Total number of teacher preparation programs: 21**

# Program Requirements

On this page, review and enter information about the program requirements for admission into the program, program completion, and supervised clinical experience. If you submitted an IPRC last year, much of this page is pre-loaded from your prior year's report. If your IHE offers both traditional and alternative programs, be sure to specify the requirements in the appropriate reports. For the traditional report, provide the requirements for traditional programs within the IHE. For the alternative report, provide the requirements for the alternative programs within the IHE.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Admissions](#)
- >> [Undergraduate Requirements](#)
- >> [Postgraduate Requirements](#)
- >> [Supervised Clinical Experience](#)

## Admissions

1. Indicate when students are formally admitted into your initial teacher certification program:

Junior year



If Other, please specify:

2. Does your initial teacher certification program conditionally admit students?

- Yes  
 No

3. Provide a link to your website where additional information about admissions requirements can be found:

<https://ung.edu/college-of-education/admissions.php>

4. Please provide any additional information about or exceptions to the admissions information provided above:

Students applying to the Master of Arts in Teaching program may be provisionally/conditionally admitted if the GPA is below the required 2.75. These candidates may take up to nine hours of graduate credit during the first semester before having their application re-reviewed to determine eligibility after the completion of this first probationary semester. These provisional admits cannot earn less than a grade of B during this first semester. No other initial certification programs conditionally or provisionally admit students. For all other initial certification programs, admissions requirements must be met by the time the students begin the program in the fall or spring of their junior year. Our Elementary/Special Education and Middle Grades programs begin in the fall semester of each year (August), while our Secondary Education and P-12 programs, including Physical Education, Art, and Music, begin in the spring semester of each year (January).

## Undergraduate Requirements

Please provide the following information about your teacher preparation program's entry and exit requirements. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(C\)\(i\)](#))

1. Are there initial teacher certification programs at the undergraduate level?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the undergraduate level. If no, leave the rest of the page blank (or [clear responses already entered](#)) then click save at the bottom of the page.

Element	Required for Entry	Required for Exit
Transcript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Fingerprint check	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Background check	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum ACT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum SAT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum basic skills test score	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Recommendation(s)	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Essay or personal statement	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Interview	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Other Specify: <input type="text" value="Pre-education coursework, pre-service certification, additional assessments"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

2. What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

3. What was the median GPA of individuals accepted into the program in academic year 2016-17?

4. What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

5. What was the median GPA of individuals completing the program in academic year 2016-17?

6. Please provide any additional information about the information provided above:

For our pre-education students, they complete the entirety of their core (first 60 hours) prior to admissions; this includes three entry-level, foundational education courses with 40 hours of observation experiences in schools. Before embarking on these early observation experiences, students complete an online certified background check, the results from which are submitted directly to our Admissions Coordinator for review. Students are required to complete their core coursework with a 2.75 GPA or higher, and they must make a "C" or higher in their early education courses mentioned above and in English 1101. In terms of applying to the College of Education, as per Georgia Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) requirements, students must pass the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Program Admissions Assessment prior to acceptance into an EPP. Students,

however, may exempt this assessment with qualifying ACT or SAT scores (a combined score of 1000 or higher on the verbal and math portions of the SAT or a combined score of 43 or higher on the verbal and math portions of the ACT). We marked that SAT and ACT scores are not required, but many of our students choose this option over taking the GACE Program Admissions. Additionally, the College of Education's application includes paperwork for the state of Georgia's pre-service certification process, a requirement for all students seeking admission to an EPP in our state. The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) conducts a background check on all applicants prior to issuing the pre-service certificate, the first level of our state's tiered certification process. This process does not include a fingerprint check. Prior to being issued a pre-service certificate, students must also attempt the GACE Educator Ethics Entry Exam (they do not have to pass; they must attempt only). In order to be recommended for certification upon graduation, however, candidates must complete and pass the GACE Educator Ethics Exit Exam. They must also attempt the GACE content area tests for their chosen field, and they must attempt the edTPA assessment through Pearson. These are requirements for certification and for program completion (for reporting purposes) but not for graduation.

## Postgraduate Requirements

Please provide the following information about your teacher preparation program's entry and exit requirements. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(C\)\(i\)](#))

1. Are there initial teacher certification programs at the postgraduate level?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, for each element listed below, indicate if it is required for admission into or exit from any of your teacher preparation program(s) at the postgraduate level. If no, leave the rest of the page blank (or [clear responses already entered](#)) then click save at the bottom of the page.

Element	Required for Entry	Required for Exit
Transcript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Fingerprint check	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Background check	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Minimum ACT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum SAT score	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Minimum basic skills test score	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Recommendation(s)	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Essay or personal statement	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Interview	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Other Specify: <input type="text" value="None"/>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

2. What is the minimum GPA required for admission into the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)



3. What was the median GPA of individuals accepted into the program in academic year 2016-17?

3.9

4. What is the minimum GPA required for completing the program? (Leave blank if you indicated that a minimum GPA is not required in the table above.)

3

5. What was the median GPA of individuals completing the program in academic year 2016-17?

3.9

6. Please provide any additional information about the information provided above:

The Post Baccalaureate and Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) initial certification programs require that applicants have completed an undergraduate degree with at least a 2.75 overall GPA. As with the undergraduate initial certification programs, the Post Baccalaureate and MAT programs also require students to go through the Georgia Professional Standards Commission's (GaPSC) pre-service certification process prior to beginning either program. The GAPSC now handles the background check for this process, and there is no longer a fingerprint requirement. This also means that students will have taken the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Educator Ethics Entry Exam prior to admission. Additionally, students must have taken and passed the GACE Program Admissions and content-level assessments for their chosen concentration field prior to admission (this is an admission requirement). Prior to graduation, candidates must have attempted the edTPA portfolio provided through Pearson and the GACE Educator Ethics Exam. Candidates must pass each assessment in order to be recommended for certification and to be completed within our state system.

## Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2016-17. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(C\)\(iii\)](#), [§205\(a\)\(1\)\(C\)\(iv\)](#))

[Additional guidance on reporting supervised clinical experience and nonclinical coursework.](#)

Average number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching	396
Average number of clock hours required for student teaching	680
Average number of clock hours required for mentoring/induction support	32
Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year	34
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE and PreK-12 staff)	30
Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	423

Please provide any additional information about or descriptions of the supervised clinical experiences:

The average number of clock hours varies for our programs because of the length of each. All two-year programs, which include Elementary/Special Education and Middle Grades, have a yearlong internship during the senior year, and candidates are also in the schools the entirety of their junior year. In fact, our Elementary/Special Education program has two yearlong placements. Our middle grades candidates are in the school for two entire years, but only the senior placement is yearlong, as these candidates also have an elementary placement to cover all required grade bands for certification. These programs, which make up our majority of students, incur more field placement hours than our other degree pathways. Our Secondary and P-12 programs, which include history, mathematics, English, the sciences, physical education, art, and music, are three-semester programs, so their field placement hours are somewhat lower. Additionally, our Post Baccalaureate and MAT programs are one year (a yearlong placement), which means their overall hours are

lower. All clinical experiences are supervised by full-time or part-time faculty, with each faculty member being assigned to a particular school and a group of students placed within that school (approximately eight students per faculty member). Faculty are expected to visit their school and students at least once per week. They are not required to conduct a formal observation each week, but they are required to have a presence at the school and be available for their teacher candidates, as expected for a Professional Development School model. This model makes it easier for faculty to build relationships with school personnel as well. Faculty have specific guidelines for documenting their time with their interns, to be turned in via LiveText, and these guidelines include submitting weekly or biweekly reports, conducting formal observations utilizing our Intern Keys observation tool, conducting informal observations utilizing a short form, checking students logged hours in LiveText, completing a summative end-of-semester Intern keys for teacher candidates, documenting regular meetings with candidates and their mentor teachers, completing a dispositions assessment tool on candidates at least twice per semester, and completing a final exit interview with candidates during the spring of their senior year. Additionally, students are each assigned a mentor teacher (teacher of record) within their classroom. These appointments of mentor teachers are decided upon jointly by school administrators and university faculty. Mentors must have at least three years of teaching experience in the field of the teacher candidate (and currently be teaching in that same field), and they cannot have received less than a three on their last three years of teaching evaluations (on a scale of one to four). Teachers in the state of Georgia are evaluated utilizing the Teacher Keys assessment, upon which our Intern Keys is based, and level three is the expected level of performance for teachers in our state. Mentor teachers also turn in documentation via LiveText regarding their time with their teacher candidates. They fill out our Intern Keys evaluation instrument and our dispositions assessments each semester, and they document hours and time spent with candidates weekly or biweekly. In terms of evaluation of clinical experiences, at the end of each semester, teacher candidates have the opportunity to provide feedback on both their university supervisors and mentor teachers through an evaluation sent out via LiveText. Starting this year, all mentor teachers will be given a survey at the end of each year to evaluate our programs, processes, assessments, faculty, and students. Also in reference to evaluation and data collection, all clinical experiences are linked directly to coursework in an effort to bridge theory and practice. Candidates are given specific assignments during their courses that they then fulfill within their assigned K-12 classrooms. These key assessments are collected via LiveText for data reporting purposes. Results are collected each year for our SACSCOC report and are shared with faculty workgroups for overall planning purposes and program improvement.

# Enrollment

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Enrollment](#)

On this page, enter the number of candidates for an initial teaching credential who are enrolled in the initial teacher preparation programs within your institution of higher education (IHE) or organization. **Do not** report on the total number of students enrolled in the entire IHE. **Do not** include individuals who currently hold a teaching credential and are seeking additional licenses or endorsements, or individuals preparing for school-based careers other than classroom teachers (e.g., administrators, guidance counselors).

The Department recognizes that in many cases, candidates voluntarily report their race/ethnicity and gender data, and that in some cases, candidates may choose not to report this information. Please report on the race/ethnicity data you have available, though the data may not be complete. It is not expected that the sum of the enrolled students reported by race/ethnicity or by gender will necessarily equal the total number of students enrolled.

If your IHE offers both traditional and alternative programs, be sure to enter the candidates enrolled in the appropriate reports. For the traditional report, provide only the candidates enrolled in traditional programs within the IHE. For the alternative report, provide only the candidates enrolled in the alternative programs within the IHE.

After entering the enrollment data, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## Enrollment

For the purpose of Title II reporting, an enrolled student is defined as a student who has been admitted to a teacher preparation program, but who has not completed the program during the academic year being reported. An individual who completed the program during the academic year being reported is counted as a program completer and *not* an enrolled student.

### [Additional guidance on reporting race and ethnicity data.](#)

Total number of students enrolled in 2016-17	<input type="text" value="485"/>
Unduplicated number of males enrolled in 2016-17	<input type="text" value="83"/>
Unduplicated number of females enrolled in 2016-17	<input type="text" value="402"/>

Provide the number of students in the teacher preparation program in the following categories. Note that you must report on the number of students by ethnicity and race separately. Individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino will be reported in one of the race categories. Also note that individuals can belong to one or more racial groups, so the sum of the members of each racial category may not necessarily add up to the total number of students enrolled. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(C\)\(ii\)\(H\)](#))

2016-17	Number Enrolled
<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Hispanic/Latino of any race	<input type="text" value="21"/>
<i>Race</i>	

2016-17

Number Enrolled

American Indian or Alaska Native

2

Asian

8

Black or African American

11

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

0

White

417

Two or more races

16

## Teachers Prepared

On this page, enter the number of program completers by the subject area in which they were prepared to teach, and by their academic majors. Note that an individual can be counted in more than one academic major and subject area. For example, if an individual is prepared to teach Elementary Education and Mathematics, that individual should be counted in both subject areas. If no individuals were prepared in a particular academic major or subject area, you may leave the cell blank. Please use the "Other" category sparingly, if there is no similar subject area or academic major listed. In these cases, you should use the text box to describe the subject area(s) and/or the academic major(s) counted in the "Other" category.

If your IHE offers both traditional and alternative programs, be sure to enter the program completers in the appropriate reports. For the traditional report, provide only the program completers in traditional programs within the IHE. For the alternative report, provide only the program completers for the alternative programs within the IHE.

After entering the teachers prepared data, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

### THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Teachers Prepared by Subject Area](#)
- >> [Teachers Prepared by Academic Major](#)

## Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by subject area for academic year 2016-17. For the purposes of this section, number prepared means the number of program completers. "Subject area" refers to the subject area(s) an individual has been prepared to teach. An individual can be counted in more than one subject area. If no individuals were prepared in a particular subject area, please leave that cell blank. ([§205\(b\)\(1\)\(H\)](#))

[Additional guidance on reporting teachers prepared by subject area.](#)

### What are CIP Codes?

No teachers prepared in academic year 2016-17

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.01	Education - General	<input type="text"/>
13.10	Teacher Education - Special Education	108
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	<input type="text"/>
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	149
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	30
13.1205	Teacher Education - Secondary Education	17
13.1206	Teacher Education - Multiple Levels	10

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1206	Teacher Education - Multiple Levels	10
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	7
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	1
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	23
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	14
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	31
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	3
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	14
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	2
13.1316	Teacher Education - Science Teacher Education/General Science	14
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	16
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	
13.1319	Teacher Education - Technical Education	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	4
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
13.1325	Teacher Education - French	
13.1326	Teacher Education - German	
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	11
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1330	Teacher Education - Spanish	<input type="text"/>
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	<input type="text"/>
13.1332	Teacher Education - Geography	<input type="text"/>
13.1333	Teacher Education - Latin	<input type="text"/>
13.1335	Teacher Education - Psychology	<input type="text"/>
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	<input type="text"/>
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	<input type="text"/>
13.02	Teacher Education - Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education	<input type="text"/>
13.99	Education - Other Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

## Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2016-17. For the purposes of this section, number prepared means the number of program completers. "Academic major" refers to the actual major(s) declared by the program completer. An individual can be counted in more than one academic major. If no individuals were prepared in a particular academic major, please leave that cell blank. ([§205\(b\)\(1\)\(H\)](#))

Please note that the list of majors includes several "Teacher Education" majors, as well as several noneducation majors. Please use care in entering your majors to ensure education-specific majors and non-education majors are counted correctly. For example, if an individual majored in Chemistry, that individual should be counted in the "Chemistry" academic major category rather than the "Teacher Education–Chemistry" category.

[Additional guidance on reporting teachers prepared by academic major.](#)

### What are CIP Codes?

No teachers prepared in academic year 2016-17

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.01	Education - General	<input type="text"/>
13.10	Teacher Education - Special Education	108
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	<input type="text"/>
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	149
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	30
13.1205	Teacher Education - Secondary Education	17

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	<input type="text"/>
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	7
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	1
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	23
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	<input type="text"/>
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	14
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	<input type="text"/>
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	<input type="text"/>
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	31
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	3
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	14
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	2
13.1316	Teacher Education - Science	14
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	16
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	<input type="text"/>
13.1319	Teacher Education - Technical Education	<input type="text"/>
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	<input type="text"/>
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	4
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	<input type="text"/>
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	<input type="text"/>
13.1325	Teacher Education - French	<input type="text"/>
13.1326	Teacher Education - German	<input type="text"/>
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	11
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	<input type="text"/>
13.1330	Teacher Education - Spanish	<input type="text"/>



CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	<input type="text"/>
13.1332	Teacher Education - Geography	<input type="text"/>
13.1333	Teacher Education - Latin	<input type="text"/>
13.1335	Teacher Education - Psychology	<input type="text"/>
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	<input type="text"/>
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	<input type="text"/>
13.02	Teacher Education - Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education	<input type="text"/>
13.03	Education - Curriculum and Instruction	<input type="text"/>
13.09	Education - Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education	<input type="text"/>
24	Liberal Arts/Humanities	<input type="text"/>
42	Psychology	<input type="text"/>
45.01	Social Sciences	<input type="text"/>
45.02	Anthropology	<input type="text"/>
45.06	Economics	<input type="text"/>
45.07	Geography and Cartography	<input type="text"/>
45.10	Political Science and Government	<input type="text"/>
45.11	Sociology	<input type="text"/>
50	Visual and Performing Arts	<input type="text"/>
54	History	<input type="text"/>
16	Foreign Languages	<input type="text"/>
19	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	<input type="text"/>
23	English Language/Literature	<input type="text"/>
38	Philosophy and Religious Studies	<input type="text"/>
01	Agriculture	<input type="text"/>
09	Communication or Journalism	<input type="text"/>

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
14	Engineering	<input type="text"/>
26	Biology	<input type="text"/>
27	Mathematics and Statistics	<input type="text"/>
40.01	Physical Sciences	<input type="text"/>
40.02	Astronomy and Astrophysics	<input type="text"/>
40.04	Atmospheric Sciences and Meteorology	<input type="text"/>
40.05	Chemistry	<input type="text"/>
40.06	Geological and Earth Sciences/Geosciences	<input type="text"/>
40.08	Physics	<input type="text"/>
52	Business/Business Administration/Accounting	<input type="text"/>
11	Computer and Information Sciences	<input type="text"/>
99	Other Specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

## Program Completers

On this page, enter the total number of individuals who completed the program in AY 2016-17 and the two prior academic years. If you submitted an IPRC last year, the number of program completers for the two prior academic years are pre-loaded from your prior year's report.

A program completer is a person who has 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. In applying this definition, the fact that an individual has or has not been recommended to the state for initial certification or licensure may not be used as a criterion for determining who is a program completer.

An individual cannot be classified as both enrolled and as a program completer at the same time. An enrolled individual is not a program completer. Once an individual has met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program and becomes a program completer, the individual is no longer classified as enrolled.

After entering the program completers, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Program Completers](#)

## Program Completers

Provide the total number of teacher preparation program completers in each of the following academic years.

2016-17	<input type="text" value="245"/>
2015-16	<input type="text" value="243"/>
2014-15	<input type="text" value="289"/>

# Annual Goals

On this page, review the annual goals in each subject area listed below. If you submitted an IPRC last year, the goals you entered last year are pre-loaded from your prior year's report. Please respond to the questions to report on progress towards the goals, and set new goals for the next academic year.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

- >> [Annual Goals - Mathematics](#)
- >> [Annual Goals - Science](#)
- >> [Annual Goals - Special Education](#)
- >> [Annual Goals - Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students](#)
- >> [Assurances](#)

## Annual Goals - Mathematics

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(A\)\(ii\)](#), [§206\(a\)](#))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html>.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in mathematics in each of three academic years.

### Academic year 2016-17

1. Did your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2016-17?

- Yes
- No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

2. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in mathematics in 2016-17?

10

3. Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in mathematics in 2016-17?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

We did not meet our originally proposed goal of adding 10 teachers trained in mathematics in the 2016-2017 academic year. In fact, we actually went down from 38 completers trained in mathematics to 31 completers, so we lost seven students rather than gaining 10. We are working with our mathematics department, however, to increase these numbers, and we will elaborate on these strategies in the space below. In looking at our past numbers, we have realized, as well, that 10 is a lofty goal for a relatively small mathematics program. Moving forward, we need to be a bit more realistic in our recruitment goals.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

Although we did not meet our goal, we have learned that the strategies that we were taking to increase our number of middle grades and secondary mathematics teacher candidates were not enough. Our secondary mathematics program is one of three programs (along with art and music) that actually does not run through our College of Education (COE). Although we handle the admissions and acceptance process and we have these students

in their pre-education foundational courses (three required courses for admissions and acceptance into the COE), we do not teach these students again after the point of admissions. Rather, the students work solely with the faculty in the mathematics department. We have noted in previous years, however, that we need to make the bridge stronger between the Teacher Education and Mathematics departments. Students have requested this in the past, and they have noted that they often receive very little communication from the COE, which is something on which we knew we needed to work. We have made steps in the past year to better connect with the department, and we will continue to do so. These steps and future plans are described in the space below.

**6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:**

This past year, the secondary mathematics program coordinator has been wonderful in terms of connecting to and interacting with the College of Education (COE). We have a strong relationship with the coordinator (who has been in her role for two years--the first of which was the 2016-2017 reporting year under review here). The development of this strong relationship is the first step in creating the most supportive environment for our shared students. For the first time, this secondary mathematics coordinator is a member of our Assessment Committee in the COE, she is a member of our Advisory Council, and she attends COE meetings related to data, supervision, and overall program improvement. She works closely, as well, with our Director of Field Placement and our EdTPA Coordinator. We will continue to work closely with her to cultivate an even stronger relationship in the future. Last year, we also noted that we would work on building relationships with local middle and high schools in hopes of providing our current majors with increased opportunities for diverse field placements. Additionally, we saw this as an opportunity to reach out to local high-school students interested in majoring in mathematics in the hope that they would choose the University of North Georgia when making college decisions. To help us achieve these goals, we created a position for a Diversity and Recruitment Coordinator to assist with these efforts. The person who is currently in this role is a faculty member within the COE who receives a small stipend and one course release per semester to assist with the work of recruitment--particularly recruitment of students of color and other underrepresented students. What we realized, however, was that one faculty member with limited time to dedicate to this role is really not enough to make the necessary changes. While this individual has done a great job, she has only so much time because this not her primary role. For this reason, we have created an additional new role, which we will report on next year (this is her first year in this role). This role is our Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships. This 12-month staff role is dedicated specifically to developing strong relationships with our P-12 partner schools and to working with our educator pathway programs for recruitment purposes. (These pathways include high-school electives designed specifically for those interested in teaching and potentially resulting in credit for a required pre-education course.) This individual will be able to help us establish stronger Professional Development Schools for our middle and secondary students, including those in secondary mathematics, and she will be able to speak with high-school and middle-school students about the possibilities of becoming a mathematics educator. Moreover, this person will be charged with helping to cover other recruitment events, including middle grades and high-school career fairs--as we have not had enough individuals to help us meet the number of incoming requests. Last year, we reported, as well, on our decision to require mandatory advising sessions for our secondary students. As noted above and in previous reports, we have heard from our secondary mathematics majors that they did not receive enough advisement from the College of Education, as their program is mostly housed in the mathematics department. For the past two years, we have offered these mandatory advising sessions. We will continue to do so to ensure that our students are aware of admissions deadlines and requirements. We will continue to work closely with the mathematics coordinator on advising, data review, and program planning. The coordinator is working with us currently to revise several required mathematics education courses, including elementary, middle grades, and secondary mathematics courses. Additionally, she has worked closely with our local high school mathematics department this year to help strengthen this particular Professional Development School relationship, and we fully believe that her efforts are steadily strengthening current student support, the results of which will be seen in recruitment efforts as well.

**Academic year 2017-18**

**7. Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2017-18?**

- Yes
- No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

**8. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in mathematics in 2017-18?**

2

**9. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:**

While we had planned (several years back) to add ten teachers in the 2016-2017 year, we realized after last year's report that we needed to be more realistic give our past numbers. Having tended to average around 6 graduates per year in the secondary program (more in the middle grades program), we had planned plan to increase our mathematics student population by two for the 2017-2018 academic year. We overestimated for our 2016-2017 number and realize that we need to start with small growth and move forward from there. As noted above, we will continue to build relationships with the faculty in the mathematics department, as they manage all aspects of our secondary mathematics department. We will continue to invite mathematics faculty and the secondary mathematics coordinator to participate in College of Education (COE) meetings, workshops, and committees. We will work with our Coordinator for Diversity and Recruitment Initiatives and our Director of Clinical Engagement and Community partnerships to increase and diversity our middle and secondary student population and to provide strong Professional Development School settings with our local middle and

secondary school partners. In this same area, we will continue our recruitment efforts at local recruitment fairs to increase our numbers in secondary mathematics. With the development of this new staff role, mentioned above, we will have a dedicated individual who can build relationships and work specifically on recruitment initiatives for our critical needs areas such as middle and secondary mathematics. Additionally, we will continue to work on pre-program advising efforts with our secondary mathematics education students to ensure that their questions are being answered and their needs are being met. Our professional advisors will offer advising sessions for pre-program students, and they will reach out to in-program students to ensure they have continuous contact with the College of Education.

## Academic year 2018-19

10. Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2018-19?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

11. How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in mathematics in 2018-19?

2

12. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Again, we will continue to be realistic about our numbers, and thus we are erring on the low side with two (in addition to the 2017-2018 number). Our numbers in middle and secondary education fluctuate each year, and one of our goals will be to find out why. We need to make a more concerted effort to evaluate students upon entry and exit to discover the types of supports students need. We currently survey students, but these surveys focus more on content and field placement rather than other supports, including financial, academic, and social strategies for keeping students in colleges and helping them graduate. Additionally, we will continue to work on advising, building relationships with partner schools, recruiting in local high schools, and maintaining and continuing to build upon our relationship with our Mathematics Department in an effort to increase these numbers. A second goal, in the future, would be to work with our Secondary Mathematics coordinator to target specific efforts for recruiting and retaining mathematics teacher candidates. As a sub-goal here, we would like for the individual in our new staff role (Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships) to meet with the secondary mathematics program coordinator in an effort to brainstorm about specific recruitment strategies. Thirdly, our STEM faculty also plan to continue to pursue grants that would help us recruit students in this area by providing scholarship opportunities. This effort, of course, is not a given, but our faculty in this area are actively working on grants dedicated to these efforts. Lastly, we are working on expanding our field placement options into a new county in the greater Atlanta area. We will not likely see the impact of this new relationship until the 2018-2019 reporting year. We will gradually expand into this region in 2017-2018, but we hope for growth in this region, and we anticipate that this will impact our overall numbers as well.

## Annual Goals - Science

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students.  [\(§205\(a\)\(1\)\(A\)\(ii\), §206\(a\)\)](#)

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html>.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in science in each of three academic years.

### Academic year 2016-17

1. Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2016-17?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

2. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in science in 2016-17?

### 3. Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in science in 2016-17?

- Yes  
 No  
 Not applicable

### 4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

While we had developed strategies, as will be described below, we did not meet our goal. As with mathematics, we actually decreased in the area of science from 29 teachers prepared in 2015-2016 to 18 teachers prepared in 2016-2017. In working to increase our numbers for science education, we have learned lessons, as we will describe, and, based on these lessons, we will continue to seek new ways to increase our recruitment in this area. We realized with science, as with mathematics, we have to be realistic in our numbers, which may mean starting small and then growing from there.

### 5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

As described in the section on mathematics, we worked to provide all of our secondary majors advising, as this was not an area provided previously. All of our secondary students have advisors in their primary content area, yet they are not assigned advisors from the College of Education (COE). As a result, many of our secondary majors noted that they felt disconnected from the COE and its required processes, including admissions, pre-service certification, testing, certification, and so forth. For this reason, we wanted to be sure to improve the communications pathways for students going into secondary education, including science majors. We are now providing mandatory advising sessions each year for secondary education majors to ensure that they have the information they need to be successful. We realize that we need to continue to enhance communications, including the development of permanent COE advisors for our secondary students (in addition to their primary content advisors). Additionally, as noted in the section on mathematics, we also created a position for a Diversity and Recruitment Coordinator. This individual was meant to help with recruitment purposes, particularly the recruitment of students of color and underrepresented students. Moreover, this person was meant to focus on middle and high school visits and partnership development. Secondary education recruitment in science is just one part of this larger role. This position was given to a current faculty member who received a small stipend and a course release per semester. This last reporting year was the first year of this position. One lesson we quickly learned was that this was not a job for one person, and it was not a job that could be done in the amount of time granted to this individual. Thus, we created a 12-month staff position entitled Director of Clinical Partnerships and Community Engagement. The purpose of this individual was to assist in developing and further strengthening our current P-12 partnerships, particularly with our middle and high school partners. Additionally, this individual was meant to focus on recruitment, visiting high school and middle school pathways programs and attending college and career fairs. Part of this individual's role includes secondary recruitment. As this is the first year of implementation for this role, we will have more to report on the successes or lessons learned regarding this role in the next reporting cycle. We have learned, thus far, that we need this individual to coordinate with our content areas, such as science, to ensure that our communication pathways are strong and to collaborate on recruitment strategies particular to the sciences. We realize that we need to be more targeted in our recruitment efforts for our science and mathematics secondary programs. Lastly, we also developed the BSED in Biology, Chemistry, and Physics, which was meant to ease the burden on many students of going over the 120-hour bachelor's degree credit hour requirements. While undoubtedly helpful on our students from a financial perspective, we understand that we need to do a better job of advertising these science education pathways and of working with our science content counterparts in advertising and promoting these degrees.

### 6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

With the plan to focus on retention and recruitment, we wanted to see an increase in the number of prospective science teachers in 2016-2017 and in 2017-2018. We did not meet our goal for 2016-2017. As noted, we did place a faculty member in the role of Diversity Initiatives Coordinator to work on a recruitment plan, particularly focusing on diverse populations. We quickly realized, however, that one faculty member was not enough—our 30-county reach is far too extensive to have one faculty member responsible for recruitment and relationship building with our partner school districts. As noted, we now have a full-time staff member dedicated to recruitment and community engagement efforts (relationship building with our school partners). Even so, we believe this area needs additional focus, as our programs are large in number and spread over a large geographical region. Next year, our goal is to continue to work with our colleagues in other departments and our department heads in our secondary content areas to provide students with the necessary advising supports and to development a recruitment plan to meet our areas of need, including science, mathematics, special education, and English for Speakers of Other Languages.

## Academic year 2017-18

### 7. Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2017-18?

- Yes

No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

8. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in science in 2017-18?

2

9. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

While we would like to increase our numbers substantially in these areas, we also want to be realistic in our abilities, particularly keeping our past reporting years in mind regarding numbers. We will continue the efforts with advisement, recruitment, and collaboration across disciplines mentioned above. Our department head will continue to emphasize the new Bachelors of Science in Education degrees in biology, chemistry, and physics, and we will continue to talk with local high-school students and current University of North Georgia students to recruit new students into these BSEDs. With our roles of Coordinator of Diversity and Recruitment and Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships, we will work to visit more high schools and career fairs to promote our secondary education degrees, including science. We will work with these two individuals, as well, to develop an in-depth strategic, five-year recruitment plan with a particular emphasis on our critical needs areas, including the sciences, mathematics, special education, and English for Speakers of Other Languages.

### Academic year 2018-19

10. Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2018-19?

Yes

No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

11. How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in science in 2018-19?

1

12. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

As noted above, we want to be realistic in our abilities, particularly keeping our past reporting years in mind regarding numbers. We will continue the efforts with advisement, recruitment, and collaboration across disciplines mentioned above. Our department head will continue to emphasize the new Bachelors of Science in Education degrees in biology, chemistry, and physics, and we will continue to talk with local high-school students and current University of North Georgia students to recruit new students into these BSEDs. With our roles of Coordinator of Diversity and Recruitment and Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships, we will work to visit more high schools and career fairs to promote our secondary education degrees, including science. We will work with these two individuals, as well, to develop an in-depth strategic recruitment plan with a particular emphasis on our critical needs areas, including the sciences, mathematics, special education, and English for Speakers of Other Languages. By the 2018-2019 year, we anticipate having a fully functioning and fully supported (regarding budget and personnel) five-year recruitment plan. We anticipate that this will help us increase our numbers. Additionally, our STEM faculty are continuing to apply for grants meant to increase the numbers of students entering into STEM education. Lastly, we are in the process of developing two science endorsements. While this may not help us in recruiting initial certification candidates in science, we hope that we can attract current teachers who want to add to their certification with an emphasis in science. We hope that these endorsements will be in place by the 2018-2019 academic year. Additionally, we are working on expanding our field placement options into a new county in the greater Atlanta area. We will not likely see the impact of this new relationship until the 2018-2019 reporting year. We will gradually expand into this region in 2017-2018, but we hope for growth in this region, and we anticipate that this will impact our overall numbers as well.

## Annual Goals - Special Education

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(A\)\(ii\)](#), [§206\(a\)](#))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html>.



Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in special education in each of three academic years.

## Academic year 2016-17

1. Did your program prepare teachers in special education in 2016-17?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

2. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in special education in 2016-17?

5

3. Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in special education in 2016-17?

- Yes  
 No  
 Not applicable

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

We did not meet our goals for this past year for our Elementary/Special Education dual degree program, which is our only program dedicated to the preparation of special educators. While we had 107 program completers in 2015-2016 prepared in special education, we had 108 program completers in 2016-2017, thus increasing only by one for this reporting year rather than 5. As we will describe below in additional detail, we are actually at capacity in regards to this program, so we do not want to increase by a large margin. We do, however, want to keep our numbers consistent so that we can adequately support our students in our Elementary/Special Education program and so that we can prepare the strongest possible special educators for the state of Georgia.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

Our Elementary/Special Education (ELE) dual degree program is our only program that prepares teacher candidates to be special educators. While this program has remained consistent in number over the past couple of years, we saw increases after our consolidation and after the discontinuation of our evening Early Childhood Care and Education program and our evening Early Childhood Education program (many of the students who would have entered into these programs during junior year joined our full-time, daytime ELE program). We want these numbers to remain consistent because we are close to capacity in terms of being able to serve our students (due to the number of faculty and our Professional Development Community approach, which will be described in more detail below). In terms of recruitment, as with our other programs, our Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships will work with this program, as well, for recruitment purposes. She is making connections with Teacher Pathways programs, which consist mostly of high-school students interested in elementary education (which is also our SPED degree program). The Director herself is a former special education teacher of the year, and this area is her passion. She is the perfect spokesperson for encouraging and motivating future special education teachers. Additionally, she is working with a local school district to create a "grow your own" model for special education, which is also described in additional detail below. She is also attending recruitment fairs at local high schools and colleges, and for this reporting year, we hosted our first Future Georgia Educators Day in collaboration with the Professional Association for Georgia Educators (PAGE). PAGE brings in high-school students from across the state to visit our College of Education for the day, and this provides us with the opportunity to showcase our programs and recruit future educators in all of our critical needs areas.

6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

In terms of special education preparation, our Elementary /Special Education (ELE/SPED) bachelor's program is a dual degree that should result in certification in both areas (upon successful completion of all requirements). As noted in last year's report, however, the ELE/SPED dual degree is almost at capacity in regard to our abilities to serve our students. While we would like to increase our numbers, these increases must be small given our number of faculty and faculty supervisors. Additionally, our ELE/SPED program functions in a Professional Development Community (PDC) model, meaning our students are in yearlong placements at one school and one faculty member is assigned to each school (approximately eight students per school). This past year, we had to increase our number of PDCs from six to seven given our student numbers. Having more than eight students per school can be a burden on the school, and we want to ensure that our partnerships remain strong and that we are not over-inundating a school with teacher candidates. In at least half of these PDCs, our students take their college courses in local elementary schools so that they can easily observe teachers and practice their own teaching. Space in these schools is also limited, and each cohort can serve only a limited number of students. Teacher education programs in the state of Georgia have seen decreases in numbers in the past couple of years, and while our numbers have remained consistent, we anticipate that our institution could see a decline as well. We saw growth over the past few years, in part, due to our consolidation of Gainesville State College and North Georgia College and State University and to the elimination of both the Early Childhood Education and Early

Childhood Care and Education (birth to five) programs. The elimination of these programs resulted in the movement of some students to the only other elementary option, the dual degree in ELE/SPED. Four years past consolidation, however, we have seen these numbers stabilize.

### Academic year 2017-18

7. Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2017-18?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

8. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in special education in 2017-18?

5

9. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

As noted above, our Elementary Education/Special Education dual degree program is our largest program and currently close to capacity in terms of serving students. We will continue to expand our Professional Development Community (PDC) model, as noted above, to meet our program needs as our budget allows. We are at the mercy of our annual budget, however, in terms of hiring and adding new faculty lines. As it currently stands, we have to do less recruitment for this program than any of our other offerings. If we see the numbers begin to fall, however, we will expand our recruitment efforts. Our new Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships has been tasked with visiting our teacher pathways program across our service region. These teacher pathways programs are developed for high-school students who think that they may be interested in a career in teaching, and they can take up to three elective courses. Completion of the three electives and a state-created test can result in college credit for one of our pre-education required courses (EDUC 2110: Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education). The majority of students in these programs are interested in elementary education, and if recruited, they would enter our ELE/SPED dual degree program, as this is the only elementary certification option available at our institution. As the 2017-2018 academic year is the first year of this position, we will be able to report on these efforts next year in terms of success with recruitment or areas for improvement.

### Academic year 2018-19

10. Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2018-19?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

11. How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in special education in 2018-19?

1

12. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

Again, we expect that our numbers within our Elementary Education/Special Education dual degree program will remain consistent of the next couple of years. We will continue to cultivate our Professional Development Community (PDC) partnerships, as our budget allows. If we see the numbers fall in this next reporting cycle, we will expand our recruitment efforts. Our new Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships has been tasked with visiting our teacher pathways program across our service region. These teacher pathways programs are developed for high-school students who think that they may be interested in a career in teaching, and they can take up to three elective courses. Completion of the three electives and a state-created test can result in college credit for one of our pre-education required courses (EDUC 2110: Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education). The majority of students in these programs are interested in elementary education, and if recruited, they would enter our ELE/SPED dual degree program, as this is the only elementary certification option available at our institution. Our Director is also working with a local community to develop a "Grow Your Own" program in regard to special education. This partner district has recruited the first group for the 2018-2019 academic year, and these students will intern in the county's schools for their senior year and will be offered a position upon graduation. As this program and the Director position mentioned above have just started, we will have more to report on these efforts in the next two years in terms of success with recruitment or areas for improvement. Additionally, we are working on expanding our PDC model into a new county in the greater Atlanta area. We will not likely see the impact of this new relationship until the 2018-2019 reporting year. We will gradually expand into this region in 2017-2018, but we hope for growth in this region, and we anticipate that this will impact our overall numbers as well.

# Annual Goals - Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students

Each institution of higher education (IHE) that conducts a traditional teacher preparation program (including programs that offer any ongoing professional development programs) or alternative route to state credential program, and that enrolls students receiving Federal assistance under this Act, shall set annual quantifiable goals for increasing the number of prospective teachers trained in teacher shortage areas designated by the Secretary or by the state educational agency, including mathematics, science, special education, and instruction of limited English proficient students. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(A\)\(ii\)](#), [§206\(a\)](#))

Information about teacher shortage areas can be found at <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.html>.

Please provide the information below about your program's goals to increase the number of prospective teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in each of three academic years.

## Academic year 2016-17

1. Did your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2016-17?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

2. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2016-17?

5

3. Did your program meet the goal for prospective teachers set in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2016-17?

- Yes  
 No  
 Not applicable

4. Description of strategies used to achieve goal, if applicable:

Our only initial certification program with an embedded endorsement for English for Speakers of Other Languages has been discontinued as of this reporting year—our Early Childhood Education part-time evening program. Thus, this will be our final reporting year for this program. Currently, we prepare certified educators in the instruction of limited English proficient students via our English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement at the graduate level (although we cover English learner preparation in all of our initial teacher preparation programs). This endorsement is offered as a stand-alone or as a strand within our Curriculum and Instruction Master of Education program and our Early Childhood Education Master of Education program. We expected our numbers to drop due to the discontinuation of our only initial certification program offering the embedded endorsement and because many of our practicing teachers go through their local Regional Education Services Agency (RESA) for professional development in this area. We did not meet our goal for this past year, but, as we will describe below, we will continue to try new strategies for providing program choices that better meet the needs of our local teachers.

5. Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal, if applicable:

As noted in last year's report, the discontinuation of our Early Childhood Education (ECE) degree has resulted in fewer numbers of candidates graduating with the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement. The ECE was a bachelor's degree offered for night students, and the ESOL endorsement was embedded into this four-year degree. These teacher candidates had difficulty, however, gaining enough field experience during the day due to work schedules. We decided, as a result, to discontinue this degree. None of our other undergraduate degrees have ESOL embedded, and we currently offer this endorsement only at the graduate level, as a stand-alone endorsement and as part of our graduate degree programs. Because of this, we knew that our numbers would decrease in this area. Through this process, we have learned that we need to focus more on recruitment strategies for our ESOL endorsement, and possibly, we need to offer different models for attaining this endorsement (i.e., a summer institute). We currently have a graduate coordinator for our ESOL endorsement, and, along with our Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies, we hope that she will be able to focus more on targeted recruitment for this endorsement program in the next two years. As noted above, in our development of a targeted recruitment plan, we will make ESOL a focus of our efforts in the next two years.

6. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

As of this reporting year, we will have graduated the last remaining cohort of the Early Childhood Education (ECE) program, which has been deactivated

due to infeasibility in regard to the completion of field experience hours (the program is in the evening and consists mostly of students who are employed full-time and have difficulty completing the required number of field hours). This program had an embedded ESOL endorsement, but it was the only remaining undergraduate program with this endorsement. Due to this and due to the large numbers of graduate students who already have this endorsement, we do not expect to see much growth to our current numbers. The endorsement is offered as a stand-alone option or as part of our Curriculum and Instruction Master's in Education and Elementary Education Master's in Education degree programs. Our coordinator for ESOL plans to engage in targeted recruitment in the next couple of years for current teachers who do not have ESOL certification. As many of our local Regional Education Service Agencies (RESAs) offer this certification at lower cost, it is difficult to compete in this arena. (RESAs are educational networks that provide services directly to districts.) We understand that in developing a plan, we may need to be more creative in the ways we offer this endorsement (i.e., a summer institute rather than a year-long program). We will continue, of course, to embed ESOL and second language acquisition content into all of our programs and their curricula.

### Academic year 2017-18

7. Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2017-18?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

8. How many prospective teachers did your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2017-18?

2

9. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

We will continue to offer the graduate-level stand-alone endorsement and the ESOL pathway in our Curriculum and Instruction Master's in Education and Elementary Education Master's in Education degrees. Being realistic, however, we do not expect these numbers to grow substantially due to the number of teachers in our region who already have this certification and due to the number of RESAs that offer a pathway to certification at a lower cost. Our ESOL program coordinator will work with our Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, however, to develop and facilitate a recruitment plan for this particular endorsement program. Given our region, we realize that ESOL certification is vital to adequate teacher preparation, and we will work closely with our partner school districts to help meet these needs and to develop a targeted plan for recruitment for this endorsement. As a new program on the horizon, we are working with one of our partner districts to establish a specialized cohort of native-Spanish speaking students in a "Grow Your Own" model. These students will be our first group of teacher candidates to graduate with the ability to teach in English and Spanish (bilingual instruction), and our partner district is promising these student a job upon graduation. However, the first group of students in this program began in fall 2017, and we will not see the results of this program until this first group graduates in 2021. This first cohort is also small, with an N of 7. We are very excited, however, about the prospects of this program.

### Academic year 2018-19

10. Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2018-19?

- Yes  
 No (leave remaining questions for year blank)

11. How many prospective teachers does your program plan to add in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2018-19?

1

12. Provide any additional comments, exceptions and explanations below:

As noted above, we will continue to offer the graduate-level stand-alone endorsement and the ESOL pathway in our Curriculum and Instruction Master's in Education and Elementary Education Master's in Education degrees. Being realistic, however, we do not expect these numbers to grow substantially due to the number of teachers in our region who already have this certification and due to the number of RESAs that offer a pathway to certification at a lower cost. Our ESOL program coordinator will work with our Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, however, to develop and facilitate a targeted recruitment plan for this particular endorsement program. Given our region, we realize that ESOL certification is vital to adequate teacher preparation, and we will work closely with our partner school districts to help meet these needs. As a new program on the horizon, we are working with one of our partner districts to establish a specialized cohort of native-Spanish speaking students in a "Grow Your Own" model. These students will be our first group of teacher candidates to graduate with the ability to teach in English and Spanish (bilingual instruction), and our partner district is prepared to offer these students positions upon graduation. However, the first group of students in this program began in fall 2017, and we will not see the results of this program until this first group graduates in 2021. This first cohort is also small, with an N of 7. We will add a new cohort in the 2018-2019 year, but this will be a small group as well. We are very excited, however, about the prospects of this program.

## Assurances

Please certify that your institution is in compliance with the following assurances. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(A\)\(iii\)](#), [§206\(b\)](#)) Note: Be prepared to provide documentation and evidence for your responses, when requested, to support the following assurances.

1. Preparation responds to the identified needs of the local educational agencies or States where the program completers are likely to teach, based on past hiring and recruitment trends.

- Yes  
 No

2. Preparation is closely linked with the needs of schools and the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom.

- Yes  
 No

3. Prospective special education teachers are prepared in core academic subjects and to instruct in core academic subjects.

- Yes  
 No  
 Program does not prepare special education teachers

4. Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students with disabilities.

- Yes  
 No

5. Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to limited English proficient students.

- Yes  
 No

6. Prospective general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to students from low-income families.

- Yes  
 No

7. Prospective teachers are prepared to effectively teach in urban and rural schools, as applicable.

- Yes  
 No

8. Describe your institution's most successful strategies in meeting the assurances listed above:

In terms of responding to the identified needs of our partner districts, in the past two years, we have developed an Advisory Board, which includes local district and school representatives including superintendents, principals, and teachers and even district Human Resources representatives. We meet with our board three times per year (once in fall, spring, and summer), and we ask for their feedback and suggestions in terms of their needs and where they see a gap or lack in terms of preparation of educators in their districts and regions. This is how we were able to develop the program mentioned above for native-Spanish-speaking students. One of our partner districts indicated that they expected to have their students graduating with an English/Spanish bilingual seal on their high-school diplomas by 2021. Part of the problem in meeting this goal, however, is that the district does not have enough teachers who can teach content in Spanish (a little under half of the students served by this district are Latinx). As a result of one of our board meetings, we worked with the district to establish a partnership to recruit Latinx high-school students to go into teacher education. These students work as paraprofessionals within the school district for part of the day, and they take college classes for the second half of the day. The district plans to offer each student a position upon graduation and certification. This is just one example of how we have collaborated with our Advisory Board members to address their local needs. Additionally, we are part of our P-20 collaboratives, sponsored by our Georgia Professional Standards Commission. These collaboratives bring together K-12 school representatives along with university, state, and Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) representatives to discuss needs and issues and to find ways to collaborate. These collaboratives meet at least three times per year, and we have been able to develop

items such as our induction plan for graduating seniors based on these meetings. The induction plan is meant to highlight strengths and areas of improvement for our teacher candidates upon graduation. They can then take these plans to their hiring schools to facilitate the process of principals and new teachers co-creating professional development plans to ensure success in the first year. These meetings also provide a space to discuss general improvements in the development of mutually beneficial relationships between K-12 schools and Educator Preparation Programs. The induction plan is also an example of how preparation is linked with the needs of our partner schools, including “the instructional decisions new teachers face in the classroom,” as noted in the question above. Our Professional Development Community (PDC) and Professional Development School (PDS) models also help facilitate this process. Each of our faculty is assigned one school, each of which hosts between six to eight of our students (depending on the level and content area). Faculty are expected to have a weekly presence at the school to facilitate strong relationships. They are expected to meet with mentor teachers and administrators regularly to ensure that they can address problems as they arise and meet the needs of the school. These faculty then work our teacher candidates to ensure that their lessons and pedagogical approaches meet the needs of the school as well. Faculty also meet with administrators each year to discuss mentor teacher decisions for the upcoming year. These decisions are made as a team to facilitate support for our teacher candidates and to ensure that we are working to benefit our partner schools as well. Additionally, when requested, faculty are available for professional development for local schools, depending on the need and areas of expertise. Lastly, in terms of instructional needs, our mentor teachers are provided regular opportunity for feedback on our teacher candidates—in fact, weekly or bi-weekly feedback is expected. In this way, we can quickly address issues as they arise and ensure that teacher candidates are meeting the instructional needs of their mentor teachers’ classrooms. As noted this past reporting year, while we have a required diversity course for all education majors and a required special education courses and/or equivalent coursework for our students, we have faculty with expertise in special education and in second language acquisition strategies who have met with College of Education colleagues in all programs to embed theory and practice into coursework in all of our initial certification programs. We meet regularly in work groups and as a unit to ensure that we are consistently updating the curricula and assessments in regard to special education and diversity, including language acquisition and socioeconomic status. In terms of preparing special education teachers to instruct in core academic subjects, our only special education degree option is actually a dual degree that gives equal emphasis to general education content and special education content. This degree is our Elementary Education and Special Education dual degree program. Special education theory, content, and practice is embedded in every class, as well as having classes dedicated specifically to disability studies, including “Characteristics of Students with Special Needs,” “Educational Assessment of Students with Special Needs,” “Instruction of Students with Special Needs,” and “Behavioral Analysis.” Additionally, in terms of academic content, students take four reading/literacy courses, one social studies course, one art course, one music course, one physical education course, three science foundations and methods courses, and three mathematics foundations and methods courses (in addition to the science and mathematics courses taken to fulfill the required academic core prior to admissions). Lastly, these students have rotating field placements, meaning they are placed in a special education classroom for six weeks, then they are placed in a general education classroom for six weeks at the same school, and this pattern of placement continues for the duration of two two-year placements (junior and senior years). Accompanying coursework requires teacher candidates to complete specific assignments related to special education and general education students. Likewise, teacher candidates in our general education teacher programs are prepared to provide instruction to individuals with disabilities. Our middle grades students have a required special education course, as do our physical education teacher candidates. Our secondary, art, music, post baccalaureate, and Master of Arts in Teaching students complete coursework equivalent to that offered in a three-credit hour course. This coursework, thus far, has been embedded within multiple courses. Currently, however, we are working on developing a special education course for our secondary, art, music, and Post-Baccalaureate/MAT teacher candidates. In addition to special education content, our general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to limited English proficient students and to students from limited-income and low-income families. As noted above, all of our students in the state of Georgia take a required sociocultural diversity course prior to entry into an Educator Preparation Program. This course covers diversity in multiple forms, including language, race, ethnicity, ability, socioeconomic status, gender, and so forth. In this entry-level course, students read sociological and educational theory regarding class structure in America and language acquisition. These topics are then expanded upon and theory is put into practice once students are accepted into their program. In terms of socioeconomic status, for example, students in our Elementary/Special Education program take a course entitled “Strategies for Supporting Children and Families from Diverse Communities,” a major part of which involves discussions for supporting families and students from low-income backgrounds. Candidates in our middle grades program learn about supports for limited-income families and children in “Culture and Practice in Middle Level Schools” and in “Teaching Content to Diverse Learners.” Likewise, our post baccalaureate and Masters of Arts in Teaching students take a course entitled, “Teaching Diverse Learners” in which socioeconomic status, language acquisition, and exceptionalities are discussed. In terms of working with English language learners, all students in all programs take either language and cognition courses or teaching reading courses, all of which cover approaches to bilingual education, and all teacher candidates take instructional differentiation and assessment courses, during which professors cover instructional and assessment strategies for English learners. As noted above, as well, we have developed a partnership with a local school district to recruit heritage Spanish speakers into the College of Education to increase the numbers of teachers who can teach content in Spanish, the most widely spoken language in our area after English. Lastly, our institution and its campuses are located in regions in which students’ field placements require teacher candidates to have knowledge of teaching practices for both limited-income families and English learners. One of our campuses is located in rural Appalachia, where, unfortunately, poverty is all too familiar for our local families. Schools are under-resourced, and teacher candidates have to learn quickly how to work with limited resources with parents and families who work long hours and are often isolated in rural areas. Likewise, our other major campus sits in a more urban location that is over 40 percent Latinx, meaning teacher candidates need to be prepared to work with English learners and, in many cases, parents who speak little to no English. Many of our partner schools in this area are close to 100 percent Latinx. Unfortunately, in this same area, poverty is also a stark reality, and many parents work long hours and do not have transportation to participate regularly in school events. Teacher candidates in the COE typically have placements in both regions (rural and urban) over the course of their programs (all candidates have a placement in our more urban area, as it is our most diverse area and we have at least one required diverse placement). Our teacher candidates, who are majority white and female, have to be prepared to understand and affirm the cultures and backgrounds of their students, and we have a responsibility, as an Education Preparation Provider, to ensure that they do not approach their classrooms from deficit perspectives. Currently, we are expanding our Professional Development Communities (PDC) into the greater Atlanta area, which will provide additional preparation for urban education for our teacher candidates. This relationship will result in increased diversity of field experiences, as well, as this area serves a larger Asian student population.



## Assessment Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Assessment Pass Rates](#)

On this page, review the assessment pass rates. Please note that this page does not have an edit feature as the pass rates have already been through several rounds of verification. If you identify an error, please contact Westat's Title II Support Center and your testing company representative.

After reviewing, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## Assessment Pass Rates

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
ESP0109 -ART EDUCATION TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2015-16	1			
ESP0109 -ART EDUCATION TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
ESP0110 -ART EDUCATION TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2015-16	1			
ESP0110 -ART EDUCATION TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	7			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	3			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	6			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	7			



Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	3			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	6			
ESP0026 -BIOLOGY TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
ESP0027 -BIOLOGY TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	4			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	4			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	4			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	2			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	4			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	4			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	4			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	2			
GAT005 -BIRTH THROUGH KINDERGARTEN TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	3			
GAT005 -BIRTH THROUGH KINDERGARTEN TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	13	257	13	100
GAT006 -BIRTH THROUGH KINDERGARTEN TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	3			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT006 -BIRTH THROUGH KINDERGARTEN TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	13	256	13	100
GAT042 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT042 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	1			
GAT042 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	1			
GAT043 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT043 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	1			
GAT043 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	1			
GAT001 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	41	261	41	100
GAT001 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	16	263	16	100
GAT001 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	41	262	41	100
GAT002 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	41	259	41	100
GAT002 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	16	268	16	100
GAT002 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	41	261	41	100
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	108	279	108	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	107	278	107	100
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	94	276	94	100
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	108	260	108	100
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	107	258	107	100
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	94	260	94	100
TPA0102 -EDTPA: BUSINESS EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	1			
TPA0110 -EDTPA: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	147	59	147	100
TPA0119 -EDTPA: HEALTH EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	1			
TPA0021 -EDTPA: K-12 PERFORMING ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	3			
TPA0011 -EDTPA: K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0011 -EDTPA: K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	10	46	10	100
TPA0018 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	6			
TPA0019 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	6			
TPA0016 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	16	45	16	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
TPA0017 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	2			
TPA0003 -EDTPA: SECONDARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	12	48	12	100
TPA0004 -EDTPA: SECONDARY HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0004 -EDTPA: SECONDARY HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	11	48	11	100
TPA0005 -EDTPA: SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0005 -EDTPA: SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	11	41	11	100
TPA0006 -EDTPA: SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	3			
TPA0006 -EDTPA: SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	5			
TPA0015 -EDTPA: VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	7			
ESP0020 -ENGLISH TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
ESP0021 -ENGLISH TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	10	278	10	100
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	275	12	100
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	14	276	14	100
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	12	276	12	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	10	272	10	100
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	276	12	100
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	14	281	14	100
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	12	278	12	100
ESP0115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
ESP0115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	1			
ESP0115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	2			
ESP0116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
ESP0116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	1			
ESP0116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	2			
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	7			
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	13	264	13	100
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	14	264	14	100
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	15	264	15	100
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	7			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	13	270	13	100
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	14	264	14	100
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	15	263	15	100
ESP0034 -HISTORY TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
ESP0035 -HISTORY TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	5			
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	11	267	11	100
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	12	272	12	100
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	6			
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	5			
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	11	263	11	100
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	12	265	12	100
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	6			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
ESP0022 -MATHEMATICS TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
ESP0022 -MATHEMATICS TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	4			
ESP0023 -MATHEMATICS TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
ESP0023 -MATHEMATICS TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	4			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	273	12	100
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	6			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	11	270	11	100
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	270	12	100
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	6			
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	11	257	11	100
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	11	264	11	100
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	24	262	24	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	19	257	19	100
ESP5011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2015-16	1			
ESP5011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	3			
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	4			
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	19	272	19	100
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	31	271	31	100
ESP5013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	7			
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	24	263	24	100
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	2			
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	7			
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	3			
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	266	12	100
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	23	264	23	100



Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	25	262	25	100
ESP5014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	2			
ESP5015 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE TEST Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	3			
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	6			
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	16	257	15	94
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	17	264	17	100
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	27	266	27	100
ESP0111 -MUSIC TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
ESP0112 -MUSIC TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	3			
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	5			
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	2			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	3			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	5			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	2			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT032 -POLITICAL SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT033 -POLITICAL SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
ESP0024 -SCIENCE TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2015-16	1			
ESP0024 -SCIENCE TEST 1 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
ESP0025 -SCIENCE TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2015-16	1			
ESP0025 -SCIENCE TEST 2 Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT024 -SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	2			
GAT024 -SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT025 -SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	2			
GAT025 -SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT141 -SPANISH TEST I READING-WRITING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	1			
GAT141 -SPANISH TEST I READING-WRITING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	1			
GAT142 -SPANISH TEST II LISTENING-SPEAKING Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT142 -SPANISH TEST II LISTENING-SPEAKING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2015-16	1			
GAT142 -SPANISH TEST II LISTENING-SPEAKING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2014-15	1			



## Summary Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Summary Pass Rates](#)

On this page, review the summary pass rates. Please note that this page does not have an edit feature as the pass rates have already been through several rounds of verification. If you identify an error, please contact Westat's Title II Support Center and your testing company representative.

After reviewing, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## Summary Pass Rates

Group	Number taking tests	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
All program completers, 2016-17	245	244	100
All program completers, 2015-16	241	240	100
All program completers, 2014-15	285	285	100

## Low-Performing

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Low-Performing](#)

On this page, review the questions regarding your program's approval/accreditation and whether your program has been designated as low performing by the state. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this section is pre-loaded from your prior year's report; please review and update as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## Low-Performing

Provide the following information about the approval or accreditation of your teacher preparation program. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(D\)](#), [§205\(a\)\(1\)\(E\)](#))

1. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited?

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please specify the organization(s) that approved or accredited your program:

- State  
 NCATE  
 TEAC  
 CAEP  
 Other specify:

NCTM (via CAEP) for Secondary Mathematics

2. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 207(a) of the HEA of 2008)?

- Yes  
 No

# Use of Technology

On this page, review the questions regarding your program's use of technology. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this section is pre-loaded from your prior year's report; please review and update as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Use of Technology](#)

## Use of Technology

1. Provide the following information about the use of technology in your teacher preparation program. Please note that choosing 'yes' indicates that your teacher preparation program would be able to provide evidence upon request. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(F\)](#))

Does your program prepare teachers to:

- a. integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction

Yes  
 No

- b. use technology effectively to collect data to improve teaching and learning

Yes  
 No

- c. use technology effectively to manage data to improve teaching and learning

Yes  
 No

- d. use technology effectively to analyze data to improve teaching and learning

Yes  
 No

2. Provide a description of the evidence that your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, and to use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data in order to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement. Include a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares teachers to use the principles of universal design for learning, as applicable. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the four elements listed above are not currently in place.

The College of Education (COE) at the University of North Georgia (UNG) has designed its Educator Preparation Programs to ensure that “candidates model and apply technology for design, implementation, and assessment learning experiences to engage students and improve learning” (CAEP Handbook Initial-Level Programs 2018). We have done so, in part, by utilizing the International Society for Technology in Education’s (ISTE) standards for faculty and students as a guide. Faculty in all Teacher Education programs have incorporate ISTE standards into their course objectives and assessments. As noted last year, we had hoped to send our Technology and Online Programs Coordinator to the annual ISTE conference, which we did. She brought back ideas and information for incorporating the standards, and each of our workgroups met to ensure that technology and the ISTE standards were integrated throughout their programs. In particular, technology standards have been incorporated into our assessment and curriculum courses to ensure that teacher candidates can implement and utilize technology for P-12 improvement and engagement in the areas of instruction and assessment. Our teacher candidates also take courses focused on differentiation of instruction, in which, from a Universal Design (UD), perspective, they learn about various ways to present materials and content; they learn to differentiate the ways in which their students can demonstrate and share what they know and have learned; they explore ways to encourage and enhance student engagement and motivation; and they generally explore ways to ensure materials, approaches, and resources are accessible to all students. Their knowledge in these areas is demonstrated through key assessments in specific courses submitted throughout students' tenure in their programs, through their Induction Portfolio submitted in the spring of their senior year,

and through their edTPA portfolio submitted in the spring of their senior year. Data are captured in Livetext (our online portfolio management system for College of Education students) and analyzed for strengths and weaknesses. To expand just a bit, the Induction Portfolio highlights the use of technology in curricula and teaching, in improving teaching and learning, in managing data, and in analyzing data to improve teaching and learning. We also analyze edTPA results to identify utilization of technology in assessment and instruction, as this assessment requires demonstration of technology in planning, instruction, and assessment. We do, however, want to continue to develop a plan for the use of technology to improve student learning and to assist with UD. To do this, we have charged our Technology and Online Programs Coordinator with reviewing all syllabi and key assessments for the integration of technology in meaningful ways. Once she completes this review, she will meet with program workgroups to discuss ways to improve and enhance the use of technology to enhance and increase student learning and to enhance and improve teaching. Our Technology Specialist (our dedicated COE instructional technology individual) also began surveying students regarding their technological needs two years ago, and we have since improved our survey to focus not just on types or forms of technology utilized but also on technological literacy and how technology is utilized to improve student learning. Our goal was to survey students to assess their current understanding of technology as a teaching tool so that we can identify gaps, refine and revise our curricula accordingly, and provide professional development for students and faculty for improvement in technology. As reported last year, we receive funding to develop a Technology Lab for our students, and this center became a reality this last semester (Fall 2017). Our technology specialist is currently working on an online technology check-out center, and he is working on technology workshops that will be held in the lab. These will be developed based on the technology survey conducted at the end of this semester.

# Teacher Training

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Teacher Training](#)

On this page, review the questions about how your program trains general education teachers and special education teachers. For the purposes of these questions, general education teachers means those who are not specifically prepared as special education teachers. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this section is pre-loaded from your prior year's report; please review and update as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

## Teacher Training

Provide the following information about your teacher preparation program. Please note that choosing 'yes' indicates that your teacher preparation program would be able to provide evidence upon request. ([§205\(a\)\(1\)\(G\)](#))

### 1. Does your program prepare general education teachers to:

#### a. teach students with disabilities effectively

- Yes  
 No

#### b. participate as a member of individualized education program teams

- Yes  
 No

#### c. teach students who are limited English proficient effectively

- Yes  
 No

### 2. Provide a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares general education teachers to teach students with disabilities effectively, including training related to participation as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and to effectively teach students who are limited English proficient. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the three elements listed above are not currently in place.

Elementary education and middle grades majors must complete courses centered on working with students with disabilities. Also, pedagogy for working with English learners is integrated into the coursework for both of these majors. Secondary students have content for both English learners and students with special needs integrated into their major education courses. For all majors, EDUC 2120: Exploring Socio-Cultural Diversity, a foundations course, introduces core theoretical components of working with both students with disabilities and students who are limited English proficient (we have units covering each area from a theoretical standpoint). Additionally, another foundations course for all majors, EDUC 2130: Exploring Teaching and Learning, requires that students demonstrate proficiency in regard to learning and teaching theories for both students with special needs and English language learners. In both of these foundational courses, students are introduced to the basic structure and requirements for an Individualized Education Program. In their later courses, they learn how to administer an Individualized Education Program, and they see these plans in action in their field experience classrooms. In working with our faculty and with their mentor teachers in placement, teacher candidates learn about what it means to participate as a member of individualized education programs teams, including the components of an individualized education plan (which entails the cycle of planning, teaching, and revising this program per each student's needs). Our faculty with expertise in language acquisition work together regularly to revise curricula to integrate practices for English learners throughout students' coursework. We are members of WIDA, which gives us access to second language acquisition resources for our students, and our faculty incorporate these resources into courses. Our students are required to have at least one diverse placement during their program. Given that our surrounding counties have a high number of Spanish-speaking students, many of our students' diverse placements allow them the opportunity to work directly with English learners. This is an invaluable experience for our students to learn the importance of additive bilingual education and (1) how to differentiate curricula for their language learners, (2) how to incorporate students' cultural backgrounds into their classrooms, (3) how to incorporate the families of their non-native English speakers in their classrooms, and (4) how to develop socially just practices that provide equal and equitable educational opportunities for all of their students. Required classroom



management courses introduce lesson and unit planning with emphases on effective differentiation, as do required curriculum and methods courses. Specifically, for middle grades majors, MGED 3115: Facilitation and Differentiation requires that teacher education candidates demonstrate that they can differentiate curriculum for diverse learners, especially in regard to strategies for readers in need of additional assistance. In MGED 3130: Teaching Content to Diverse Learners, teacher candidates learn how to differentiate lesson plans for the various learners in their classrooms. In the secondary program, students enrolled in SCED 4002: Educational Assessment Grades 6-12 learn how to differentiate their assessments, and in SCED 4003: Classroom Management, students develop a management plan with interventions, modifications, and adaptations for the various needs and learners in their classrooms. In terms of our largest program, one half of the curriculum and clinical placements in the ELE/SPED program are based in special education, and all of the assignments in these courses require that teacher candidates learn to plan, instruct, and assess according to the needs of the learners in their classrooms. In all programs, teacher candidates are expected to demonstrate their training in working with students with disabilities and with students who are limited English proficient in their edTPA, in their Induction Portfolio, and in their field experience supervision instrument filled out by their university supervisor upon observation of teaching. We would like to see more of an emphasis on teaching students with special needs and working with language learners in our secondary, P-12, post baccalaureate, and Master's of Arts in Teaching (MAT) programs. We have developed a timeline for creating special education course for our secondary, post baccalaureate, and MAT programs, as right now the content for special education is embedded in other courses. By the 2018-2019 academic year, all of our secondary programs will have their own course. We will continue to work with our art and music coordinators to ensure content is embedded throughout their programs and to ensure that they have key assessments that illustrate students' knowledge of working with English learners and individuals with disabilities. These two P-12 programs, much like our secondary mathematics program, are run by coordinators within the department, so changes are more difficult to make. However, we meet regularly with these content coordinators, and we have stressed the necessity of these changes in the upcoming year. Additionally, we are expanding our field experiences into the greater Atlanta area for all of our students, which adds even more possibilities for diverse placements, especially in regard to language learners.

**3. Does your program prepare special education teachers to:**

**a. teach students with disabilities effectively**

- Yes
- No
- Program does not prepare special education teachers

**b. participate as a member of individualized education program teams**

- Yes
- No
- Program does not prepare special education teachers

**c. teach students who are limited English proficient effectively**

- Yes
- No
- Program does not prepare special education teachers

**4. Provide a description of the evidence your program uses to show that it prepares special education teachers to teach students with disabilities effectively, including training related to participation as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and to effectively teach students who are limited English proficient. Include planning activities and a timeline if any of the three elements listed above are not currently in place.**

The Elementary and Special Education (ELE/SPED) students complete two semesters of placement in special education settings, two in early childhood settings, and at least one placement in a diverse setting. Teacher candidates must successfully complete the following courses focused on the planning, instruction, and assessments of individuals with disabilities: ECSP 3100: Characteristics of Students with Disabilities; ECSP 4000: Assessment of Exceptional Students; ECSP 4200: Methods and Materials for Students with Disabilities; ECSP 4001: Applied Behavior Analysis; and ECSP 3010: Working with Students and Families from Diverse Backgrounds. From their first ELE/SPED courses, students are engaged in case studies examining the physical, socio-emotional, cognitive, and linguistic development of students with special needs. Teacher candidates are creating behavior and classroom management plans that differentiate for the various academic, behavioral, and physical needs in their classrooms, and they create a disability resource presentation that is shared with their peers to create a library of resources for future use in the elementary and/or special education classroom. In their assessment of students with special needs course, pre-service teachers engage in a case study in which they choose a student with whom to utilize the Response to Intervention (RTI) tiered approach. In addition, in this same course, they engage in a case study where they participate in Individualized Education Program (IEP) development and in the discussion process with the IEP team. In their applied behavior analysis course, candidates complete a Functional Behavior Assessment and a Behavior Intervention Plan, which they carry out and reflect upon throughout the semester. In terms of language learners, we have a team of faculty with expertise in second language acquisition who have worked to ensure that theory and pedagogy are interwoven throughout all courses in the ELE/SPED program. We have a membership to WIDA, which provides standards-based resources for faculty and their students in regard to language acquisition. We teach students how to test their students' language skills and improve literacy specifically for language learners. In particular, teacher candidates learn about language acquisition, bilingual education approaches, and cultural affirmation in courses such as "Working with Students and Families from Diverse Backgrounds," "Language and Cognition," and through a

series of four required reading courses. Teacher candidates evidence this knowledge through key assessments turned in via LiveText. Then, in their final semester, candidates are expected to demonstrate their knowledge of students with disabilities and of English learners through their Induction Portfolio, their edTPA portfolio, and their InternKeys observation assessment. Each of these requires that candidates demonstrate their abilities to work with students with special needs and language learners through their planning, instruction, and assessment, with a key emphasis on differentiation. These assessments are then analyzed each year, data is shared with faculty workgroups, and changes are made according to the strengths and weaknesses apparent in students' knowledge.

## Contextual Information

On this page, review the contextual information about your program. If you submitted an IPRC last year, this section is pre-loaded from your prior year's report; please review and update as necessary.

After reviewing and updating as necessary, save the page using the floating save box at the bottom of the page.

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

>> [Contextual Information](#)

## Contextual Information

Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s). You may also attach information to this report card (see below). The U.S. Department of Education is especially interested in any evaluation plans or interim or final reports that may be available.

We have attached our SACSCOC assessment and planning reports for last year for each program. In addition, we have attached our graduate survey data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc., for the 2016-2017 reporting year and our partnership model and recruitment plan for the College of Education at the University of North Georgia.

## Supporting Files

<a href="#">ELE/SPED SACS Report</a>	
<a href="#">ECE SACS Report</a>	
<a href="#">MGED SACS Report</a>	
<a href="#">P12 and Secondary SACS Report</a>	
<a href="#">Post Baccalaureate and MAT SACS Report</a>	
<a href="#">Grad Program SACS Report</a>	
<a href="#">Graduate and Completer Survey Results</a>	
<a href="#">Partnership Model and Recruitment Plan</a>	

You may upload files to be included with your report card. You should only upload PDF or Microsoft Word or Excel files. These files will be listed as links in your report card. Upload files in the order that you'd like them to appear.

# Report Card Certification

Please make sure your entire report card is complete and accurate before completing this section. Once your report card is certified you will not be able to edit your data.

## Enrollment Confirmation

Total Title II enrollment from Section I: Program Information, Enrollment is **485**.

Number of program completers from Section I: Program Information, Program Completers is **245**.

For a total enrollment of **730**.

I certify the total enrollment shown above is correct.

## Certification of submission

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report is accurate and complete and conforms to the definitions and instructions used in the *Higher Education Opportunity Act, Title II: Reporting Reference and User Manual*.

NAME OF RESPONSIBLE REPRESENTATIVE FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM:

Sheri C. Hardee

TITLE:

Associate Dean, College of Education

## Certification of review of submission

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this report is accurate and complete and conforms to the definitions and instructions used in the *Higher Education Opportunity Act, Title II: Reporting Reference and User Manual*.

NAME OF REVIEWER:

Missy Martin

TITLE:

Title II Coordinator

## Comparison with Last Year

Item	Last Year	This Year	Change
<a href="#">Total Enrollment</a>	493	485	-1.62%
<a href="#">Male Enrollment</a>	64	83	29.69%
<a href="#">Female Enrollment</a>	429	402	-6.29%
<a href="#">Hispanic/Latino Enrollment</a>	31	21	-32.26%
<a href="#">American Indian or Alaska Native Enrollment</a>	0	2	
<a href="#">Asian Enrollment</a>	3	8	166.67%
<a href="#">Black or African American Enrollment</a>	12	11	-8.33%

Item	Last Year	This Year	Change
<a href="#">Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Enrollment</a>	1	0	
<a href="#">White Enrollment</a>	441	417	-5.44%
<a href="#">Two or more races Enrollment</a>	0	16	
<a href="#">Average number of clock hours required prior to student teaching</a>	281	396	40.93%
<a href="#">Average number of clock hours required for student teaching</a>	752	680	-9.57%
<a href="#">Average number of clock hours required for mentoring</a>	0	32	
<a href="#">Number of full-time equivalent faculty in supervised clinical experience during this academic year</a>	28	34	21.43%
<a href="#">Number of adjunct faculty in supervised clinical experience during this academic year (IHE and PreK-12 staff)</a>	17	30	76.47%
<a href="#">Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year</a>	216	423	95.83%
<a href="#">Total completers for current academic year</a>	243	245	0.82%
<a href="#">Total completers for prior academic year</a>	289	243	-15.92%
<a href="#">Total completers for second prior academic year</a>	265	289	9.06%