

Advanced Programs
(Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership)

Curriculum and Instruction Completers
Impact on K-12 Student Learning and Development
One-Year Post Program Completion

Introduction for Curriculum and Instruction:

The following tables showcase data provided by the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) on our Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) completers one year after program completion. Before we describe this data, it is important to include some notes on the data provided, including origin and terminology. Georgia's Teacher Keys Effectiveness System Handbook, published by the GaDOE, has been included as documentation, and this handbook outlines the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System, including how scores are defined and aggregated. To provide a brief introduction, however, this system "is comprised of three components which contribute to an overall Teacher Effectiveness Measure (TEM): Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), Professional Growth, and Student Growth" (Handbook, GaDOE, p. 5). A description of how each of these measures is assessed is included in this handbook. For the TAPS data, supervisors evaluate the teachers in their schools based on ten standards, which are outlined in the handbook and in the data below. This data is based on observations and artifacts/documentation throughout the year, but the final rating is based "on the Summative Performance Evaluation" by the supervisor (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5). Professional Growth is measured "by progress toward or attain of Professional Growth Goals" developed in conjunction with one's supervisor (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5). Lastly, Student Growth is a measure of Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) from state assessment data and district-determined data, which could include student learning objectives, school or district mean growth percentiles, or other data as determined by the Local Educational Agency (LEA) (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5).

The Teacher Effectiveness Measures (TEM) results are unofficial due to the refinement of data collections methodology. This extended timeline was necessary because of the changes that were made to the evaluation instrument as a result of GA Senate Bill #364. According to GA Senate Bill #364, since SY 2016-2017, a TEM score is a weighted score from three components: the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS)-50%, professional growth-20%, and student growth (lagging data)-30%. A teacher's TAPS rating is derived from the sum of their summative scores on all ten TAPS standards using the following rubric: 0-6 (Level 1), 7-16 (Level 2), 17-26 (Level 3), and 27-30 (Level 4). On TAPS standards, Level 1 scores a 0, Level 2 scores as 1, level 3 scores as 2, and level 4 scores as 3. Student Growth Ratings are derived from lagging Student Growth Percentile (SGP) Ratings or Non-SGP Ratings. If a teacher taught a SGP course(s) in the previous year and received a SGP Rating, the teacher's Student Growth Rating will be the

If in need of this content in an alternate format for accessibility (e.g. Braille, large print, audio, etc.), please contact Kathy.Moody@ung.edu or call 706-864-1757.

SGP Rating. If a teacher taught a SGP course(s) in the previous year and didn't receive a SGP Rating according to teacher SGP calculation rules, then the teacher's Student Growth Rating will be missing. If a teacher didn't teach SGP course(s), then the teacher's Student Growth Rating will be Non-SGP Rating, which is provided by the district. Therefore, the total number of Student Growth Ratings will be equal to the sum of the number of SGP Ratings and Non-SGP Ratings. For more information, please refer to the TKES Handbook, which has been included as an evidence piece, and this handbook can be found at the following link:

<https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20TKES%20Documents/2019-2020%20Documents%20TKES%20and%20LKES/TKES%20Handbook%202019.2020.pdf>

Additionally, in terms of years and breakdown of data, as of report submission, we have included the most recently available cycles of data as an aggregate and then broken down by year. There are no results at the time of this submission for 2018-2019 completers (which would include the 2019-2020 academic year). Typically, the GaDOE will provide evaluation data at the close of each school year, but complications from COVID-19 have prevented this from occurring in time for the submission of this report. Complications from COVID-19 will impact the data provided, as well, because testing did not occur during the spring of 2020. Thus, while there will be data available for 2019-2020, it will be limited. This data, however, will be provided by the time of the site visit. Moreover, there are no results prior to 2017-2018, as the Curriculum and Instruction Master of Education is a newer program. As a note to reviewers, there may be a blank page in between programs in the presentation of tables below, but the data will continue on the following page. An analysis of this data follows the presentation of all data tables.

Data:

Table 1. *Distribution of Component Rating in Teacher Effectiveness Measures for EPP Advanced Completers, 2017 to 2018*

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Teacher Effectiveness Measure	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (100%)	0 (0.00%)
Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (100%)	0 (0.00%)
Student Growth Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (100%)	0 (0.00%)
Student Growth Percentile	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (100%)	0 (0.00%)

Non-Student Growth Percentile Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	5 (100%)	0 (0.00%)
Professional Growth Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (100%)	0 (0.00%)

Table 2. *Summary Statistics of Ratings in Teacher Effectiveness Measures for All EPP Advanced Completers, 2017 to 2018*

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
TEM Rating	7	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Rating	8	3.00	0.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Sum	8	21.62	2.07	21.00	20.00	26.00
Student Growth Rating	7	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Student Growth Percentile Rating*	2	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Student Growth Percentile Mean*	2	46.07	7.09	46.07	41.06	51.08
Non-Student Growth Percentile Rating	5	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Professional Growth Rating	8	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00

*SGP Rating and SGP Mean are lagging data.

Table 3. *Distribution of 10 Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Rating in Teacher Effectiveness Measure for EPP Advanced Completers, 2017 to 2018*

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
1. Professional Knowledge <i>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing</i>	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)

<i>relevant learning experiences.</i>				
2. Instructional Planning <i>The teacher plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	8 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
3. Instructional Strategies <i>The teacher promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students' acquisition of key knowledge and skills.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)
4. Differentiated Instruction <i>The teacher challenges and supports each student's learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
5. Assessment Strategies <i>The teacher systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	8 (100 %)	0 (0.00 %)
6. Assessment Uses <i>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.5 %)	1 (12.50 %)
7. Positive Learning Environment <i>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)

<i>inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.</i>				
8. Academically Challenging Environment <i>The teacher creates a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.5 %)	1 (12.50 %)
9. Professionalism <i>The teacher exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	6 (75.00 %)	2 (25.00 %)
10. Communication <i>The teacher communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.5 %)	1 (12.50 %)

Table 4. Summary Statistics of 10 Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Ratings in Teacher Effectiveness Measure for EPP Advanced Completers, 2017 to 2018

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
1. Professional Knowledge <i>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning</i>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3

<i>experiences.</i>						
2. Instructional Planning <i>The teacher plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.</i>	8	2.00	0.00	2	2	2
3. Instructional Strategies <i>The teacher promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students' acquisition of key knowledge and skills.</i>	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3
4. Differentiated Instruction <i>The teacher challenges and supports each student's learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.</i>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
5. Assessment Strategies <i>The teacher systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.</i>	8	2.00	0.00	2	2	2
6. Assessment Uses <i>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to</i>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3

<i>measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.</i>						
7. Positive Learning Environment <i>The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.</i>	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3
8. Academically Challenging Environment <i>The teacher creates a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners.</i>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
9. Professionalism <i>The teacher exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.</i>	8	2.25	0.46	2	2	3
10. Communication <i>The teacher communicates</i>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3

<i>effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.</i>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 5. *Results for Curriculum and Instruction Program by Year*

See page below.

TEM Request for EPP Advanced Completers of University of North Georgia



April 15, 2020

TEM Results for EPP Advanced 2017-2018 Completers

Distribution of Component Ratings in TEM

	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV
<i>TEM Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>TAPS Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	8 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>Student Growth Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>SGP Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	2 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>NonSGP Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	5 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>Professional Growth Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	8 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)

Summary Statistics of Ratings in TEM

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
TEM_Rating	7	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
TAPS_Rating	8	3.00	0.00	3	3	3
TAPS_Sum	8	21.62	2.07	21	20	26
StudentGrowthRating	7	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
SGP_Rating	2	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
SGP_Mean	2	46.07	7.09	46.07	41.06	51.08
NonSGPGrowthRating	5	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
ProfessionalGrowthRating	8	3.00	0.00	3	3	3

SGP Rating and SGP Mean are lagging data.

Distribution of 10 TAPS Performance Standards Rating in TEM

	Level II	Level III	Level IV
<i>PS1</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>PS2</i>	0 (0.00 %)	8 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>PS3</i>	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)
<i>PS4</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>PS5</i>	0 (0.00 %)	8 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>PS6</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>PS7</i>	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)
<i>PS8</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>PS9</i>	0 (0.00 %)	6 (75.00 %)	2 (25.00 %)
<i>PS10</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)

[1] "The "Level I" has been omitted in the table since no teacher has "Level I" in all 10 TAPS Performance Standards."

Summary Statistics of 10 TAPS Performance Standards in TEM

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
PS1	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
PS2	8	2.00	0.00	2	2	2
PS3	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3
PS4	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
PS5	8	2.00	0.00	2	2	2
PS6	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
PS7	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3
PS8	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
PS9	8	2.25	0.46	2	2	3

PS10	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
------	---	------	------	---	---	---

Notes:

1. TEM results are unofficial due to the refinement of data collections methodology. This extended timeline was necessary because of the changes that were made to the evaluation instrument as a result of Senate Bill 364.
2. According to GA Senate Bill #364, since SY 2016-2017, a TEM score is a weighted score from three components: TAPS-50%, professional growth-20%, and student growth (lagging data)-30%.
3. A teacher's TAPS rating is derived from the sum of his/her summative scores on all ten TAPS standards using the following rubric: 0-6 (Level I), 7-16 (Level II), 17-26 (Level III), 27-30 (Level IV).
4. On TAPS standards, Level I scores as 0, Level II scores as 1, Level III scores as 2, and Level IV scores as 3.
5. Student Growth Ratings are derived from lagging SGP Ratings or NonSGP Ratings. If a teacher taught SGP course(s) in the previous year and received an SGP Rating, the teacher's Student Growth Rating will be the SGP Rating. If a teacher taught SGP course(s) in the previous year and didn't receive an SGP Rating according to teacher SGP calculation rules, the teacher's Student Growth Rating will be missing. If a teacher didn't teach SGP course(s), the teacher's Student Growth Rating will be NonSGP Rating, which is provided by the district. Therefore, the total number of Student Growth Ratings will be equal to the sum of the number of SGP Ratings and NonSGP Ratings.
6. For more information, please refer to the TKES Handbook: <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20TKES%20Documents/2019-2020%20Documents%20TKES%20and%20TKES/TKES%20Handbook%202019.2020.pdf> (<https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20TKES%20Documents/2019-2020%20Documents%20TKES%20and%20TKES/TKES%20Handbook%202019.2020.pdf>).
7. No results for 2018-2019 completers. Evaluation data is provided at the close of each school year.

Analysis of Curriculum and Instruction Data:

In terms of the TEMs data presented above, all Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) completers scored at a level 3 on all aspects, including Student Growth Ratings and Student Growth Percentiles. This indicates that these completers are on par or proficient/average in all areas. In regard to TAPS data, all completers from the C&I program scored at a level 3 or 4. In fact, 37.5 percent scored at a level 4 on instructional strategies and positive learning environment. Additionally, 25 percent scored at a level 4 on professionalism. This means that these completers are above average in these areas. Many of our C&I completers have been in the classroom prior to entering the program, and this data is not as surprising, given their prior experience with teaching. We hope, however, that their success in the classroom is enhanced by their participation in and the knowledge and skills gleaned from the C&I program. The data from the GaDOE is shared with program faculty, and this data is utilized during data days to plan curricular and assessment changes or revisions throughout the academic year.

Leadership Completers
Impact on Schools/Districts
One-Year Post Program Completion

Introduction to Educational Leadership:

The following tables showcase data provided by the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) on our Educational Leadership program completers one year after program completion. Before we describe this data, it is important to include some notes on the data provided, including origin and terminology. Georgia's Leader Keys Effectiveness System Implementation Handbook outlines the parameters of the evaluation measures provided below, but the system "is comprised of four components which contribute to an overall Leader Effectiveness Measure (LEM): Leader Assessment on Performance Standards (LAPS), Student Growth, CCRPI School Climate Star Rating, and a Combination of Additional Data (Achievement Gap Reduction, Beating the Odds and CCRPI Data)" (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5). The LAPS is based on eight performance standards, which are included in the data below, and credentialed evaluators assess leaders via observation and evidence submitted/compiled over the course of each year (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5). For Student Growth, the "grand mean of SGP performance for all SGP Grades and Courses taught in the school will constitute the School Mean Growth Percentile" (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5). The CCRPI School Climate Star Rating "shows how well a school is fostering an atmosphere where students feel welcomed, safe, and respected" (GaDOE Handbook, p. 5). And finally, the Combination of Additional Data includes the "Achievement Gap Reduction, Beating the Odds, and/or CCRPI data" (GaDOE Handbook, p. 6).

The Leader Effectiveness Measures (LEM) results are unofficial due to the refinement of data collections methodology. This extended timeline was necessary because of the changes that were made to the evaluation instrument as a result of GA Senate Bill #364. According to GA Senate Bill #364, since SY 2016-2017, LEM components changed (weights and number of elements) as a result of Senate Bill 364. The weights of the elements are as follows: the Leader Assessment Performance Standards (LAPS)-30%; CCRPI School Climate Star Rating-10%; Student Growth-40% (lagging data); Combination of Additional-20%. A leader's LAPS rating is derived from the sum of his/her summative scores on all eight LAPS standards using the following rubric: 0-5 (Level I), 6-13 (Level II), 14-21 (Level III), and 22-24 (Level IV). On LAPS standards, Level 1 scores a 0, Level 2 scores as 1, level 3 scores as 2, and level 4 scores as 3. Student Growth Ratings are derived from lagging Mean Growth Percentile (MGP) Ratings or Non-MGP Ratings. If a leader came from a school that has SGP course(s) and received a MGP Rating from the school MGP, the leader's Student Growth Rating will be the MGP Rating. If a leader came from a school that has SGP course(s) and didn't receive an MGP Rating according to school and leader MGP calculation rules, then the leader's Student Growth Rating will be missing. If a leader came from a school that doesn't have SGP course(s), then the leader's Student Growth Rating will be Non-MGP Rating, which is provided by the district. Therefore, the total number of Student Growth Ratings will be equal to the sum of the number of MGP Ratings and Non-MGP Ratings. For more information, please refer to the LKES Handbook, which has been provided as an evidence piece, and the link to this handbook is provided here as well: <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20LKES%20Documents/LKES%20Handbook2018.2019.pdf>

Additionally, in terms of years and breakdown of data, as of report submission, we have included the most recently available cycles of data as an aggregate and then broken down by year. There are no results at the time of this submission for 2018-2019 completers (which would include the 2019-2020 academic year). Typically, the GaDOE will provide evaluation data at the close of each school year, but complications from COVID-19 have prevented this from occurring in time for the submission of this report. Complications from COVID-19 will impact the data provided, as well, because testing did not occur during the spring of 2020. Thus, while there will be data available for 2019-2020, it will be limited. This data, however, will be provided by the time of the site visit. Moreover, there are no results prior to 2017-2018, as the Tier I Educational Leadership is a new program. There are no results for Tier II, as we have not yet had any completers for this program. An analysis of this data follows the presentation of all data tables.

Data:

Table 1. *Distribution of Component Rating in Leader Effectiveness Measures for All EPP Advanced Completers, 2017 to 2018*

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Leader Effectiveness Measure	0	0	0	0

	(0.00%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)	(0.00%)
Leader Assessment on Performance Standards Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (87.50%)	1 (12.50%)
Student Growth Rating	1 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (80.00%)	0 (0.00%)
MGP_Rating	1 (20.00%)	0 (0.00%)	4 (80.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Non-MGP Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
School/Climate Star Rating	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	1 (14.29%)	6 (85.71%)
Combination of Additional Data	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

[1] "As there are no results for the Combination of Additional Data (optional for the year of 2018-2019), NO LEM rating results were calculated."

Table 2. *Summary Statistics of Ratings in Leader Effectiveness Measures for All EPP Initial Completers, 2017 to 2018*

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
Leader Assessment on Performance Standards Rating	8	3.12	0.35	3	3	4
Leader Assessment on Performance Standards Sum	8	18.50	2.56	18.5	16	23
Student Growth Rating	5	2.60	0.89	3.00	1.00	3.00
M Growth Percentile Rating	5	2.60	0.89	3.00	1.00	3.00
M Growth Percentile	5	47.86	9.90	51.64	31.28	56.91
School Climate Star Rating	7	3.86	0.38	4.00	3.00	4.00

MGP Rating and MGP Mean are lagging data. There are no MGP data in this LEM subset.

Table 3. *Distribution of 8 Leader Assessment on Performance Standards Rating in Leader Effectiveness Measure for All EPP Initial Completers, 2017 to 2018*

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
1. Instructional Leadership <i>The leader fosters the success of all students by facilitating the development, communication, implementation, and evaluation of a shared vision of teaching and learning that leads to school improvement.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	3 (37.50 %)	5 (62.50 %)
2. School Climate <i>The leader promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, and sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)
3. Planning and Assessment <i>The leader effectively gathers, analyzes, and uses a variety of data to inform planning and decision making consistent with established guidelines, policies, and procedures.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
4. Organizational Management <i>The leader fosters the success of all students by supporting, managing, and overseeing the school's organization,</i>	0 (0.00 %)	1 (12.50 %)	5 (62.50 %)	2 (25.00 %)

<i>operation, and use of resources.</i>				
5. Human Resources Management <i>The leader fosters effective human resources management through the selection, induction, support, and retention of quality instructional and support personnel.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
6. Teacher/Staff Evaluation <i>The leader fairly and consistently evaluates school personnel in accordance with state and district guidelines and provides them with timely and constructive feedback focused on improved student learning.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	6 (75.00 %)	2 (25.00 %)
7. Professionalism <i>The leader fosters the success of students by demonstrating professional standards and ethics, engaging in continuous professional development, and contributing to the profession.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	4 (50.00 %)	4 (50.00 %)
8. Communication and Community Relations <i>The leader fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively with stakeholders.</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)

Table 4. Summary Statistics of 8 Leader Assessment on Performance Standards Ratings in Leader Effectiveness Measure for All EPP Initial Completers, 2017 to 2018

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
-----------	---	------	----------	--------	-----	-----

<p>1. Instructional Leadership <i>The leader fosters the success of all students by facilitating the development, communication, implementation, and evaluation of a shared vision of teaching and learning that leads to school improvement.</i></p>	8	2.62	0.52	3	2	3
<p>2. School Climate <i>The leader promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, and sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders.</i></p>	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3
<p>3. Planning and Assessment <i>The leader effectively gathers, analyzes, and uses a variety of data to inform planning and decision making consistent with established guidelines, policies, and procedures.</i></p>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
<p>4. Organizational Management <i>The leader fosters the success of all students by supporting, managing, and overseeing the school's organization, operation, and use of resources.</i></p>	8	2.12	0.64	2	1	3
<p>5. Human Resources Management <i>The leader fosters effective human</i></p>	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3

<i>resources management through the selection, induction, support, and retention of quality instructional and support personnel.</i>						
6. Teacher/Staff Evaluation <i>The leader fairly and consistently evaluates school personnel in accordance with state and district guidelines and provides them with timely and constructive feedback focused on improved student learning.</i>	8	2.25	0.46	2	2	3
7. Professionalism <i>The leader fosters the success of students by demonstrating professional standards and ethics, engaging in continuous professional development, and contributing to the profession.</i>	8	2.50	0.53	2.5	2	3
8. Communication and Community Relations <i>The leader fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively with stakeholders.</i>	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3

Table 5. Results for Educational Leadership Program by Year

LEM Request for EDL Completers of University of North Georgia



April 16, 2020

LEM Results for EDL 2017-2018 Completers

Distribution of Ratings in LEM (SY 2018-2019)

	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV
<i>LEM_Rating</i>	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)
<i>LAPS_Rating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>StudentGrowthRating</i>	1 (20.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	4 (80.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>MGP_Rating</i>	1 (20.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	4 (80.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)
<i>NonMGP_Rating</i>	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)
<i>SchoolClimateStarRating</i>	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	1 (14.29 %)	6 (85.71 %)
<i>CombinationofAdditionalData</i>	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)	0 (NaN %)

[1] "As there are no results for the Combination of Additional Data (optional for the year of 2018-2019), NO LEM rating results were calculated."

Summary Statistics of Ratings in LEM (SY 2018-2019)

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
LAPS_Rating	8	3.12	0.35	3	3	4
LAPS_Sum	8	18.50	2.56	18.5	16	23
StudentGrowthRating	5	2.60	0.89	3.00	1.00	3.00
MGP_Rating	5	2.60	0.89	3.00	1.00	3.00
MGP	5	47.86	9.90	51.64	31.28	56.91

SchoolClimateStarRating	7	3.86	0.38	4.00	3.00	4.00
-------------------------	---	------	------	------	------	------

MGP Rating and MGP Mean are lagging data. There are no NonMGP data in this LEM subset.

Distribution of 8 LAPS Performance Standards Rating (SY 2018-2019)

	Level II	Level III	Level IV
<i>LAPS_PS1</i>	0 (0.00 %)	3 (37.50 %)	5 (62.50 %)
<i>LAPS_PS2</i>	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)
<i>LAPS_PS3</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>LAPS_PS4</i>	1 (12.50 %)	5 (62.50 %)	2 (25.00 %)
<i>LAPS_PS5</i>	0 (0.00 %)	7 (87.50 %)	1 (12.50 %)
<i>LAPS_PS6</i>	0 (0.00 %)	6 (75.00 %)	2 (25.00 %)
<i>LAPS_PS7</i>	0 (0.00 %)	4 (50.00 %)	4 (50.00 %)
<i>LAPS_PS8</i>	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.50 %)	3 (37.50 %)

[1] "The "Level I" has been omitted in the table since no leader has "Level I" in all 8 LAPS Performance Standards."

Summary Statistics of 8 LAPS Performance Standards in LEM (SY 2018-2019)

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Median	Min	Max
LAPS_PS1	8	2.62	0.52	3	2	3
LAPS_PS2	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3
LAPS_PS3	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
LAPS_PS4	8	2.12	0.64	2	1	3
LAPS_PS5	8	2.12	0.35	2	2	3
LAPS_PS6	8	2.25	0.46	2	2	3
LAPS_PS7	8	2.50	0.53	2.5	2	3
LAPS_PS8	8	2.38	0.52	2	2	3

Notes:

1. LEM results are unofficial due to the refinement of data collections methodology. This extended timeline was necessary because of the changes that were made to the evaluation instrument as a result of Senate Bill 364.
2. Since SY 2016-2017, LEM components changed (weights and number of elements) as a result of Senate Bill 364. The weights of the elements are as follows: LAPS-30%; CCRPI School Climate Star Rating-10%; Student Growth-40% (lagging data); Combination of Additional Data-20%.
3. A leader's LAPS rating is derived from the sum of his/her summative scores on all eight LAPS standards using the following rubric: 0-5 (Level I), 6-13 (Level II), 14-21 (Level III), and 22-24 (Level IV).
4. On LAPS standards, Level I scores as 0, Level II scores as 1, Level III scores as 2, and Level IV scores as 3.
5. Student Growth Ratings are derived from lagging MGP Ratings or NonMGP Ratings. If a leader came from a school that has SGP course(s) and received an MGP Rating from the school MGP, the leader's Student Growth Rating will be the MGP Rating. If a leader came from a school that has SGP course(s) and didn't receive an MGP Rating according to school and leader MGP calculation rules, the leader's Student Growth Rating will be missing. If a leader came from a school that doesn't have SGP course(s), the leader's Student Growth Rating will be NonMGP Rating, which is provided by the district. Therefore, the total number of Student Growth Ratings will be equal to the sum of the number of MGP Ratings and NonMGP Ratings.
6. For more information, please refer to LKES Handbook: <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20LKES%20Documents/2019-2020%20Documents%20TKES%20and%20LKES/LKESHandbook2019.2020.pdf> (<https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20LKES%20Documents/2019-2020%20Documents%20TKES%20and%20LKES/LKESHandbook2019.2020.pdf>).
7. No results for 2018-2019 completers. Evaluation data is provided at the close of each school year.

CONFIDENTIAL

Analysis of Educational Leadership Data:

In terms of our Educational Leadership completer data, all candidates scored at least a 3 or 4 on LEMs data. In fact, 87.5 percent scored at a level 4 for School/Climate Star Rating. Additionally, all candidates scored at a level 3 or 4 on LAPS data, with the exception of one candidate who received a rating of level 2 for organizational management. In fact, 62.5 percent scored at a level 4 for instructional leadership, 37.5 percent scored a level 4 for school climate, 50 percent scored a level 4 for professionalism, and 37.5 percent scored a level 4 for communications and community relations. We see this as a testament to our completers and our program but also to the districts and schools with whom they work. The categories in which completers scored higher are all related to relationships, and it seems that our completers have strong relationship and communication skills, both of which are vital to strong and impactful leadership. As with our other programs, all data is shared with program faculty, and this data is utilized in planning curricular changes during data days throughout the year.