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.

GA

University of North Georgia
Traditional Report AY 2018-19
Georgia

REPORT COMPLETE
STATUS: CERTIFIED

Institution Information

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Academic year
- IPEDS ID

IPEDS ID

482680

☐ **THIS INSTITUTION HAS NO IPEDS ID**

IF NO IPEDS ID, PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION

ADDRESS

82 College Circle

CITY

Dahlonega

STATE

Georgia

ZIP

30597

SALUTATION

Dr.

FIRST NAME

April

LAST NAME

Nelms

PHONE

(706) 864-1998

EMAIL

april.nelms@ung.edu

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

List of Programs

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

List each program for an initial teaching credential below and indicate whether it is offered at the Undergraduate level (UG), Institution Information Postgraduate level (PG), or both. **(§205(a)(C))**

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Teacher Preparation Program

List of Programs

CIP Code	Teacher Preparation Programs	UG, PG, or Both	Update
13.1203	Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education and Teaching	Both	
13.1	Special Education	UG	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	Both	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	UG	
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	PG	
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	UG	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	PG	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	Both	
13.1316	Teacher Education - General Science	Both	
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	Both	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	Both	
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	Both	
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	Both	
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	Both	
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Sciences	PG	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	Both	

Total number of teacher preparation programs:

15

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Requirements

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Check the elements required for admission (entry) into and completion (exit) from the program. If programs are offered at the undergraduate level and postgraduate level, complete the table for both types of programs. **(§205(a)(1)(C)(i))**

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience
- Adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience
- Cooperating Teachers/PreK-12 Staff Supervising Clinical Experience
- Supervised clinical experience

Undergraduate Requirements

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 table below blank (or **clear responses already entered**) then click save at the bottom of the page.

Element	Admission	Completion
Transcript	(●) Yes ( ) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Fingerprint check	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Background check	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	(●) Yes ( ) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum GPA	(●) Yes ( ) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	(●) Yes ( ) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	(●) Yes ( ) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Minimum ACT score	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Minimum SAT score	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Minimum basic skills test score	(●) Yes ( ) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	( ) Yes (●) No	(●) Yes ( ) No
Recommendation(s)	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No
Essay or personal statement	( ) Yes (●) No	( ) Yes (●) No

Element	Admission	Completion
Interview	○ Yes ● No	○ Yes ● No
Other Specify: Pre-education coursework; preservice certification; ethics, dispositions, edTPA as…	● Yes ○ No	● Yes ○ 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.)

2.75

3. 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

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

Our pre-education students complete the entirety of their core coursework, which is the first 60 hours of their program of study, prior to their admission to an education program. The core coursework includes three entry-level, foundational education courses with 40 hours of observation experiences in schools. Before students are allowed to pursue these early observation experiences, they must complete an online certified background check. The results are then submitted directly to our Program Admissions Specialist for review. Students are required to complete their core coursework with a 2.75 GPA or higher, and they must earn a "C" or higher in their early education courses mentioned above and in English 1101, English 1102, and their first required mathematics course. In terms of applying to the College of Education, as per Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) requirements, applicants must pass the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Program Admissions Assessments in reading, writing, and mathematics before acceptance into an educator preparation program (EPP). Students, however, may exempt this assessment with qualifying ACT or SAT scores (a combined score of 1080 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 noted in element number one above that SAT and ACT scores are not required, but many of our students utilize this option instead of taking the GACE Program Admissions Assessment. 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 before issuing the pre-service certificate, which is 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 only attempt the assessment), and they must complete a self- beliefs disposition assessment. Currently, the GaPSC requires students to take the GACE Ethics Entry Exam prior to admissions and the GACE Ethics Exit Exam prior to completion and certification (for a total of two tests). During the upcoming academic year, the GaPSC requirements have changed to require only one ethics exam at the point of entry. Prior to program completion, candidates must attempt the GACE Content Area Assessment for their chosen field, and they must attempt the Educative Teacher Performance Assessment (EdTPA) through Pearson. Currently, these are requirements for certification and for program completion (for reporting purposes) but not for graduation, and the EdTPA is under review for removal as a certification requirement.

Postgraduate Requirements

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 table below blank (or **clear responses already entered**) then click save at the bottom of the page.

Element	Admission	Completion
Transcript	● Yes ○ No	● Yes ○ No
Fingerprint check	○ Yes ● No	○ Yes ● No

Element	Admission	Completion
Background check	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum number of courses/credits/semester hours completed	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum GPA	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum GPA in content area coursework	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum GPA in professional education coursework	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum ACT score	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum SAT score	Yes / No	Yes / No
Minimum basic skills test score	Yes / No	Yes / No
Subject area/academic content test or other subject matter verification	Yes / No	Yes / No
Recommendation(s)	Yes / No	Yes / No
Essay or personal statement	Yes / No	Yes / No
Interview	Yes / No	Yes / No
Other Specify: None	Yes / No	Yes / 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.)

2.75

3. 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

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

Our postgraduate, initial certification programs include the Post Baccalaureate program and the Master of Arts in Teaching. 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 before starting either program. The GaPSC handles the background check for this process, and there is no fingerprint requirement. Before admissions into either of these programs, prospective candidates must attempt the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Educator Ethics Entry Exam, pass the GACE Program Admissions Assessment, and pass the GACE Content Area Assessment at the professional level (a score of 250 out of 300) for their chosen content field. Additionally, applicants complete a self-beliefs dispositions assessment at the time of admissions. Before graduation, candidates must attempt the EdTPA provided through Pearson and the GACE Educator Ethics Exit Exam. As with our undergraduate programs, a passing score on the GACE Educator Ethics Exit Exam will be required for program admissions during the next academic year. The GaPSC will eliminate the requirement for two Ethics exams. Additionally, as noted above, the EdTPA is under review for removal as a certification requirement for the GaPSC. Currently, though, candidates must pass each assessment to be recommended for certification, but only have to attempt these assessments to be listed as program completers in our system.

Supervised Clinical Experience

Provide the following information about supervised clinical experience in 2018-19. (§205(a)(1)(C)(iii), §205(a)(1)(C)(iv))

Are there programs with student teaching models?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, provide the next two responses. If no, leave them blank.

Programs with student teaching models (most traditional programs)	
Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to student teaching	405
Number of clock hours required for student teaching	742

Are there programs in which candidates are the teacher of record?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, provide the next two responses. If no, leave them blank.

Programs in which candidates are the teacher of record in a classroom during the program (many alternative programs)	
Number of clock hours of supervised clinical experience required prior to teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom	456
Number of years required for teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom	816

All Programs	
Number of full-time equivalent faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff) Optional tool for automatically calculating full-time equivalent faculty in the system	35.5
Number of adjunct faculty supervising clinical experience during this academic year (IHE staff)	0
Number of cooperating teachers/K-12 staff supervising clinical experience during this academic year	246
Number of students in supervised clinical experience during this academic year	246

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

The average number of clock hours varies for our programs due to each program's length and the content course requirements. Programs that encompass the entire length of the candidates' junior and senior years, which include Elementary/Special Education and Middle Grades, have a year-long internship during the senior year, and these candidates are also in the schools the entirety of their junior year. Our Elementary/Special Education program has two year-long placements. While our middle grades candidates are in the schools for two entire years, only the senior placement is year-long, as these candidates also have an elementary school placement to cover all required grade bands for certification that occurs during the first half of year one of the program. Our Secondary programs, which include history, mathematics, English, and the sciences, are three-semester programs. They also include one year-long placement during the senior year and a middle grades placement during the second semester of the junior year. These programs mentioned above, which make up our majority of students, incur more field placement hours than our other degree pathways. Our P-12 programs, which include physical education, art, and music, are also three-semester programs. Still, they have fewer clinical experiences due to the required time in content courses and additional requirements such as recitals and performances (i.e., music). Additionally, our Post Baccalaureate and MAT programs are one year (a year-long placement), which means their overall hours are lower. All clinical experiences are supervised by full-time or part-time faculty. Each faculty

member is assigned to a particular school and a group of students placed within that school (approximately eight students per faculty member except art, music, physical education, and mathematics). Faculty are expected to visit their school and students at least once per week. They are not required to conduct a formal observation weekly, but they are expected to have a presence at the school and be available for their teacher candidates, as anticipated in 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 (an online data and learning management system), and these guidelines include submitting biweekly reports, conducting informal observations, conducting formal assessments utilizing our Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS) summative assessment tool, checking candidates' logged hours in LiveText, documenting regular meetings with candidates and their mentor teachers, completing a dispositions assessment tool on candidates at least once per placement, and completing a final exit interview with candidates during the spring of their senior year. Additionally, candidates are each assigned a mentor teacher (teacher of record) within their classroom. The 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 with four being the highest). Teachers in the state of Georgia are evaluated utilizing the Teacher Keys Effective System, upon which our CAPS tool is based. While a level three is the expected level of performance for teachers in our state, our goal with teacher candidates is to see growth over time. We do not expect them to score 4's by the time they graduate. Mentor teachers also submit documentation via LiveText regarding their time with their teacher candidates. They fill out our CAPS evaluation instrument and our dispositions assessments each semester, and they document hours and time spent with candidates biweekly. In terms of evaluation of clinical experiences, teacher candidates have the opportunity to provide feedback on both their university supervisors and mentor teachers through an evaluation sent out via LiveText at the end of each year. Mentor teachers receive 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 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. Each year, results are obtained for our SACSCOC report and shared with faculty workgroups for overall planning purposes and program improvement.

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Enrollment and Program Completers

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

In each of the following categories, provide the total number of individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs for an initial teaching credential and the subset of individuals enrolled who also completed the program during the academic year. **(§205(a)(1)(C)(ii))**

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Enrolled Student
- Program Completer

Enrollment and Program Completers

2018-19 Total	
Total Number of Individuals Enrolled	808
Subset of Program Completers	239

Gender	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Male	122	35
Female	686	204
Non-Binary/Other	0	0
No Gender Reported	0	0
Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	1
Asian	12	3
Black or African American	12	2
Hispanic/Latino of any race	76	20
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0
White	692	210

Race/Ethnicity	Total Enrolled	Subset of Program Completers
Two or more races	5	1
No Race/Ethnicity Reported	8	2

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Teachers Prepared

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

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.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Academic Major

Teachers Prepared by Subject Area

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by subject area for academic year 2018-19.

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))**

What are CIP Codes?

☐ **No teachers prepared in academic year 2018-19**

If your program has no teachers prepared, check the box above and leave the table below blank (or **clear responses already entered**).

What are CIP codes? The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, and 2000 (https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55).

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.10	Teacher Education - Special Education	133
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	133

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	48
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	3
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	28
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	35
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	4
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	13
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	1
13.1316	Teacher Education - Science Teacher Education/General Science	23
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	27
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	4
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	16
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	

CIP Code	Subject Area	Number Prepared
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	
13.99	Education - Other Specify:	

Teachers Prepared by Academic Major

Please provide the number of teachers prepared by academic major for academic year 2018-19. 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.

What are CIP Codes?

Do participants earn a degree upon completion of the program?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

☐ No teachers prepared in academic year 2018-19

If your program does not grant participants a degree upon completion, or has no teachers prepared, leave the table below blank (or clear responses already entered).

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.10	Teacher Education - Special Education	133
13.1202	Teacher Education - Elementary Education	133
13.1203	Teacher Education - Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education	41
13.1210	Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education	
13.1301	Teacher Education - Agriculture	
13.1302	Teacher Education - Art	3
13.1303	Teacher Education - Business	
13.1305	Teacher Education - English/Language Arts	23
13.1306	Teacher Education - Foreign Language	
13.1307	Teacher Education - Health	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
13.1308	Teacher Education - Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics	
13.1309	Teacher Education - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts	
13.1311	Teacher Education - Mathematics	29
13.1312	Teacher Education - Music	2
13.1314	Teacher Education - Physical Education and Coaching	12
13.1315	Teacher Education - Reading	1
13.1316	Teacher Education - General Science	20
13.1317	Teacher Education - Social Science	
13.1318	Teacher Education - Social Studies	23
13.1320	Teacher Education - Trade and Industrial	
13.1321	Teacher Education - Computer Science	
13.1322	Teacher Education - Biology	4
13.1323	Teacher Education - Chemistry	
13.1324	Teacher Education - Drama and Dance	
13.1328	Teacher Education - History	12
13.1329	Teacher Education - Physics	
13.1331	Teacher Education - Speech	
13.1337	Teacher Education - Earth Science	
13.14	Teacher Education - English as a Second Language	
13.99	Education - Other Specify:	
01	Agriculture	
03	Natural Resources and Conservation	
05	Area, Ethnic, Cultural, and Gender Studies	
09	Communication or Journalism	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
11	Computer and Information Sciences	
12	Personal and Culinary Services	
14	Engineering	
16	Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics	
19	Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	
21	Technology Education/Industrial Arts	
22	Legal Professions and Studies	
23	English Language/Literature	
24	Liberal Arts/Humanities	
25	Library Science	
26	Biological and Biomedical Sciences	
27	Mathematics and Statistics	
30	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	
38	Philosophy and Religious Studies	
40	Physical Sciences	
41	Science Technologies/Technicians	
42	Psychology	
44	Public Administration and Social Service Professions	
45	Social Sciences	
46	Construction	
47	Mechanic and Repair Technologies	
50	Visual and Performing Arts	
51	Health Professions and Related Clinical Sciences	
52	Business/Management/Marketing	
54	History	

CIP Code	Academic Major	Number Prepared
99	Other Specify:	

SECTION I: PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Assurances

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Respond to the following assurances. Note: Teacher preparation programs should be prepared to provide documentation and evidence, when requested, to support the following assurances. **(§205(a)(1)(A)(iii); §206(b))**

Program Assurances

1. Program 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 three years, we have convened 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 gaps in terms of preparation of educators in their districts and regions. From this collaboration, we were able to develop a program 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 classes 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 pursue 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 Educational 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 highlights 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 an example of how preparation is linked with the needs of our partner schools. 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 healthy relationships. They are expected to meet with mentor teachers and administrators regularly to ensure that they address problems and meet the school's needs. These faculty then work with our teacher candidates to ensure that their lessons and pedagogical approaches meet the school's needs. 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 a 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. For the second year, we convened a Mentor Teacher Advisory Board to provide targeted feedback on our students, processes, and assessments. We also continued to survey all of our mentor teachers for feedback on our programs and operations. We have a required diversity course for all education majors and special education courses and/or equivalent coursework for our students. We also have faculty with expertise in special education and second language acquisition strategies. These experts have met with their College of Education colleagues to embed theory and practice into coursework in all of our initial certification programs. We meet regularly in small workgroups and as a whole Educator Preparation Program (EPP) to ensure that we are consistently updating the curricula and assessments regarding 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 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 explicitly dedicated 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 before 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, secondary, post-baccalaureate, and Master of Arts in Teaching candidates have a required special education course, as do our physical education teacher candidates. Our art and music candidates complete 21 special education modules equivalent to that offered in a three-credit hour course. Currently, however, we are working on developing a special education course for our art and music candidates. The music for special learners course will be offered for the first time in the spring of 2020. Candidates in the art program will be allowed to select a special education course from the k-5, 4-8, or 6-12 grade bands beginning in the 2020-2021 academic year. In addition to special education content, our general education teachers are prepared to provide instruction to limited English proficient students and 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 before entering into an Educator Preparation Program. This course covers diversity in multiple forms, including language, race, ethnicity, ability, socioeconomic status, gender, and so forth. Students read sociological and educational theories regarding class structure in America and language acquisition in this entry-level course. Then, these topics are expanded upon, and theory is put into practice once students are accepted into their program. For example, in terms of socioeconomic status, students in our Elementary/Special Education program take a course entitled "Strategies for Supporting Children and Families from Diverse Communities," a significant part of which involves discussions for supporting families and students from low-income backgrounds. Candidates in our middle grades program learn about support structures for limited-income families and children in "Culture and Practice in Middle-Level Schools" and "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. All teacher candidates take instructional differentiation and assessment courses, during which professors include 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 where students' field placements require teacher candidates to know 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 how to work with limited resources with parents and families who work long hours and are often isolated in rural areas. Likewise, our other primary 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, poverty is a stark reality in this area. Many parents work long hours and do not have transportation to participate regularly in school events. Teacher candidates in the College of Education typically have placements in both regions (rural and urban) throughout 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. We have a responsibility, as an Education Preparation Provider, to ensure that they do not approach their classrooms from deficit perspectives. In recent years, we expanded 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 the increased diversity of

field experiences, as well, as this area serves a larger Asian student population. In terms of program assurance related to the number of teachers prepared, it is important to note that our system indicated we prepared two teachers in addition to what is present in this report. Through communications with the Director of Rules Management and Educator Assessment at the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC), it was determined that the additional teachers prepared (one in English language arts and one in business education) were not Title II applicable. Additionally, the GaPSC representative confirmed that they reviewed the data multiple times and were certain of the accuracy of the number of teachers prepared.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Mathematics

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

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 teacher preparation 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)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Please note that the goals you set last year are not pre-loaded into your report because the Department's changes to wording of the questions in this section make them incompatible for pre-loading from last year's data. Next year, your goals will be pre-loaded into your report based on the goals you enter this year.

In order to complete this section, you may find it helpful to review your goals in your 2019 report. You may download and review your 2019 report by following the following steps: 1) click the Home tab, 2) click "Academic Year 2018-19 Data" in the banner near the top of the page to expand the dropdown, and select "Academic Year 2017-18 Data," 3) Click Download Report.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2018-19)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2018-19?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2018-19 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Describe your goal.

For the 2018-2019 academic year, we aspired to prepare two additional teachers in mathematics.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

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

For secondary mathematics, our numbers remained consistent from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019, with ten admitted during the former and ten admitted during the latter. During the same period, our numbers of completers declined in secondary mathematics, with nine students completing in 2017-2018

and five completing in 2018-2019. These numbers do not include middle grades students, although many of these students do graduate with mathematics as a primary or secondary content teaching area. When reviewing our Title II/Westat preparation data from this reporting year to the prior one, we prepared 29 students in the subject area and major of mathematics as compared to 19 the previous year. These numbers would include candidates in our middle grades, secondary, post-baccalaureate, and Master of Arts in Teaching programs. We did meet our goal of adding two students when counting the number of completers from our middle grades and secondary education programs. Our secondary mathematics education program is one of four programs that operate outside of the College of Education's bounds. While the College of Education handles the admission of these students for reporting purposes, the program is run by the Mathematics department, their faculty teach all courses except for three Social Foundations of Education courses taken prior to entry into the College of Education programs, and the program is accredited by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (all data for which are collected and turned in by the mathematics education program coordinator). The mathematics department also handles advising and recruiting for their program, which they typically recruit from their current mathematics majors. They regularly advertise at our Open Houses and other recruitment events on campus, and they recruit in local high schools. While their numbers remain good for mathematics programs, they also illustrate a trend occurring across the state with decreasing numbers of secondary candidates and decreasing numbers of mathematics candidates. As noted, they have also built strong relationships with local schools and regularly work with high-school students to begin the recruitment process for mathematics education. The College of Education also assists with recruitment at high-school recruitment fairs across the state. We advertise the mathematics education program in all of our recruitment materials and on our website. Additionally, we have faculty members who have submitted annually for grants to increase the number of students majoring in STEM education, including mathematics. These faculty have applied for a Robert Noyce Grant, with a particular emphasis on scholarships and training for students from diverse backgrounds going into STEM education. Faculty applied in the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 years but were unable to secure the grant. Although the feedback indicated that we produced adequate numbers of educators, we are still contributing to the deficit in our state and have the capacity to do so. They will apply again after a one-year hiatus to implement more robust interventions and student supports. As a part of their proposal, they created a recruitment plan for students, parts of which we will utilize for recruitment in our STEM education fields. Lastly, the College of Education developed information sessions for interested students, and we will continue to advertise these widely to all of our content area partners and their students.

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

Although this program runs out of the mathematics department, mathematics faculty and the College of Education realize that we need to work together closely to ensure that our students' needs are met. We have strengthened our relationship over the past two years, meeting regularly and trying to keep one another current regarding the events and activities of both departments. We have developed a good relationship that we hope can help us in collaborating on recruitment for mathematics. We will continue to work on this relationship over the upcoming academic year. We will meet with the mathematics education coordinator specifically regarding our numbers, and brainstorm to enhance our recruitment efforts as a team. In the College of Education, we plan to focus on more internal recruitment over the next year, including working earlier with students (they do not apply to the College of Education until junior year). We are working on a five-year recruitment plan, which we will implement in the fall of 2019. We will continue to attend New Student Orientations, Transfer Student Orientations, and Open House. We will reach out to students throughout the first year and sophomore year to ensure that they have contact with us and can have their questions answered. We will continue scheduling information sessions, and we hope to plan regular dialogues where students can ask questions and discuss topics related to education. Our goal is to create a community so that students feel supported and welcomed before that junior year. We will continue to reach out to our partner schools as well. We have begun accreditation interviews with administrators. We will be sure to reach out regarding visiting upper-level mathematics courses to speak with potential students and to ask these administrators for feedback regarding recruitment for mathematics education.

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

Again, as we continue to be realistic about our numbers, we erred on the low side with two. Our numbers in middle and secondary education fluctuate each year, which is an issue across the state, and one of our goals will be to pinpoint why more students are not going into mathematics education and other secondary content areas in our region--we hope our accreditation interviews will help with information here. Additionally, we need to make a more concerted effort to evaluate students upon program entry and exit to discover the types of support students need. We currently survey students, but these surveys focus more on content and field placement 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 to increase these numbers. A second goal for the upcoming year is to work with our Secondary Mathematics coordinator to target specific efforts for recruiting and retaining mathematics teacher candidates. Thirdly, our STEM faculty also plan to continue to pursue grants that would help us recruit students in this area by providing scholarship opportunities. Of course, this effort is not a given, but our faculty in this area are actively working on grants dedicated to these efforts and have received excellent feedback to assist them in reapplying. Lastly, we are 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 2019-2020 reporting year. We gradually expanded into this region in 2018-2019, but we hope for growth in this region, and we anticipate that this will impact our overall numbers as well.

Review Current Year's Goal (2019-20)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in mathematics in 2019-20? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

For the 2019-2020 academic year, we aspire to prepare one additional teacher in mathematics.

Set Next Year's Goal (2020-21)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in mathematics in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

For the 2020-2021 academic year, we aspire to prepare one additional teacher in mathematics.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Science

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

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 teacher preparation 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)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Please note that the goals you set last year are not pre-loaded into your report because the Department's changes to wording of the questions in this section make them incompatible for pre-loading from last year's data. Next year, your goals will be pre-loaded into your report based on the goals you enter this year.

In order to complete this section, you may find it helpful to review your goals in your 2019 report. You may download and review your 2019 report by following the following steps: 1) click the Home tab, 2) click "Academic Year 2018-19 Data" in the banner near the top of the page to expand the dropdown, and select "Academic Year 2017-18 Data," 3) Click Download Report.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2018-19)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in science in 2018-19?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2018-19 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Describe your goal.

Our goal for the 2018-2019 academic year was to prepare one additional teacher in science.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

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

In terms of the numbers of admitted candidates for secondary science programs (biology, chemistry, and physics), we met our goal for the 2018-2019 year; our number admitted from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 went up from four to five students. In terms of completers, though, we completed eight

students in secondary science in 2017-2018, but we only completed four students in 2018-2019 in secondary science. These numbers do not include our middle grades, post-baccalaureate, or Master of Arts in Teaching programs, which also certify in science education. According to data provided by Title II/Westat, our number of teachers prepared in the subject area of science was 21 in 2017-2018 as compared to 23 in 2018-2019. This past reporting year, as years prior, our science education faculty submitted for a federal grant to increase the number of students, specifically the number of diverse students, entering into science education. Thus far, we have not received one of these grants, but this team will continue to apply to utilize the feedback they have received to improve upon their applications. As part of these grants, this team has developed a recruitment plan for science education, which we will integrate into our five-year recruitment plan currently under development. Our science education team also created a Bachelors of Science in Education (BSED) for the sciences, including concentrations in biology, chemistry, and physics, hoping that this would increase the number of students in these fields. Because we do not have much communication with our students during the first 2.5 years of their education (they are completing their core courses and do not begin in the College of Education until the spring semester of their junior year), we feel that we lose students due to a lack of continual contact. Over the past couple of years, we have worked to change our degree pathways and our advising approaches so that we can have contact as early as possible and hopefully keep more students in the field of education. As noted with mathematics, we have implemented informational sessions, and we hope to continue to find ways to reach out to students and provide more events for them to attend to increase contact before the point of application.

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

Our science education faculty developed BSEDs in biology, physics, and chemistry. They work to maintain contact with our secondary science students over their first two years to have a strong line of communication and support for students before their admission into the College of Education. However, we are still having difficulty recruiting additional students into the fields of science education, as with mathematics education. In terms of what we have learned, first, we recognize that we still need an increased emphasis on advising. We need to improve in reaching out to students from their first day and ensuring that they have regular contact from the College of Education. Our secondary students are housed in their content areas throughout their college experience, meaning they don't typically have advisors in the College of Education, and we do not see them during their first two years, unless they reach out to us. We need to make concerted and specific efforts to reach out for both advising and social events so students have a connection and feel supported by the College of Education. Secondly, we need to ensure that we are collaborating successfully with our science departments so that we can work together to help these students. We need to schedule regular meetings with department heads in biology, chemistry, and physics to discuss ways to support teacher education students. This has not happened in the past, but, as we have learned, this is an essential step for us to take in improving our programs for our students. We will work with our coordinator of secondary programs so that she feels comfortable reaching out and having regular meetings with our content area representatives. Lastly, we have increased our recruitment efforts with our local high schools over the past year, and we will continue in these efforts. As with our narrative regarding mathematics education, we would like to visit local schools to speak with students in their upper-level science courses about potential careers in science education. In terms of lessons learned in seeking funding to recruit diverse students to become STEM teachers, we learned that we need to demonstrate our need and student support structures better. The faculty seeking funding will spend a year developing additional supports before they reapply for the Robert F. Noyce Scholarship Program through the National Science Foundation. During this time, they will also work in partnership with the Physics Department to develop a Learning Assistant Program and seek funding for recruitment through the American Physics Society and the American Association for Physics Teachers. One such example is the Learning Assistant (LA) Program implemented in the Physics Department. Students are trained in science teaching pedagogies and assist in physics labs. While in the LA Program, students are recruited into teaching. To support and expand the LA Program, faculty from physics, chemistry, and education partnered to develop the program. Part of the development was to expand the LA Program to the Chemistry Department. After that, the faculty earned a two-year grant to expand their marketing efforts and support advising training for faculty and recruitment in local schools. We hope to see an increase in students admitted to science education fields within the next three years due to the LA Program.

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

As noted above, we want to be realistic in our abilities, mainly keeping our past reporting years in mind regarding numbers. Given our current numbers, it is unlikely that we see an increase next year. However, we may see students pursue chemistry and physics in addition to our consistent enrollment in biology education majors. Our program recently admitted only one science education student for the 2018-2019 academic year, and we will graduate four biology completers in 2019. With this in mind, we will continue the efforts with advisement, recruitment, and collaboration across disciplines mentioned above with increased emphasis. 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. Through two of our newer positions, the Coordinator of Diversity and Recruitment and Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships 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 integrate specific steps for recruitment of critical needs areas in our recruitment plan with, including the sciences, mathematics, special education, and English for Speakers of Other Languages. By the 2018-2019 year, we had anticipated having a fully functioning and fully supported (regarding budget and personnel) five-year recruitment plan, but we have pushed this goal to 2019-2020. We expect that launching this plan in the fall of 2019 will increase our numbers in time. Our STEM faculty are continuing to apply for grants meant to increase the number of students entering into STEM education. 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 2019-2020 reporting year. We gradually expanded into this region in 2018-2019, but we hope for growth in this region, and we anticipate that this will impact our overall numbers as well.

Review Current Year's Goal (2019-20)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in science in 2019-20? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

Our goal for the 2019-2020 academic year is to prepare one additional teacher in science.

Set Next Year's Goal (2020-21)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in science in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

Our goal for the 2020-2021 academic year is to prepare one additional teacher in science.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Special Education

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

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 teacher preparation 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)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Please note that the goals you set last year are not pre-loaded into your report because the Department's changes to wording of the questions in this section make them incompatible for pre-loading from last year's data. Next year, your goals will be pre-loaded into your report based on the goals you enter this year.

In order to complete this section, you may find it helpful to review your goals in your 2019 report. You may download and review your 2019 report by following the following steps: 1) click the Home tab, 2) click "Academic Year 2018-19 Data" in the banner near the top of the page to expand the dropdown, and select "Academic Year 2017-18 Data," 3) Click Download Report.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2018-19)

1. Did your program prepare teachers in special education in 2018-19?

If no, leave remaining questions for 2018-19 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) **Yes**
- ( ) **No**

2. Describe your goal.

For the 2018-2019 academic year, our goal was to prepare one additional teacher in special education.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) **Yes**
- ( ) **No**

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

As a brief caveat, our only special education program is a dual bachelor's degree in elementary and special education--we have no other options for either elementary education or special education. In terms of completers, we met our goal for 2018-2019. As noted in our Title II/Westat data, we had

133 completers claiming special education for their subject area and major, as opposed to 101 completers for 2017-2018. In terms of admits, for the 2018-2019 reporting year, we did meet our goal of adding one prospective teacher to our special education program. In 2017-2018, we admitted 176 candidates, and in 2018-2019, we admitted 180 candidates. This particular program has intensive advising, which we know is an asset in tracking students and ensuring that we have consistent contact with students. We have highly-trained advisors that focus mostly on our Elementary/Special Education and Middle Grades students, and these students meet their advisors from their very first visit to campus, thus beginning a relationship that is cultivated over time. These students have mandatory advising meetings prior to their application to the program, which occurs the semester before their junior year. Once in the program, candidates are placed in cohort groups in Professional Development Communities (PDCs), which we also believe helps with retention. Candidates remain with their cohort for both years in the program, and they are assigned in groups of eight to a school. Each school has a university faculty member associated with the school who checks in weekly with candidates to ensure that they are successful in placement. This kind of intensive focus on each candidate means faculty have a better pulse on how students are doing and when they are struggling. Candidates facing consistent issues are placed on a Professional Development Plan, not as a punitive measure but to help them succeed. Additionally, our Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships visits Teacher Pathways Programs at local schools. In our state, these programs consist mainly of students entering into elementary education. Since our special education program is a dual degree program in elementary and special education, we receive many recruits just through these efforts. Annually, we sponsor a Professional Association of Georgia Educators (PAGE) Future Georgia Educators day, and again, the majority of the high-school students in attendance are interested in elementary education. Thus for those entering into our program, they are dually certified in special education as well—our dual certification results in increased numbers in terms of recruitment for special needs.

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

As with all of our degree programs, we can certainly continue to improve our performance in terms of student recruitment. As noted in earlier narratives related to mathematics and science education, we know that we need to work more on internal recruitment. We can reach out to our general/interdisciplinary studies programs and other first-year courses and programming to recruit students. Additionally, we will continue to emphasize recruitment outside of our IHE. As mentioned previously, we started accreditation interviews with P-12 administrators and teacher leaders to determine how we can better serve their needs. We will work with our Advisory Council and Mentor Teacher Advisory Board to brainstorm for recruitment initiatives on which we can partner, such as "Grow Your Own" programs. We will continue to work with our Coordinator for Diversity and Recruitment Initiatives and our Director of Community Engagement and Partnerships on our external recruitment efforts as well, particularly concerning the recruitment of diverse students in our Elementary/Special Education program (and other programs). We just completed our five-year recruitment plan, which will be implemented in the fall of 2019. We hope to increase dissemination of information regarding our programs and our students' and faculty's successes through social media and reports--we know we need to improve in terms of telling our story and ensuring that our partners and our community are aware of the great work our Elementary/Special Education candidates and completers are doing.

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

We noted last year that we expected our numbers within our Elementary Education/Special Education dual degree program to remain consistent over the next couple of years. For the 2018-2019 year, we ended up with 180 admits for fall 2018, which was an improvement from our previous year's numbers (although we inevitably lose students before the program start). However, we admitted 219 students to begin the program in the fall of 2019. Although our numbers rebounded from the decrease in 2018-2019, we will expand our recruitment efforts and continue to cultivate and expand our Professional Development Community (PDC) partnerships to provide potential students with more placement options. We sometimes lose students before the program starts due to limited placement options with our PDC model. While there are many benefits to this model, we also have to provide support for our students driving from long distances. As an example of this, we have expanded 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 2019-2020 reporting year, but we hope this provides more choice for students. Additionally, our Director of Clinical Engagement and Community Partnerships is 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. Completing 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. Lastly, as noted in previous narratives, we will work with our Advisory Council, Mentor Teacher Advisory Board, and our administrative partners to brainstorm regarding joint recruitment initiatives.

Review Current Year's Goal (2019-20)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in special education in 2019-20? If no, leave the next question blank.

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

8. Describe your goal.

For the 2019-2020 academic year, we aspire to prepare one additional teacher in special education.

Set Next Year's Goal (2020-21)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in special education in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

10. Describe your goal.

For the 2020-2021 academic year, we will aim to prepare one additional teacher in special education.

SECTION II: ANNUAL GOALS

Annual Goals: Instruction of Limited English Proficient Students

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

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 teacher preparation 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)(i), §205(a)(1)(A)(ii), §206(a))

Please note that the goals you set last year are not pre-loaded into your report because the Department's changes to wording of the questions in this section make them incompatible for pre-loading from last year's data. Next year, your goals will be pre-loaded into your report based on the goals you enter this year.

In order to complete this section, you may find it helpful to review your goals in your 2019 report. You may download and review your 2019 report by following the following steps: 1) click the Home tab, 2) click "Academic Year 2018-19 Data" in the banner near the top of the page to expand the dropdown, and select "Academic Year 2017-18 Data," 3) Click Download Report.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Quantifiable Goals

Report Progress on Last Year's Goal (2018-19)

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

If no, leave remaining questions for 2018-19 blank (or clear responses already entered).

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

2. Describe your goal.

Our goal for the 2018-2019 academic year was to prepare one additional teacher in the instruction of limited English proficient students.

3. Did your program meet the goal?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

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

The University of North Georgia's (UNG) Educator Preparation Programs offer an endorsement in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) at

the graduate level. This endorsement is entirely online. While we did meet our goal (up from three to nine candidates according to our state database), this program has decreased substantially in previous years, as school districts have begun offering ESOL certifications through Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs). With this in mind, we worked to integrate the ESOL certification into our other degree programs, offering ESOL as a strand in our Curriculum and Instruction Master's Degree and our Early Childhood Education Master's Degree programs. We offer this program as a stand-alone endorsement for both graduate and professional learning unit (PLU) credit for practicing teachers. We regularly attend recruitment events for middle and high-school students, and at these events, we also recruit practicing teachers (who attend with their students) for our graduate programs. We also talk with P-12 administrators and school partners to provide information about our graduate-level programs and endorsements to share with their teachers.

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

We have learned that we need to be more creative in developing ways to compete with our Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs). As we create our college-wide recruitment plan, we have been thinking of ways to incentivize current educators to participate in these programs. We plan to have these discussions with our Advisory Council and Mentor Teacher Advisory Board. In particular, we will seek out the input from our district partners with high numbers of English learners. These could include ideas such as offering a special rate for districts willing and able to send a specific amount of practicing teachers through the program. We also need to focus on our advertising and marketing strategies, including enhancing our social media footprint and connecting more with our P-12 partners. We have done very little to advertise our ESOL program in the past. Lastly, we have learned that we need to solicit input from those who have completed this program, which we have not done previously. While we survey our initial program completers, we have not surveyed our endorsement completers, which could help us gather vital input for program improvement.

6. 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 strand in our Curriculum and Instruction Master's in Education and Early Childhood Education Master's in Education degrees. Being realistic, 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. We will work with our ESOL program coordinator to develop and facilitate specific recruitment plan steps for this endorsement program, including partnering with local school districts and enhancing our advertising initiatives. Given our region, which has high numbers of English learners, 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. For example, we have worked with one of our partner districts to establish a specialized cohort of native-Spanish speaking students in a "Grow Your Own" model called the RISE program (Realizing Inspiring and Successful Educators). These students will be our first group of teacher candidates to graduate with the ability to teach in English and Spanish (bilingual instruction). Our partner district promises these students 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. We are very excited, though, about the prospects of this program, and we hope to be able to expand with similar initiatives in other districts. Once we started the RISE program, for instance, we met with another neighboring district interested in similar programming. Now, we have developed the Aspiring Teachers Program (ATP), a sister program to RISE.

Review Current Year's Goal (2019-20)

7. Is your program preparing teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2019-20? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8. Describe your goal.

Our goal for the 2019-2020 academic year is to prepare one additional teacher in the instruction of limited English proficient students.

Set Next Year's Goal (2020-21)

9. Will your program prepare teachers in instruction of limited English proficient students in 2020-21? If no, leave the next question blank.

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

10. Describe your goal.

Our goal for the 2020-2021 academic year is to prepare one additional teacher in the instruction of limited English proficient students.

SECTION III: PROGRAM PASS RATES

Assessment Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

The pass rates table is populated from files provided by the testing company or state. The table provides information on the performance of the students in your teacher preparation program on each teacher credential assessment used by your state. In cases where a student has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test is used. In the case of a teacher preparation program with fewer than 10 scores reported on any single initial teacher credential assessment during an academic year, the program shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate and scaled score on each state credential assessment taken over a three-year period. **(§205(a)(1)(B))**

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.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Pass rate
- Scaled score
- Teacher credential assessment

Assessment Pass Rates

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	3			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	2			
GAT109 -ART EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	7			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			

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) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	3			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	2			
GAT110 -ART EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	7			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	4			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	8			
GAT026 -BIOLOGY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	4			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	4			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	8			
GAT027 -BIOLOGY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	4			
GAT042 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT042 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	1			
GAT043 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT043 -BUSINESS EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT001 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	41	261	41	100
GAT002 -EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	41	259	41	100
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	133	274	133	100
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	101	276	101	100
GAT003 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	108	279	108	100
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	133	255	133	100
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	101	256	101	100
GAT004 -EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION G C TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	108	260	108	100
TPA0102 -EDTPA: BUSINESS EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0102 -EDTPA: BUSINESS EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	1			
TPA0110 -EDTPA: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0110 -EDTPA: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	121	53	117	97
TPA0110 -EDTPA: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	101	56	101	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
TPA0110 -EDTPA: ELEMENTARY EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	149	59	149	100
TPA0119 -EDTPA: HEALTH EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
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 Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0021 -EDTPA: K-12 PERFORMING ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
TPA0021 -EDTPA: K-12 PERFORMING ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	5			
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 All program completers, 2018-19	12	44	12	100
TPA0011 -EDTPA: K-12 PHYSICAL EDUCATION Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	14	45	13	93
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, 2018-19	8			
TPA0018 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	3			
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, 2018-19	11	50	11	100
TPA0019 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	3			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
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, 2018-19	13	45	13	100
TPA0016 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	9			
TPA0016 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	16	45	16	100
TPA0017 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	13	46	13	100
TPA0017 -EDTPA: MIDDLE CHILDHOOD SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	5			
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 Other enrolled students	2			
TPA0003 -EDTPA: SECONDARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	10	47	10	100
TPA0003 -EDTPA: SECONDARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	14	49	14	100
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 All program completers, 2018-19	16	49	16	100
TPA0004 -EDTPA: SECONDARY HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	14	48	14	100
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	2			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
TPA0005 -EDTPA: SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	7			
TPA0005 -EDTPA: SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	7			
TPA0005 -EDTPA: SECONDARY MATHEMATICS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	12	38	11	92
TPA0006 -EDTPA: SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
TPA0006 -EDTPA: SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson Other enrolled students	1			
TPA0006 -EDTPA: SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2018-19	4			
TPA0006 -EDTPA: SECONDARY SCIENCE Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	8			
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, 2018-19	3			
TPA0015 -EDTPA: VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	2			
TPA0015 -EDTPA: VISUAL ARTS Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2016-17	7			
TPA0020 -EDTPA: WORLD LANGUAGES Evaluation Systems group of Pearson All program completers, 2017-18	1			
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	5			
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	5			
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	10	273	10	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	14	267	14	100
GAT020 -ENGLISH TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	275	12	100
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	5			
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	5			
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	10	269	10	100
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	14	267	14	100
GAT021 -ENGLISH TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	276	12	100
GAT036 -GEOGRAPHY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT037 -GEOGRAPHY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
ESP0115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST 1 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, 2016-17	1			
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	13	260	13	100
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	14	262	14	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT115 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	13	264	13	100
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	13	262	13	100
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	14	264	14	100
GAT116 -HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	13	270	13	100
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	6			
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	16	268	16	100
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	13	264	13	100
GAT034 -HISTORY TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	11	267	11	100
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	6			
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	16	262	16	100
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	13	268	13	100

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT035 -HISTORY TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	11	263	11	100
GAT046 -MARKETING EDUCATION TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT047 -MARKETING EDUCATION TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	4			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	8			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	6			
GAT022 -MATHEMATICS TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	273	12	100
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	4			
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	8			
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	6			
GAT023 -MATHEMATICS TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	12	270	12	100
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	4			
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			

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, 2018-19	18	264	18	100
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	4			
GAT011 -MIDDLE GRADES LANGUAGE ARTS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	11	264	11	100
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	1			
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	3			
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	27	262	27	100
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	12	274	12	100
GAT013 -MIDDLE GRADES MATHEMATICS Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	19	272	19	100
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	1			
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	4			
GAT012 -MIDDLE GRADES READING Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	2			
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	23	259	23	100
GAT014 -MIDDLE GRADES SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	12	269	12	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, 2016-17	12	266	12	100
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All enrolled students who have completed all noncl	2			
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, 2018-19	27	252	27	100
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	8			
GAT015 -MIDDLE GRADES SOCIAL SCIENCE Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	16	257	15	94
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	3			
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	5			
GAT111 -MUSIC TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	3			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	2			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2018-19	3			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	5			
GAT112 -MUSIC TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	3			
GAT032 -POLITICAL SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	1			

Assessment code - Assessment name Test Company Group	Number taking tests	Avg. scaled score	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
GAT033 -POLITICAL SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	1			
GAT024 -SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT024 -SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	1			
GAT024 -SCIENCE TEST I Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	2			
GAT025 -SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) Other enrolled students	1			
GAT025 -SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2017-18	1			
GAT025 -SCIENCE TEST II Educational Testing Service (ETS) All program completers, 2016-17	2			

SECTION III: PROGRAM PASS RATES

Summary Pass Rates

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

The pass rates table is populated from files provided by the testing company or state. The table provides information on the performance of the students in your teacher preparation program on each teacher credential assessment used by your state. In cases where a student has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test is used. In the case of a teacher preparation program with fewer than 10 scores reported on any single initial teacher credential assessment during an academic year, the program shall collect and publish information with respect to an average pass rate and scaled score on each state credential assessment taken over a three-year period. **(§205(a)(1)(B))**

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.

Key terms in this section are listed below. Click on the link to view the definition(s) in the glossary.

- Pass rate
- Scaled score
- Teacher credential assessment

Summary Pass Rates

Group	Number taking tests	Number passing tests	Pass rate (%)
All program completers, 2018-19	239	235	98
All program completers, 2017-18	188	186	99
All program completers, 2016-17	245	243	99

SECTION IV: LOW-PERFORMING

Low-Performing

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

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Low-Performing

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:

- [x] State
- [x] CAEP
- [ ] AAQEP
- [x] Other specify:

NCTM (via CAEP) for Secondary Mathematics

2. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

SECTION V: USE OF TECHNOLOGY

Use of Technology

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

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.

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 (EPP) 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 incorporated ISTE standards into their course objectives and assessments where applicable--not all syllabi reflect these. 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 how 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 content and theoretical 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. In 2018, we added a technology-specific component to the Induction Portfolio, which is based on the ISTE standards. We asked candidates to identify artifacts that best demonstrate their understanding of teaching P-12 students how to integrate technology into their learning, and they must then reflect on how these artifacts represent the ISTE standards. 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. Additionally, components of our CAPS and dispositions assessment pinpoint technology. The dispositions assessment asks whether candidates effectively, ethically, and responsibly utilize technology in the classroom, and this is completed by the student (a self-assessment), the mentor teacher, and the university supervisor per placement. The CAPS is our summative assessment of a candidate's field placement performance, and this rubric also refers to candidates' responsible use of technology and the integration of technology into teaching and learning. While coursework can demonstrate a candidate's theoretical and conceptual use of technology, these placement-specific components provide us with data that tells the complete story of our candidate's understanding in this area. Our Technology Specialist (our dedicated COE instructional technology individual) began surveying students regarding their technological needs three 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 two years ago, we received funding to develop a Technology Lab for our students. Our technology specialist has developed an online technology check-out center, has offered workshops for students, and is working on the development of new workshops for the upcoming year. These are developed based on needs identified in the technology survey conducted at the end of each spring semester.

SECTION VI: TEACHER TRAINING

Teacher Training

THIS PAGE INCLUDES:

Provide the following information about your teacher preparation program.
(§205(a)(1)(G))

Teacher Training

1. **Provide a description of the activities that prepare general education teachers to:**

   a. **Teach students with disabilities effectively**

   For all majors, EDUC 2120: Exploring Socio-Cultural Diversity, a Social Foundations course, introduces core theoretical components of working with students with disabilities. Additionally, another Social Foundations course for all majors, EDUC 2130: Exploring Teaching and Learning, requires that students demonstrate proficiency regarding learning and teaching theories for both students with special needs and English learners. In both of these foundational courses, students are introduced to the basic structure and requirements for an Individualized Education Program. All of our programs, except for Art and Music Education, have at least one course focused on working with students with disabilities. Our Art and Music Education majors currently complete a series of 21 modules focused on working with individuals with disabilities. These modules each have assessments graded by a special education faculty member, and the modules are the equivalent of a three-credit-hour course. They cover content from an introduction to disabilities to more specific details on disabilities, to teaching techniques, to state-specific knowledge, including the development of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). Currently, both art and music are working on the development of a special education course. For the Music Education Program, the music for special learners course will be offered for the first time in the spring of 2020. The faculty in Art Education decided to allow students to choose a special education course for either the K-5, 4-8, or 6-12 grade bands. Required classroom management courses introduce lesson and unit planning with an emphasis 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 they can differentiate curriculum for diverse learners, especially regarding 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 SPED 3100: Characteristics of Students with Mild Disabilities, our middle grades students learn about disabilities in greater detail, they learn about how to teach and assess for students with special needs, and they learn about how to work with IEP teams to ensure student success. In the secondary programs, students enrolled in SCED 4003: Characteristics of Students with Mild Disabilities for Secondary Education, also learn about how to teach and assess students with disabilities, and they learn how to help lead IEP teams for students. They also take a curriculum course (SCED 3000) and an assessment course (SCED 4002), where they learn how to differentiate curricula and assessments for the various 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 many 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. Candidates enrolled in this program take the following special education courses: (1) ECSP 3100: Characteristics of Students with Special Needs, (2) ECSP 4000: Educational Assessment of Students with Special Needs, (3) ECSP 4200: Instruction of Students with Special Needs, (4) ECSP 4001: Applied Behavior Analysis, and (5) ECSP 3010: Strategies for Supporting Children and Families from Diverse Communities, all of which have key assessment related to theory and practice. For our post-baccalaureate and Master of Arts in Teaching program, candidates take EDUC 5104: Teaching Diverse Learners, which is explicitly focused on students with special needs; they take a curriculum course; they take a teaching strategies course; and they enroll in an assessment course that all integrate methods for working with diverse learners. Similarly, our physical education students take KINS 3400: Adapted Physical Education, which focuses specifically on working with students with special needs. All of these courses have key assessments, which are collected each year, and the data is provided to faculty so that they can review and revise their courses accordingly. In all programs, teacher candidates are expected to demonstrate their training in working with students with disabilities in their edTPA; in their Induction Portfolio; in their field experience summative CAPS assessment completed by their university supervisor and mentor teacher at the end of each semester; and in their dispositions assessment completed by the candidate (self-assessment), the mentor teacher, and the university supervisor at the end of each placement. As noted above, we would like to see more of an emphasis on teaching students with special needs. 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 individuals with disabilities. Coordinators within the respective content departments run these P-12 programs, so changes require more collaboration and cooperation across departments. However, we meet regularly with these content coordinators, and we have stressed the necessity of these changes in the upcoming year.

   b. **Participate as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.***

   In their later courses described below, candidates learn how to administer an Individualized Education Program (IEP), and they see these plans in

action in their field and clinical experience classrooms. In working with our faculty and with their mentor teachers in placement, teacher candidates learn what it means to participate as a member of IEP teams, including the components of an IEP (which entails the cycle of planning, teaching, and revising this program per each student's needs). In SPED 3100: Characteristics of Students with Mild Disabilities, our middle grades students learn about disabilities in greater detail, they learn about how to teach and assess for students with special needs, and they learn about how to work with IEP teams to ensure student success. In the secondary programs, students enrolled in SCED 4003: Characteristics of Students with Mild Disabilities for Secondary Education, also learn about how to teach and assess students with disabilities, and they learn how to help lead IEP teams for students. They also take a curriculum course (SCED 3000) and an assessment course (SCED 4002), where they learn how to differentiate curricula and assessments for the various 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 many 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. Candidates enrolled in this program take the following special education courses: (1) ECSP 3100: Characteristics of Students with Special Needs, (2) ECSP 4000: Educational Assessment of Students with Special Needs, (3) ECSP 4200: Instruction of Students with Special Needs, (4) ECSP 4001: Applied Behavior Analysis, and (5) ECSP 3010: Strategies for Supporting Children and Families from Diverse Communities, all of which have key assessment related to theory and practice. For our post-baccalaureate and Master of Arts in Teaching program, candidates take EDUC 5104: Teaching Diverse Learners, which is explicitly focused on students with special needs; they take a curriculum course; they take a teaching strategies course; and they enroll in an assessment course that all integrate methods for working with diverse learners. Similarly, our physical education students take KINS 3400: Adapted Physical Education, which focuses specifically on working with students with special needs. All of these courses have key assessments, which are collected each year, and the data is provided to the faculty so that they can review and revise their courses accordingly. Our Art and Music Education majors currently complete a series of 21 modules focused on working with individuals with disabilities. These modules each have assessments graded by a special education faculty member, and the modules are the equivalent of a three-credit-hour course. They cover content from an introduction to disabilities to more specific details on disabilities, to teaching techniques, to state-specific knowledge, including the development of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs).

c. Effectively teach students who are limited English proficient.

All of our programs, with the exception of Art and Music Education, have courses that embed knowledge and techniques for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). For all majors, EDUC 2120: Exploring Socio-Cultural Diversity, a Social Foundations course, introduces core theoretical components of working with students who are English Learners. Additionally, another Social Foundations course for all majors, EDUC 2130: Exploring Teaching and Learning, requires that students demonstrate proficiency in regard to learning and teaching theories for students who are English learners. 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 understand 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 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. They also take a curriculum course (SCED 3000) and an assessment course (SCED 4002) where they learn how to differentiate curricula and assessment for the various learners in their classrooms, including English learners. Additionally, candidates in our Elementary and Special Education Program take ECSP 3030: Language and Cognition, a class during which they learn specifically about working with English learners. For our post baccalaureate and Master of Arts in Teaching program, candidates take EDUC 5104: Teaching Diverse Learners; they take a curriculum course; they take a teaching strategies course; and they enroll in an assessment course that all integrate methods for working with diverse learners, including English learners. All of these course have key assessments, which are collected each year and the data is provided to faculty so that they can review and revise their courses accordingly. We do need to work with our P-12 program coordinators in Physical Education, Art, and Music to integrate additional content and pedagogy on teaching English learners. In all programs, teacher candidates are expected to demonstrate their training in working with students who are limited English proficient in their edTPA; in their Induction Portfolio; in their field experience summative CAPS assessment completed by their university supervisor and mentor teacher at the end of each semester; and in their dispositions assessment completed by the candidate (self-assessment), the mentor teacher, and the university supervisor at the end of each placement. As noted above, we would like to see more of an emphasis on working with language learners in our P-12 programs. Specifically, we would like to see our physical education faculty add in more information about English learners, and we would like our art and music programs to focus on emphasizing strategies for working with English learners. 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. These P-12 programs are run by coordinators within their respective departments, so changes require more collaboration and cooperation across the university. 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.

2. **Does your program prepare special education teachers?**

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, provide a description of the activities that prepare *special education teachers* to:

a. **Teach students with disabilities effectively**

The Elementary and Special Education (ELE/SPED) program is our only program specific to special education, and candidates in this program complete two years in placement, with at least one placement in a diverse setting. In order to cover all grade bands and general education and special education settings, candidates switch placement every six weeks--they spend six weeks in a general education classroom and then switch to complete the next six weeks in a special education classroom. While in placement, candidates are also enrolled in courses that enable them to bring together theory and practice through targeted assessments. Teacher candidates must successfully complete the following courses focused on the planning, instruction, and assessments of individuals with disabilities: (1) ECSP 3010: Strategies for Supporting Children and Families from Diverse Communities, (2) ECSP 3030: Language and Cognition, (3) ECSP 3100: Characteristics of Students with Special Needs, (4) ECSP 3540: Applied Data Analysis, (5) ECSP 4000: Educational Assessment of Students with Special Needs, (6) ECSP 4001: Applied Behavior Analysis, and (7) ECSP 4200: Instruction of Students with Special Needs.

b. **Participate as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.***

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.

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

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 English 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 their Induction Portfolio, their edTPA portfolio, their dispositions assessments, and their CAPS summative field placement assessment. Each of these requires that candidates demonstrate their abilities to work with students with special needs 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

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.

To better describe our Educator Preparation Programs, we are attaching the following: (1) SACSCOC assessment and planning reports for last year for each program (2) Graduate survey data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc., for the 2018-2019 reporting year (3) Mentor Teacher Survey 2018 2019 Reporting Year (4) Georgia Professional Standards Commission Induction Teacher Survey (2017, 2018, and 2019) (5) Georgia Professional Standards Commission Employer Survey (2017, 2018, and 2019) Additional reports and information can also be found on our Accreditation and Program Approval page at the following link: https://ung.edu/college-of-education/accreditation-and-reporting.php

Supporting Files

SACSCOC Assessment Report 2018-2019	
Georgia Professional Standards Commission Induction Teacher Survey	
Georgia Professional Standards Commission Employer Survey	
Mentor Teacher Experience Survey	
Graduate survey data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc.	

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.

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:

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:

April W. Nelms

TITLE:

Associate Dean, College of Education