

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**STATE OF GEORGIA**

<b>IN RE:</b>	:	
	:	
<b>ONNA MUSGROVE,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Appellant,</b>	:	<b>CASE NO. 1986-51</b>
	:	
<b>vs.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>STATE DEPARTMENT</b>	:	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<b>EDUCATION,</b>	:	<b>OF SPECIAL MASTER</b>
	:	
	:	
<b>Appellee.</b>	:	

This is an appeal by Onna Musgrove (hereinafter “Appellant”) from a decision of the State Department of Education (hereinafter “Department”) not to grant her a performance-based certificate after her non-renewable associate professional certificate expired. Appellant maintains that the rating system used to grant performance-based certification was improperly applied to her, or the rating system is defective.

Appellant was issued a non-renewable associate professional certificate in early childhood education in February, 1982. The certificate was valid until August 31, 1985. The State Board of Education has adopted a policy which provides that non-renewable associate professional certificates issued to new teachers are good for three years. During this period, a teacher is assessed to determine whether a performance-based certificate should be issued. Assessments are performed twice annually so that a teacher has six opportunities during the three year period to obtain a performance-based certificate.

The assessment covers 14 different areas of competence, and a teacher is required to pass all 14 areas in order to obtain a performance-based certificate. The policy provides that if a teacher receives an 85% rating in any competency, then that rating is carried over

and the teacher does not have to pass that competency again. Also, if a teacher receives a 75% rating on two consecutive assessments for a single competency, then that competency is also carried forward.

Appellant was assessed in January, April and November, 1984 and in April, 1985. Her non-renewable associate professional certificate expired on August 31, 1985, but she was granted a one-year extension for the 1985—1986 school year. During this extension period, she was again assessed in November, 1985 and March, 1986. In these six assessments, Appellant was unable to obtain an 85% rating, or two successive 75% ratings, in competency No. 2, which relates to the organization of instructional material to take into account individual differences among learners.

The assessment ratings are obtained by having three trained raters observe new teachers, interview them, and review their instructional materials. The raters complete forms which require some subjective determinations within the constraints of the rating system established by the forms. Within each competency, there are several “indicators”, each of which has to be completed by the raters. The ratings of the three observers are then averaged in order to obtain a score for each indicator, and then the indicators are totaled to determine if a teacher has passed the competency.

Appellant argues that the assessments were improper because she was inconsistently rated on Indicators 6 and 7 in Competency TI. For example, on two of her assessments, she received a minimum passing rating from all three of her raters for Indicator 6, but, on the next two assessments, none of her raters gave her a passing rating. Appellant maintains that these inconsistencies show that she was being improperly rated.

The Department showed that the ratings are combined and averaged in order to remove any bias. Additionally, Appellant was rated by ten different people during her six assessments in order to remove the possibility of erroneous ratings because of personality differences. The methods of combining scores and reviewing the ratings are designed to obtain a statistically reliable score for each assessment.

Under these methods, Appellant had ratings ranging from twenty-two percent to seventy-seven percent in Competency II, with the averages ranging from forty-four percent to sixty-seven percent. She had averages of forty-four percent and thirty-three percent for Indicators 6 and 7, respectively.

Based upon the record submitted and the arguments made by Appellant and the Department, the Special Master is of the opinion that there is no evidence to show that the Department of Education improperly evaluated Appellant, or that the methods used by the Department of Education in implementing the policy of the State Board of Education for granting Performance-Based certificates have been improperly designed. The Special Master, therefore, recommends that Appellant not be granted a Performance-Based Certificate.

L.O. BUCKLAND  
Special Master