

## **NCATE STANDARD 1**

### **STANDARDS**

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

#### **Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

#### **Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review**

To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard 1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

**1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates.** [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

**1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content**

---

**knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]**

DSU requires the passage of PRAXIS II prior to student teaching and, subsequently, program completion. The table below indicates that all completers passed their state licensure test for the 2008-09 academic year. For a complete report on pass rates please see ETS Pass Rates, [2006-07](#) [1] [2007-08](#) [1] [2008-09](#) [1]

**Table 4 is located in [TK20 Document Room](#) [1]**

**1a.2 (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]**

Currently, we collect graduate surveys from pre-service teachers who have just finished their student teaching. The current instrument asks candidates to rate their mentor teachers and faculty supervisors, offer advice to future student teachers, and discuss ways in which they felt unprepared for teaching. The last two elements of the survey reveal their perspectives on their preparation for teaching ([See table 1a.4: Graduate Survey 2009-2010](#)) [1]. Response rate for Sp09 was 85%, for F09 was 0%, and for Sp10 was 65%. No students indicated that they were unprepared in their content areas. As a result of this analysis, we realize that it is necessary to develop a new survey which will better align with the standard. A new instrument was created in the fall of 2010 and will be administered to program completers at the end of the spring 2011 semester. The new instrument will be available in the evidence room at the time of the BOE visit.

Initial employer follow up surveys of DSU education baccalaureate graduates were conducted in the summer of 2008. The survey was sent to 134 administrators of local Delaware school systems with a 16 percent return rate. The 2008 survey, ([See table 1a.4: Old Employee Survey](#) [1]) included questions that evaluated pedagogical knowledge and skills (planning, implementation,

assessment, classroom management, reflection) and dispositions (professional dispositions, diversity, collaboration), but not content knowledge. ([See table 1a.4: Old Employee Survey](#) [1]) An updated employer follow up survey is scheduled to be administered in the Fall of 2010. The new survey will include questions that will help us evaluate all three areas of Standard 1; content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, and dispositions ([See exhibit 1a.4: New Employer Survey](#) [1]).

Forty eight percent of DSU's education students come from the neighboring states of Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York. The University does not have an effective method of tracking out of state graduates once they leave the institution. However, the DSU Department of Education is making efforts to improve communication with graduates by working with IHE's in the state through the Delaware Association for Teacher Colleges of Education (Delaware State University, Wesley College, Wilmington University and the University of Delaware) to determine the best way to keep contact with out of state graduates. Currently, the plan is to ensure that the education department has permanent home addresses of all candidates when they exit our programs.

**1a.5 (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

[table 1a.4: Graduate Survey 2009-2010](#) [1]

[table 1a.4: Employer Survey SU 2008](#) [1]

**1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of**

**follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]**

[Please see table Graduate Survey and description in 1a.4.](#) [1]

Data revealed that one student felt unprepared in the content areas of reading and math for early childhood education. Our early childhood candidates receive less content in the area of reading instruction than do the elementary candidates. There were no data for Fall 2009 because it could not be extracted from TK20. The data for the graduate surveys administered in the spring semesters of 2009 and 2010 show a significant improvement in percentage difference (from 55% to .09% students feeling inadequate in preparation) for classroom management; an opposite change in the area of assessment occurred (from 18% to 27%). With the exception of Early Childhood majors, all candidates take EDUC 357, Effective Teaching Strategies and Classroom Management. In this course, candidates create a classroom management plan. This assessment will need to be revisited when we review the findings of the NCATE self-study and review.

The Unit has been working to revise the early childhood curriculum to include, in the fall of 2011, a developmental reading course. When this is in place, candidates will have a more solid foundation for reading instruction, including phonics.

Please see table Employer Survey SU 2008 and the description of the assessment in 1a.4. Survey results for the old survey were rated on a 3 point scale (inadequate, adequate, and target). Interestingly, the mean scores for the six elements that relate to pedagogical knowledge and skills were all 2.7, indicating an excellent rating for our graduates in this area.

**1b.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)**

**1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

The Teacher Work Sample and the Student Teaching Evaluation are the key instruments used to assess undergraduate candidates' ability to demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Both instruments are aligned with professional, state, and institutional standards. Aggregated data for Spring 2009 – Spring 2010 are presented in the table in 1a.4: Teacher Work Sample and Student Teaching. For Teacher Work Sample, N = 63 reflects number of TWS evaluation. Each TWS is independently evaluated by two evaluators. For Student Teaching Evaluations, N = 198 reflects number of Student Teaching Evaluations conducted by Supervisors (4) and Mentor Teachers (2).

[See table 1b.4: TWS - ST Data Sp.09-SP10.](#) [1]

Overall, the data reveal that DSU teacher candidates graduate having the professional knowledge and skills to facilitate learning as delineated by professional, state, and institutional standards. Aggregated mean scores show that candidate performance falls well within the target area. The difference in scores indicates that comprehensive mean scores appear to have moved from the Acceptable range into the Target range. This information is gratifying to us as efforts have been made throughout the unit to ensure that candidates are prepared to carry out the expectations of this assessment during their student teaching semester.

Although recent scores in the TWS are still in the Target range, lowest scores on individual elements of the TWS throughout the three semesters indicate that candidates have the most difficulty with #3, the Assessment Plan (7.65 – 8.84). The Assessment Plan involves performance in both formative and summative assessments throughout the time of study. This unit-wide concern will be addressed as we review the findings of the NCATE self-study and review.

Student Teaching Data for spring 2009-spring 2010 indicates that candidates are well prepared in the areas of planning, implementation, evaluation, and reflection. The lowest scores, although still within the Target range, are in planning.

Our advanced programs for licensed teachers are in Curriculum and Instruction and Special Education and have the capacity to produce a high number of graduates. These programs are currently undergoing rigorous review at the unit, university, and state levels. Therefore, we are closely monitoring these programs as a prelude to incorporating them into our assessment system.

**1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

[See table 1b.4: TWS - ST Data Sp 09-SP10.](#) [1]

1. TWS – Contextual Factors and Assessment Plan

The accompanying table indicates an above average degree of ability in analyzing school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students. Data indicate that the mean scores for Contextual Factors and Assessment Plan are 8.1 and 8.4 respectively, both of which fall within the Target range for these assessments.

2. TWS – Reflection and Self-Assessment

The accompanying table indicates an above average degree of ability in reflection. Data indicate that the mean score for Reflection and Self Assessment is 8.86, well within the Target range of the assessment.

3. The Persuasive Essay assessment is required of all students in the department in EDUC-204, Philosophical Foundations of Education. The essay requires students to examine Schools of Thought in light of their own thinking and create a referenced persuasive argument for their position. [Table 1c.2 Persuasive Essay](#) [1] indicates a high degree of student understanding of major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning.

4. The Critique of a Research Article Assessment is required of all students in EDUC-416 Analysis of Student Teaching. The accompanying [table](#) [1] indicates a superior degree of ability of students to analyze educational research findings. The percentage of students reaching the target is high with an anomaly occurring within the summary category during the Spring 2009 semester. This is not considered a problem since 61.11% of students fell within the acceptable range.

Our advanced programs for licensed teachers are in Curriculum and Instruction and Special Education and produce a small number of masters' degrees. These programs are currently undergoing rigorous review at the unit, university, and state levels. Therefore, we have no current data to report.

**1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

N/A: At this time, DSU does not have programs that serve advanced teacher candidates.

**1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

Please see table Graduate Survey and description in 1a.4.

The data for the graduate surveys administered in the spring semesters of 2009 and 2010 indicate that candidates felt unprepared in the areas of classroom management and assessment, including the Teacher Work Sample. With the exception of Early Childhood majors, all candidates take EDUC 357, Effective Teaching Strategies and Classroom Management. In this course, candidates create a classroom management plan. This assessment will need to be revisited when we review the findings of the NCATE self-study and review.

Additionally, all candidates take a course in assessment (EDUC 423 or EDUC 401) in which they explore forms and types of assessment available to the classroom teacher. Although both of these courses appear late in the candidates' programs, the approach to the content is primarily theoretical, rather than practical. This is another area that will be revisited and evaluated, based upon discussion and further student feedback.

Please see table 1a.4: Employer Survey SU 2008 and the description of the data. The 2008 follow up survey was heavily weighted toward pedagogical knowledge and skills with six of the ten questions devoted to planning, implementation and assessment. Comprehensive mean scores (2.7 out of a maximum score of 3) indicate that employers believe our candidates are very well prepared to teach.

**1c.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

[See table 1b.4: TWS - ST Data Sp 09-SP10.](#) [1]

[table 1c.2 Persuasive Essay](#) [1]

[table 1c.2 Article Critique](#) [1]

**1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]**

Please see table in 1a.4 Graduate Survey and description.

In the past, graduate surveys did not include information on this element. New survey data will be available in the exhibit room (EH 109).

Please see table 1a.4 Employer Follow-up Survey SU 2008 and the description of the assessment. The employer follow up survey of 2008 did not include information on this element. New survey data will be available in the exhibit room (EH 109).

**1d.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

**1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

**1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.**

The State of Delaware does not require licensure for administrators. Therefore, candidates in the Leadership programs at DSU do not take licensure tests.

**Table 5**

**Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals**

**For Period:**

% Passing State Li

Program	Name of Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Li
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)			

**1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be**

**reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]**

The graduate follow-up survey is currently under revision and will be administered during spring 2011.

Until this review, the Advance level programs did not have a system for collecting follow-up data. A new assessment has been created for Advance level follow-up survey and employers survey and will be administered during spring 2011. **See exhibit [1e.3: Educational Leadership satisfaction and competence Survey](#).** [1]

**1e.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

## **1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

**1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]**

All of our programs have been nationally reviewed with the exception of Art Education and Music Education, which are reviewed by the state. State review for these programs is in progress.

**1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student learning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]**

Until this review, the Advance level programs did not have a system for collecting follow-up data. A new assessment has been created for Advance level follow-up survey and employers' survey and will be administered during spring 2011. **See exhibit [1e.3: Educational Leadership satisfaction and competence Survey](#).** [1]

**1f.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

**1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]****1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?**

Currently, undergraduate candidates are assessed using rubrics that address basic professionalism such as attendance, punctuality, attire, preparation, and conduct. The rubrics assess skill sets required for teaching: communication, critical thinking, collaboration, and technology integration. Dispositions were supposed to be carefully tracked as the candidate progressed from pre-education to TEP. This review alerted us that dispositions assessments were entered into TK20 less frequently than we had believed. As a result, we developed a flow chart that identifies staff members responsible for disseminating the data and developing an improvement plan with the candidate. See [Exhibit 1g1a: Dispositions Flow Chart](#). [1] As of Spring 2011, undergraduate candidates will be assessed with newly developed dispositions rubrics. Several of the dispositions from the current assessments are included in the new assessments. See Exhibit 1g1b: [Comparison of New Disposition Assessments to Current Assessments](#). [1]

Although these dispositions assessments were approved and adopted by the PEU in Spring, 2010, they will not be available on TK20 for faculty use until Spring 2011. These dispositions assessments are much better aligned with NCATE Standards and INTASC but remain closely aligned to unit standards. The university classroom dispositions assessment also addresses attendance, punctuality, attire, preparation, and conduct but goes beyond by addressing scholarship, reflective learning, problem solving, and commitment to professional growth. Additionally, the new disposition surveys address the issues of fairness and respect for all and the belief that all children can learn. Finally, the new disposition surveys allow instructors/ supervisors to indicate where the evidence for meeting these criteria was recorded. See [Exhibit 1g1c: New Dispositions Assessments](#). [1] The dispositions assessment for graduate students is aligned with core competencies for all graduate students and aligned with ELCC and ISLLC. This assessment targets dispositions predominantly linked to leadership qualities: leadership, vision, decision-making, adaptability, consideration, and attitude. As a consequence of assessments and review, it was determined that the rubric did not adequately address diversity. Therefore, the rubric is under revision. See [Summary Exhibit 1g1d: Graduate Dispositions and Table of Summary Data](#). [1]

**1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]**

Candidates are able to demonstrate that they have developed dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all children can learn in the TWS and Student Teaching Evaluation. Nine Elements of the TWS: 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 from Contextual Factors, 3.5 Assessment Plan, 4.5 Design for Instruction, 5.2 Instructional Decision-Making, 6.4 Student Learning, and 7.1, & 7.2 Reflection & Self-Evaluation represented these dispositions well. The common denominator for these elements was the relationship to identifying, understanding and meeting diverse student needs through instructional planning and implementation, as well as candidate reflection and self-evaluation. Means for TWS scores on the selected elements consistently fell in the target range with three exceptions. The mean for reflection on least successful learning goals was also in the acceptable range (7.83). Overall means for each element over seven semesters were well within the range for target scores. One of the highest means posted was for instructional modifications based on analysis of student learning (9.22). Candidates demonstrated the most proficiency in discussing the most successful aspects of their teaching. Making adaptations based on the needs of individual students proved to be an area of programmatic weakness although the overall mean of 8.50 was within target range. Still, this was the lowest overall performance mean.

Three elements were identified in the student teaching assessment, Planning 3, Implementation 2, and Reflection 3, that demonstrate addressing the needs of diverse students, and demonstration of professional dispositions that support student learning and fairness. Note that scoring for final student teaching assessment changed to a 3-point scale in Fall 2009. In both 2008, 2009 and Spring 2010, candidates consistently showed proficiency in planning and teaching diverse learners, as evidenced by high mean scores for each of these categories. The Fall 2009 student teachers' scores represented the lowest score means recorded over the 5 semesters reported, though these scores were still in the acceptable range. These data have provided evidence that our students do develop and act upon a strong belief that all children can learn. See [Exhibit: Summary Table 1g2 TWS-ST](#). [1]

**1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]**

Each SPA in the PEU demonstrated through its own standards that our candidates demonstrate professional dispositions with students, families, colleagues and communities. A survey distributed to employers of our graduates demonstrated that employers see these dispositions in our graduates as evidenced by survey mean scores of 2.8, 2.7, and 2.5 out of a possible 3, for working with students, parents and families, and school staff & administration, respectively. See table [table 1a.4: Employer Survey SU 2008](#) [1]

**1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]**

Graduates from academic year 2009 and Spring 2010 responded to a survey. In this survey, program completers showed evidence of the following dispositions assessed by the current assessment: communication, collaboration, and professional demeanor. Graduates showed evidence of the following dispositions that will be assessed in the new dispositions surveys: flexibility and perseverance (problem solving). [See Attachment Table 1a4: Graduate Survey 2009-2010](#) [1]

Employers responded to a survey requesting feedback about DSU graduates employed in their schools or districts. This survey provided evidence of the following dispositions, expressed as means based on a scale of 3: effective lesson planning – 2.7, effective instruction- 2.7, proper assessment- 2.7, effective classroom management- 2.7, technology integration- 2.7, plan for profession growth- 2.7, model professional dispositions- 2.7, address needs of diverse learners- 2.8, collaboration with parents and community- 2.7, and collaboration with staff and administration- 2.7. Employers of our graduates provide evidence that these students have developed the professional dispositions we actively cultivated during their experiences at DSU. [See Exhibit 1a4: Raw Data Employer SU 2008](#). [1]

Until this review, the graduate program did not have a system for collecting follow-up data. A new assessment has been created for graduates and employers and will be administered by telephone prior to the BOE visit. Data will be available in the Evidence Room 109. [See Exhibit 1e3: Ed Leadership Post-Graduate and Employer Surveys](#). [1]

**1g.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

## **Optional**

### **1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?**

The Education Department at DSU requires that all students pass the PRAXIS I prior to admission into the Teacher Education Program and that all students pass the PRAXIS II in their field prior to admission to student teaching. Although this policy has resulted in low numbers in our upper level education courses, we have not wavered as we believe that it is essential that our candidates have a firm foundation before they student teach. In recent years, we have been able to implement several interventions for students who take the PRAXIS I and II tests. First, with help from a Title III grant, we were able to hire a full time Praxis coordinator, provide online tutorials and cover registration fees for the students. Additionally, the PRAXIS coordinator has collaborated with the Instructor for University Seminar in Education to provide instruction. The result is that our students'

PRAXIS scores have improved, increasing our enrollment in the Teacher Education Program and the number of student teachers each year.

We have found that our Teacher Work Sample is a solid assessment to measure candidates' abilities to ensure student learning. Almost all candidates perform well on this assessment and are able to speak articulately about the ways in which their students have learned. The TWS has proven to be a comprehensive assessment for us, meeting the needs of many standards across professional, university student learning goals, and state institutions.

## **2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

### **Grant**

Professional Development Partnership to improve Content knowledge and teaching skills in mathematics.

### **Published Research (see Standard 5)**

Middle school readers as expert knowers: We learned what to expect from a book.

An examination of the multidimensionality of situational interest in elementary school physical education

Effects of perceptual motor training on perceptual motor abilities and intelligence among mentally challenged children

### **Ongoing Research**

Factors influencing selection of STEM disciplines by undergraduate students

Team teaching in inclusive classrooms

The achievement gap, inquiry instruction in science methods classes

Math pedagogy and student achievement in math.

### **Exhibits**

1. Program review documents or state program review documents (Program review documents will be available in NCATE's database, AIMS, for programs reviewed through the national program review process. If programs were reviewed through the national process or through a state process that required the review of assessments and assessment data, then no other assessment data for those already reviewed programs are required for this element.) (IN AIMS)
2. State licensure test scores aggregated by program area and reported over multiple years (Title II data reported to the state for the last year **must** be available to the team.) ETS Pass Rates [2006-07](#) [1] [2007-08](#) [1] [2008-09](#) [1].
3. Data tables and summaries that show how teacher candidates (both initial and advanced) have performed on key assessments over the past three years. (Located in Standard 2)
4. Key assessments and scoring guides used by faculty to assess candidate learning against standards and the outcomes identified in the unit's conceptual framework. Table showing [State, Professional, and institutional standards](#) [1] and See [See Table 2a.6.1](#) [1]
5. Samples of candidate work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) Exhibit located in EH

109.

6. Follow-up studies of graduates and data tables of results. See [See table 1a.4: Graduate Survey 2009-2010](#) [1]
7. Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results. See [table 1a.4: Employer Survey SU 2008](#) [1]
8. Items 1, 6, & 7 (for programs that underwent national or similar state program review) or Items 3-7 above related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills of initial and advanced teacher candidates.
9. Items 3-7 above related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of initial and advanced teacher candidates.
10. Items 1, 6, & 7 (for programs that underwent national or similar state program review) or Items 3-7 above related to student learning of initial and advanced teacher candidates.
11. Items 3-7 above related to knowledge and skills for other school professionals.
12. Items 1, 6, & 7 (for programs that underwent national or similar state program review) or Items 3-7 above related to student learning for other school professionals.
13. List of candidate dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn. See 1g1b: [Comparison of New Disposition Assessments to Current Assessments](#). [1]
14. Assessments used to determine dispositions. See 1g1b: [Comparison of New Disposition Assessments to Current Assessments](#). [1]
15. Summary of candidate performance on those assessments. See [See Exhibit: Summary Table 1g2 TWS-ST](#). [1]
16. Items 6-7 above related to professional dispositions for all candidates

**Source URL:** <http://www.desu.edu/education/ncate-standard-1>

**Links**

[1] <https://desu.tk20.com/campustoolshighered/start.do>