

2006 – 2007 Activity and Assessment Educator Preparation Unit Profile

Context

The educator preparation unit of The Ohio State University has an assessment system that collects, compiles, summarizes, and analyzes multiple internal and external assessment data to make candidate, program, and unit decisions. Assessments used are aligned with the unit's respective conceptual frameworks. In addition, assessments are used to gather data regarding the management and operations of the unit. The following is a compilation of aggregated data collected regarding candidates, program completers, and the management and operations of the unit from September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007.

This profile is organized according to preparation level (initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other professional school roles preparation) as well as those threads which run across the unit regardless of preparation level.

I. INITIAL TEACHER PREPARATION

A. Admission to the Program

A.1 Number of Applicants Considered during the Academic Year for Admission to Initial Teacher Preparation

335

A.2 Number of Applicants Accepted during the Academic Year for Admission to Initial Teacher Preparation

320

A.3 Decision Point 1: Admission to Initial Teacher Preparation Data

A.3.1 General Knowledge Assessment I: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percentage of Applicants at Criterion Level (2.75/3.00)	92.238
---	--------

A.3.2 Professional Dispositions Assessment I

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment I	
0	Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
1	There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
2	There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
3	There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
4	There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment I Applicant Proficiencies		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Score
1.1	The applicant has an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she plans to teach	2.468
1.2	The applicant has an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he plans to teach has on current society and culture	2.524
1.3	The applicant has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change	2.318
1.4	The applicant has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	2.481
1.5	The applicant has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	2.483
1.6	The applicant has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	2.082
1.7	The applicant has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	2.345
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (4 of 7 dispositions rated at 3 or higher)		54.97

B. Number of Candidates Enrolled in the Initial Teacher Preparation Across the Academic Year

686

C. Number of Candidates at Each Decision Point (2-4) Across the Academic Year

Decision Point 2: Completion of Unit Assessment Field Experience	Decision Point 3: Admission to Clinical Experience	Decision Point 4: Completion of Clinical Practice
519	519	494

D. Decision Point 2: Completion of Unit Assessment Field Experience Data
[Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

D.1 Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency A.1.2):
Candidate knows the subject-matter she/he plans to teach.

0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge and understanding of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the subject-matter she/he plans to teach
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency A.1.2	3.255	3.427

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency A.1.3):
Candidate is able to explain the principles and concepts of the subject-matter she/he plans to teach.

0	The candidate is unable to explain the principles and concepts of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach <i>OR</i> The candidate incorrectly explains the principles and concepts of the subject-matter she/he plans to teach
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate accurately explains the principles and concepts of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate is able to explain how specific learning expectations within the subject-matter she/he plans to teach are related to the overall structure of the discipline

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency A.1.3	3.145	3.274

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.1):
Candidate uses relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences.

0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, does not know how to find this information and lacks familiarity with students' background knowledge and experiences
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates some understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, can describe one procedure used to obtain this information and has some familiarity with the background knowledge and experiences of students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, can describe several procedures used to obtain this information and demonstrates a clear understanding of students' background knowledge and experiences

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.1	3.234	3.554

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.2):
Candidate articulates clear learning expectations for lessons that are appropriate for students.

0	The candidate does not articulate clear learning expectations <i>OR</i> The candidate chooses learning expectations that are inappropriate for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate articulates clear learning expectations that are appropriate for students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate articulates clear learning expectations and provides a well thought out explanation of why they are appropriate for students <i>OR</i> The candidate articulates clear learning expectations that are appropriate for students and are differentiated for groups or individual students in the class

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.2	3.171	3.444

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.3):
Candidate makes connections among the subject-matter that was learned previously, the current subject-matter and the subject-matter that remains to be learned in the future.

0	The candidate cannot accurately explain how the subject-matter of lessons relates to the subject-matter of previous or future lessons
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate accurately explains how the subject-matter of lessons relates to the subject-matter of previous or future lessons
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate accurately explains how the subject-matter of lessons fits within the overall structure of the content area(s)

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.3	3.145	3.4

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.4):
Candidate creates and selects teaching methods, learning activities and instructional materials or other resources, including instructional technologies, which are appropriate for students and which are aligned with the learning expectations of lessons.

0	The candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that are unrelated to the learning expectations of lessons <i>AND/OR</i> The candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that are not appropriate for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that are aligned with the learning expectations of lessons AND that are appropriate for students in general
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that allow for differentiated learning experiences for individuals or groups of students AND when a single method, activity and/or material is used for all students, the candidate can provide a logical explanation as to why the method, activity and/or material is appropriate for all students

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.4	3.173	3.3

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.5):
Candidate creates and selects evaluation strategies that are appropriate for students and which are aligned with the learning expectations of lessons.

0	The evaluations the candidate uses to assess student learning do not assess the learning expectations he/she has for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The evaluations the candidate uses to assess student learning provide her/him with information about student understanding of the subject-matter taught AND the evaluations are appropriate for students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate can describe how he/she uses the results of evaluations to plan future instruction

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.5	3.056	3.27

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.2.1):
Candidate creates a climate that promotes fairness.

0	The candidate is unfair in the treatment of students <i>AND/OR</i> The candidate tolerates obviously unfair behavior among students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate is fair in the treatment of students and does not accept obviously unfair behavior among students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate is fair in the treatment of students and actively encourages fairness among students

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.1	3.469	3.76

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.2.2):
Candidate establishes and maintains rapport with students.

0	The candidate does not attempt to establish rapport with students <i>OR</i> The candidate's attempts to establish rapport with students are inappropriate
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate establishes a basic level of rapport with students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate successfully establishes rapport in ways that are appropriate to students' diverse backgrounds and needs

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.2	3.434	3.71

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.2.3):
Candidate communicates challenging learning expectations to each student

0	The candidate communicates explicitly or implicitly to individuals, to groups within the class or to the class as a whole that they are incapable of learning OR that his/her expectations for their learning are very low
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate does nothing to communicate to any student that he/she is incapable of meeting learning expectations
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate actively encourages students to meet challenging learning expectations

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.3	3.397	3.617

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.2.4):
Candidate establishes and maintains consistent standards of classroom behavior.

0	The candidate makes no attempt to respond to disruptive behavior OR The candidate's responses to disruptive behavior do not demonstrate respect for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate makes appropriate attempts to respond to disruptive behavior in ways that demonstrate respect for students OR Some students may display minor misbehavior but it does not disrupt the class
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate responds to disruptive behavior or minor misbehavior consistently and with reasonable success, in ways that demonstrate respect for students OR Student behavior during lessons is consistently appropriate

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.4	3.13	3.25

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.2.5): <i>Candidate makes the physical environment safe and conducive to learning.</i>	
0	The candidate allows the physical environment to be unsafe <i>OR</i> The candidate allows the physical environment to interfere with learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate creates a physical environment that is safe and does not interfere with learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate uses the physical environment as a resource to facilitate learning, provisions are made to accommodate all students, including those with special needs and, if the candidate does not control the physical environment, she/he effectively adjusts the activities to the existing physical environment

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.5	3.321	3.528

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.1): <i>Candidate makes learning expectations and instructional procedures clear to students.</i>	
0	The candidate provides students with no information, confusing information or inaccurate information about the learning expectations or the instructional procedures for lessons
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate provides students with accurate information about the learning expectations AND the candidate provides students with clear, accurate information about the instructional procedures for lessons that most students seem to understand
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, students seem to understand the learning goals fully AND the candidate ensures that all students, including those who may initially have trouble, understand and can carry out the instructional procedures of lessons

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.1	3.178	3.212

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.2): <i>Candidate makes the subject-matter comprehensible to all students.</i>	
0	Assessment results of student work indicate that the subject-matter appears to be incomprehensible to students <i>OR</i> The candidate's explanations of the subject-matter contain substantive inaccuracies
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate's explanations of the subject-matter are accurate and assessment results of student work indicate that the subject-matter is comprehensible to students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the lesson as a whole has a logical and coherent structure

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.2	3.213	3.242

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.3): <i>Candidate integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment.</i>	
0	The candidate does not integrate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment <i>OR</i> The candidate either incorrectly or inappropriately integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate adequately integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate extensively integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.3	3.039	3.054

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.4): <i>Candidate provides culturally-responsive teaching for all students.</i>	
0	The candidate does not provide culturally-responsive teaching for ALL students <i>OR</i> The candidate provides inappropriate culturally-responsive teaching for all students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate provides some culturally-responsive teaching for ALL students <i>OR</i> The candidate provides culturally-responsive teaching for some but not ALL students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate thoroughly provides culturally-responsive teaching for ALL students

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.4	3.204	3.137

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.5): <i>Candidate encourages students to extend their thinking.</i>	
0	The candidate discourages students from thinking independently, creatively or critically
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate encourages students to think independently, creatively or critically in the context of the subject-matter being studied
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate uses activities or strategies that are specifically designed to actively encourage students to think independently, creatively or critically about the content being taught

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.5	3.217	3.442

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.6):
Candidate monitors students' understanding of the subject-matter through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands.

0	The candidate makes no attempt to determine whether students understand the subject-matter being taught and gives them no feedback
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate monitors students' understanding of the subject-matter, AND students receive feedback as necessary
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate monitors individual students' or groups of students' understanding of the subject-matter, makes appropriate instructional adjustments if necessary and, as appropriate, provides substantive and specific feedback

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.6	3.193	3.409

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.3.7):
Candidate uses instructional time effectively.

0	The candidate spends substantial amounts of instructional time on activities of little instructional value <i>OR</i> The pacing of the candidate's lessons is inappropriate to the subject-matter and/or the students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate spends substantial amounts of instructional time on activities of little instructional value <i>OR</i> The pacing of the candidate's lessons is inappropriate to the subject-matter and/or the students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate provides students with activities of instructional value for the entire instructional time, paces them appropriately and efficiently performs necessary non-instructional procedures

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.7	3.163	3.179

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.4.1):
Candidate reflects on the extent to which learning expectations of lessons are met.

0	The candidate does not accurately identify the strengths and weaknesses of lessons in relation to learning expectations
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate accurately describes the strengths and weaknesses of lessons in relation to learning expectations and describes, in general terms, how he/she could use the experiences from lessons taught in future instruction
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate supports her/his judgments with specific evidence from specific lessons taught

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.1	3.247	3.325

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.4.2):
Candidate demonstrates a sense of efficacy; that is, a sense of responsibility for learning on the part of ALL students.

0	The candidate makes no attempt to address the specific learning needs of students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate attempts to find ways to address the specific learning needs of students, but cannot suggest specific, practical actions that he/she has not already tried
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate suggests specific, practical actions that she/he can take to address the specific learning expectations of students

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.2	3.325	3.359

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.4.3):
Candidate builds professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students.

0	The candidate demonstrates no knowledge of how to identify or use available resources
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates knowledge of resources and attempts to consult with others on matters related to learning and instruction
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate actively collaborates with others to coordinate learning activities or to address other concerns related to teaching

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.3	3.314	3.431

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.4.4):
Candidate communicates with parents and guardians about student learning.

0	The candidate demonstrates no knowledge of forms of communication that she/he can use to communicate with parents and guardians
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates knowledge of forms of communication that he/she can use to communicate with parents and guardians of students for various purposes
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate can describe specific situations in which she/he has communicated or would communicate with parents and guardians regarding specific students

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.4	2.883	3.026

	University Supervisors / Mentors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (16 of 23 proficiencies rated at 2 or higher)	97.4	99.8

D.2 Professional Dispositions Assessment II

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment II	
0	The candidate <i>never</i> demonstrates the expectation
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate <i>sometimes</i> demonstrates the expectation
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate <i>always</i> demonstrates the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment II Candidate Proficiencies

		Mean Scores		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
1.1	The candidate has an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she plans to teach	3.475	3.707	3.735

		Mean Scores		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
1.2	The candidate has an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he plans to teach has on current society and culture	3.325	3.576	3.575
1.3	The candidate has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change	3.277	3.606	3.652
1.4	The candidate has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.455	3.724	3.684
1.5	The candidate has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	3.455	3.733	3.798
1.6	The candidate has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	3.293	3.438	3.482
1.7	The candidate has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.432	3.661	3.688

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (5 of 7 dispositions rated at 3 or higher)	87.92	95.16	98.02

E. Decision Point 3: Admission to Clinical Experience Data [Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

E.1 General Knowledge Assessment II: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (2.75/3.00)	99.036
---	--------

E.2 Praxis II Specialty Area Test (2005-2006):

Percentage of Candidates Passing Praxis II Specialty Area Tests	88.819
---	--------

F. Decision Point 4: Completion of Clinical Practice Data [Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

F.1 General Knowledge Assessment III: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (2.75/3.00)	98.582
---	--------

F.2 Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency A.1.2): <i>Candidate knows the subject-matter she/he plans to teach.</i>	
0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge and understanding of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the subject-matter she/he plans to teach
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency A.1.2	3.553	3.525	3.58

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency A.1.3):
Candidate is able to explain the principles and concepts of the subject-matter she/he plans to teach.

0	The candidate is unable to explain the principles and concepts of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach <i>OR</i> The candidate incorrectly explains the principles and concepts of the subject-matter she/he plans to teach
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate accurately explains the principles and concepts of the subject-matter he/she plans to teach
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate is able to explain how specific learning expectations within the subject-matter she/he plans to teach are related to the overall structure of the discipline

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency A.1.3	3.462	3.396	3.482

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.1):
Candidate uses relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences.

0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, does not know how to find this information and lacks familiarity with students' background knowledge and experiences
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates some understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, can describe one procedure used to obtain this information and has some familiarity with the background knowledge and experiences of students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences, can describe several procedures used to obtain this information and demonstrates a clear understanding of students' background knowledge and experiences

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.1	3.492	3.532	3.682

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.2):
Candidate articulates clear learning expectations for lessons that are appropriate for students.

0	The candidate does not articulate clear learning expectations <i>OR</i> The candidate chooses learning expectations that are inappropriate for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate articulates clear learning expectations that are appropriate for students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate articulates clear learning expectations and provides a well thought out explanation of why they are appropriate for students <i>OR</i> The candidate articulates clear learning expectations that are appropriate for students and are differentiated for groups or individual students in the class

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.2	3.496	3.433	3.587

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.3):
Candidate makes connections among the subject-matter that was learned previously, the current subject-matter and the subject-matter that remains to be learned in the future.

0	The candidate cannot accurately explain how the subject-matter of lessons relates to the subject-matter of previous or future lessons
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate accurately explains how the subject-matter of lessons relates to the subject-matter of previous or future lessons
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate accurately explains how the subject-matter of lessons fits within the overall structure of the content area(s)

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.3	3.5	3.453	3.585

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.4):
Candidate creates and selects teaching methods, learning activities and instructional materials or other resources, including instructional technologies, which are appropriate for students and which are aligned with the learning expectations of lessons.

0	The candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that are unrelated to the learning expectations of lessons <i>AND/OR</i> The candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that are not appropriate for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that are aligned with the learning expectations of lessons AND that are appropriate for students in general
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate designs units and/or lesson plans (methods, activities and/or materials) that allow for differentiated learning experiences for individuals or groups of students AND when a single method, activity and/or material is used for all students, the candidate can provide a logical explanation as to why the method, activity and/or material is appropriate for all students

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.4	3.473	3.460	3.526

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.5):
Candidate creates and selects evaluation strategies that are appropriate for students and which are aligned with the learning expectations of lessons.

0	The evaluations the candidate uses to assess student learning do not assess the learning expectations he/she has for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The evaluations the candidate uses to assess student learning provide her/him with information about student understanding of the subject-matter taught AND the evaluations are appropriate for students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate can describe how he/she uses the results of evaluations to plan future instruction

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.5	3.384	3.368	3.464

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.2.1): <i>Candidate creates a climate that promotes fairness.</i>	
0	The candidate is unfair in the treatment of students <i>AND/OR</i> The candidate tolerates obviously unfair behavior among students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate is fair in the treatment of students and does not accept obviously unfair behavior among students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate is fair in the treatment of students and actively encourages fairness among students

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.1	3.713	3.716	3.769

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.2.2): <i>Candidate establishes and maintains rapport with students.</i>	
0	The candidate does not attempt to establish rapport with students <i>OR</i> The candidate's attempts to establish rapport with students are inappropriate
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate establishes a basic level of rapport with students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate successfully establishes rapport in ways that are appropriate to students' diverse backgrounds and needs

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.2	3.684	3.659	3.846

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.2.3): <i>Candidate communicates challenging learning expectations to each student</i>	
0	The candidate communicates explicitly or implicitly to individuals, to groups within the class or to the class as a whole that they are incapable of learning OR that his/her expectations for their learning are very low
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate does nothing to communicate to any student that he/she is incapable of meeting learning expectations
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate actively encourages students to meet challenging learning expectations

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.3	3.525	3.669	3.708

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.2.4):
Candidate establishes and maintains consistent standards of classroom behavior.

0	The candidate makes no attempt to respond to disruptive behavior <i>OR</i> The candidate's responses to disruptive behavior do not demonstrate respect for students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate makes appropriate attempts to respond to disruptive behavior in ways that demonstrate respect for students <i>OR</i> Some students may display minor misbehavior but it does not disrupt the class
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate responds to disruptive behavior or minor misbehavior consistently and with reasonable success, in ways that demonstrate respect for students <i>OR</i> Student behavior during lessons is consistently appropriate

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.4	3.403	3.265	3.476

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.2.5):
Candidate makes the physical environment safe and conducive to learning.

0	The candidate allows the physical environment to be unsafe <i>OR</i> The candidate allows the physical environment to interfere with learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate creates a physical environment that is safe and does not interfere with learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate uses the physical environment as a resource to facilitate learning, provisions are made to accommodate all students, including those with special needs and, if the candidate does not control the physical environment, she/he effectively adjusts the activities to the existing physical environment

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.2.5	3.631	3.639	3.704

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.1):
Candidate makes learning expectations and instructional procedures clear to students.

0	The candidate provides students with no information, confusing information or inaccurate information about the learning expectations or the instructional procedures for lessons
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate provides students with accurate information about the learning expectations AND the candidate provides students with clear, accurate information about the instructional procedures for lessons that most students seem to understand
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, students seem to understand the learning goals fully AND the candidate ensures that all students, including those who may initially have trouble, understand and can carry out the instructional procedures of lessons

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.1	3.534	3.403	3.449

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.2):
Candidate makes the subject-matter comprehensible to all students.

0	Assessment results of student work indicate that the subject-matter appears to be incomprehensible to students <i>OR</i> The candidate's explanations of the subject-matter contain substantive inaccuracies
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate's explanations of the subject-matter are accurate and assessment results of student work indicate that the subject-matter is comprehensible to students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the lesson as a whole has a logical and coherent structure

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.2	3.468	3.429	3.484

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.3): <i>Candidate integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment.</i>	
0	The candidate does not integrate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment <i>OR</i> The candidate either incorrectly or inappropriately integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate adequately integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate extensively integrates knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity across curriculum, instruction and assessment

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.3	3.342	3.3	3.298

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.4): <i>Candidate provides culturally-responsive teaching for all students.</i>	
0	The candidate does not provide culturally-responsive teaching for ALL students <i>OR</i> The candidate provides inappropriate culturally-responsive teaching for all students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate provides some culturally-responsive teaching for ALL students <i>OR</i> The candidate provides culturally-responsive teaching for some but not ALL students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate thoroughly provides culturally-responsive teaching for ALL students

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.4	3.403	3.47	3.381

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.5): <i>Candidate encourages students to extend their thinking.</i>	
0	The candidate discourages students from thinking independently, creatively or critically
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate encourages students to think independently, creatively or critically in the context of the subject-matter being studied
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate uses activities or strategies that are specifically designed to actively encourage students to think independently, creatively or critically about the content being taught

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.5	3.376	3.464	3.625

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.6): <i>Candidate monitors students' understanding of the subject-matter through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands.</i>	
0	The candidate makes no attempt to determine whether students understand the subject-matter being taught and gives them no feedback
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate monitors students' understanding of the subject-matter, AND students receive feedback as necessary
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate monitors individual students' or groups of students' understanding of the subject-matter, makes appropriate instructional adjustments if necessary and, as appropriate, provides substantive and specific feedback

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.6	3.477	3.517	3.66

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.3.7): <i>Candidate uses instructional time effectively.</i>	
0	The candidate spends substantial amounts of instructional time on activities of little instructional value <i>OR</i> The pacing of the candidate's lessons is inappropriate to the subject-matter and/or the students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate spends substantial amounts of instructional time on activities of little instructional value <i>OR</i> The pacing of the candidate's lessons is inappropriate to the subject-matter and/or the students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate provides students with activities of instructional value for the entire instructional time, paces them appropriately and efficiently performs necessary non-instructional procedures

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.3.7	3.452	3.363	3.48

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.4.1): <i>Candidate reflects on the extent to which learning expectations of lessons are met.</i>	
0	The candidate does not accurately identify the strengths and weaknesses of lessons in relation to learning expectations
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate accurately describes the strengths and weaknesses of lessons in relation to learning expectations and describes, in general terms, how he/she could use the experiences from lessons taught in future instruction
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate supports her/his judgments with specific evidence from specific lessons taught

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.1	3.523	3.508	3.569

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.4.2):
Candidate demonstrates a sense of efficacy; that is, a sense of responsibility for learning on the part of ALL students.

0	The candidate makes no attempt to address the specific learning needs of students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate attempts to find ways to address the specific learning needs of students, but cannot suggest specific, practical actions that he/she has not already tried
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate suggests specific, practical actions that she/he can take to address the specific learning expectations of students

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.2	3.542	3.587	3.599

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.4.3):
Candidate builds professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students.

0	The candidate demonstrates no knowledge of how to identify or use available resources
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates knowledge of resources and attempts to consult with others on matters related to learning and instruction
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate actively collaborates with others to coordinate learning activities or to address other concerns related to teaching

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.3	3.616	3.54	3.676

Rubric for Subject-Matter Knowledge and Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.4.4):
Candidate communicates with parents and guardians about student learning.

0	The candidate demonstrates no knowledge of forms of communication that she/he can use to communicate with parents and guardians
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates knowledge of forms of communication that he/she can use to communicate with parents and guardians of students for various purposes
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	In addition to the requirements for level 2, the candidate can describe specific situations in which she/he has communicated or would communicate with parents and guardians regarding specific students

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.4.4	3.304	3.212	3.441

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (20 of 23 proficiencies rated at level 2 or higher)	97.91	96.13	99.01

F.3 Professional Dispositions Assessment III

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment III	
0	The candidate <i>never</i> demonstrates the expectation
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate <i>sometimes</i> demonstrates the expectation
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate <i>always</i> demonstrates the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment III Candidate Proficiencies

		Mean Scores		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
1.1	The candidate has an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she plans to teach	3.759	3.788	3.859

		Mean Scores		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
1.2	The candidate has an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he plans to teach has on current society and culture	3.62	3.677	3.754
1.3	The candidate has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change	3.542	3.72	3.77

		Mean Scores		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
1.4	The candidate has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.629	3.76	3.824
1.5	The candidate has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	3.728	3.806	3.887
1.6	The candidate has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	3.521	3.568	3.657
1.7	The candidate has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.641	3.708	3.782

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 7 dispositions rated at 4)	59.92	68.08	66.53

F.4 Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test (2005-2006)

Percentage of Candidates Passing Principles of Learning and Teaching Tests	94.331
---	--------

F.5 Clinical Practice Grade

Percentage of Candidates Passing Clinical Practice (Grade of B or S)	97.975
---	--------

G. Progression of Candidates Across Decision Points

G.1 Decision Point 1 Recommendations re: Applicant Admission to the Program

Recommendations	
Percentage of applicants granted admission	95.522
Percentage of applicants who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to admission	0.298
Percentage of applicants removed from consideration for admission	4.179

G.2 Decision Point 2 Recommendations re: Candidates at Completion of Unit Assessment Field Experience

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted permission to move to next decision point	99.229
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to movement to Decision Point 3	0.385
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0.385

G.3 Decision Point 3 Recommendations re: Candidate Admission to Clinical Experience

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted permission to move to next decision point	99.229
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to movement to Decision Point 4	0.385
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0.385

G.4 Decision Point 4 Recommendations re: Candidate Completion of Clinical Practice

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted program completion status	93.522
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior acquiring program completion status	5.870
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0.607

H. Program Completers from September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007

582

I. Competence of Program Completers (N = 281)

The competence of recent program completers, those employed as beginning teachers in Ohio schools, is measured through the Praxis III Classroom Performance Assessment of Beginning Teachers, an assessment required of all beginning teachers in the state of Ohio. The assessment includes a pre-observation interview, a classroom observation, and a post-observation interview, all three of which are conducted by an Educational Testing Service (ETS) trained Praxis III assessor. Successful completion of this assessment is a requirement for securing professional licensure as well as a requirement for continuing to teach in Ohio. For 2006-2007, N = 281, the number of program completers serving as beginning teachers in Ohio.

Percentage of Graduates Passing Domain A of Praxis III (Ohio Qualifying Score: 10)	100
Percentage of Graduates Passing Domain B of Praxis III (Ohio Qualifying Score: 10)	100
Percentage of Graduates Passing Domain C of Praxis III (Ohio Qualifying Score: 10)	99.6
Percentage of Graduates Passing Domain D of Praxis III (Ohio Qualifying Score: 8)	98.2
Percentage of Graduates Passing Praxis III (Ohio Qualifying Score: a minimum score of 10 on each of the following Domains - A, B, and C; a minimum score of 8 for Domain D; and no more than one score below 2 for Domains B and C together)	98.576

II. ADVANCED TEACHER PREPARATION

Advanced teacher preparation includes those individuals who possess a certificate and/or license to teach, but who return or enroll for the first time in the institution for the purpose of enhancing their skills as a P-12 teacher. During 2006-2007, each program was asked to respond to the following questions for the purpose of determining whether the program(s) they offer should be considered as advanced teacher preparation.

1. Is the *purpose* of your graduate program to allow those holding a teaching license to obtain one or more additional licensure areas?
2. Is the *purpose* of your graduate program to allow those holding a teaching license to enhance their current knowledge and skills as a P-12 teacher?
3. Is the *purpose* of your graduate program to prepare individuals for enrollment in advanced graduate studies?

As a result of this study, the following programs were labeled as Advanced Teacher Preparation:

- Adapted Physical Education
- Hearing Impaired
- Music Education
- Route B Career and Technical Education
- Visually Impaired

In addition, the following endorsement programs are offered.

- Adapted Physical Education
- Career-Based Intervention
- Gifted Intervention Specialist
- Language Arts and Reading 4-6 Generalist
- Literacy Specialist
- Mathematics 4-6 Generalist
- Pre-Kindergarten Special Needs
- Reading K-12
- Science 4-6 Generalist
- Social Studies 4-6 Generalist
- Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

In accordance with the guidelines of the Ohio Department of Education, data regarding the candidates in these programs need not be collected until fall 2008 in preparation for the 2011 NCATE visit.

A. Number of Candidates Enrolled in Advanced Teacher Preparation Across the Academic Year

156

B. Number of Candidates at Each Decision Point Across the Academic Year

Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program	Decision Point 2: Admission to Culminating Experience	Decision Point 3: Completion of Culminating Experience
142	15	14

C. Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program Data [Measures of APPLICANT QUALIFICATIONS]

C.1 General Knowledge Assessment I: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (3.00)	92.306
--	--------

C.2 Professional Dispositions Assessment I

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment I	
0	Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
1	There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
2	There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
3	There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
4	There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment I Applicant Proficiencies		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Score
1.1	The applicant has an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she teaches	3.85
1.2	The applicant has an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he teaches has on current society and culture	3.46
1.3	The applicant has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change	3.05
1.4	The applicant has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.08
1.5	The applicant has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	3.1
1.6	The applicant has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	2.99
1.7	The applicant has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.15
Percent of Applicants at Criterion Level (4 of 7 dispositions rated at 3 or higher)		97.5

D. Decision Point 2: Admission to Culminating Experience Data [Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

D.1 General Knowledge Assessment II: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (3.00)	100
---	------------

D.2 Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.1): <i>Candidate understands the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy.</i>	
0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a thorough understanding of the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.1	3.83	3.5

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.2): <i>Candidate selects and uses a broad range of instructional strategies to promote students learning.</i>	
0	The candidate neither selects nor uses a broad range of instructional strategies to promote student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate selects and uses a limited range of instructional strategies to promote student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate selects and uses a broad range of instructional strategies to promote student learning

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.2	3.87	3.57

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.3): <i>Candidate synthesizes research and policies to promote student learning.</i>	
0	The candidate does not synthesize research or policies to promote student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate synthesizes research to promote student learning OR The candidate synthesizes policies to promote student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate synthesizes research and policies to promote student learning

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.3	3.5	3.28

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.4): <i>Candidate analyzes student, classroom and school performance data.</i>	
0	The candidate does not analyze student, classroom or school performance data to promote student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate analyzes, on a limited basis, student, classroom and school performance data to promote student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate thoroughly analyzes student, classroom and school performance data to promote student learning

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.4	3.66	3.21

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.5): <i>Candidate makes data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning.</i>	
0	The candidate does not make data-driven decisions to identify or develop strategies for teaching and learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate makes data-driven decisions, on a limited basis, to identify and develop strategies for teaching and learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate thoughtfully makes data-driven decisions to identify and develop strategies for teaching and learning

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.5	3.58	3.14

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (4 of 5 proficiencies rated at 2 or higher)	100	100

D.3 Professional Dispositions Assessment II

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment II	
0	The candidate <i>never</i> demonstrates the expectation
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate <i>sometimes</i> demonstrates the expectation
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate <i>always</i> demonstrates the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment II Candidate Proficiencies

Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Scores	
		Faculty Advisors	Candidates
1.1	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she teaches	3.94	3.85
1.2	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he teaches has on current society and culture	3.94	3.85
1.3	The candidate has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change	3.68	3.57
1.4	The candidate has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.63	3.78

1.5	The candidate has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	4	3.78
1.6	The candidate has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	3.77	3.42
1.7	The candidate has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.88	3.78

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 7 dispositions rated at 3 or higher)	100	100

E. Decision Point 3: Completion to Culminating Experience Data [Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

E.1 General Knowledge Assessment III: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (3.00)	100
---	-----

E.2 Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.1): <i>Candidate understands the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy.</i>	
0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a thorough understanding of the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.1	3.4	3.5

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.2): <i>Candidate selects and uses a broad range of instructional strategies to promote students learning.</i>	
0	The candidate neither selects nor uses a broad range of instructional strategies to promote student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate selects and uses a limited range of instructional strategies to promote student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate selects and uses a broad range of instructional strategies to promote student learning

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.2	3.62	3.7

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.3): <i>Candidate synthesizes research and policies to promote student learning.</i>	
0	The candidate does not synthesize research or policies to promote student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate synthesizes research to promote student learning OR The candidate synthesizes policies to promote student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate synthesizes research and policies to promote student learning

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.3	3.43	2.9

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.4): <i>Candidate analyzes student, classroom and school performance data.</i>	
0	The candidate does not analyze student, classroom or school performance data to promote student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate analyzes, on a limited basis, student, classroom and school performance data to promote student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate thoroughly analyzes student, classroom and school performance data to promote student learning

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.4	3.62	3.2

Rubric for Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.5): <i>Candidate makes data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning.</i>	
0	The candidate does not make data-driven decisions to identify or develop strategies for teaching and learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate makes data-driven decisions, on a limited basis, to identify and develop strategies for teaching and learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate thoughtfully makes data-driven decisions to identify and develop strategies for teaching and learning

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.5	3.62	2.8

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (4 of 5 proficiencies rated at 3 or higher)	81.25	87.5

E.3 Professional Dispositions Assessment III

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment III	
0	The candidate <i>never</i> demonstrates the expectation
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate <i>sometimes</i> demonstrates the expectation
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate <i>always</i> demonstrates the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment III Candidate Proficiencies

Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Scores	
		Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
1.1	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the subject-matter he/she teaches	3.71	3.8
1.2	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the impact that the subject-matter she/he teaches has on current society and culture	3.57	3.8
1.3	The candidate has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and teachers as agents of change	3.57	3.3

1.4	The candidate has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.85	3.9
1.5	The candidate has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	3.85	3.8
1.6	The candidate has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	3.5	3.3
1.7	The candidate has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.57	3.3

	Culminating Experience Supervisors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 7 dispositions rated at 4 or higher)	64.29	40

F. Progression of Candidates Across Decision Points

F.1 Decision Point 1 Recommendations re: Applicant Admission to the Program

Recommendations	
Percentage of applicants granted admission	100
Percentage of applicants who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to admission	0
Percentage of applicants removed from consideration for admission	0

F.2 Decision Point 2 Recommendations re: Candidate Admission to Culminating Experience

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted permission to move to next decision point	100
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to movement to Decision Point 3	0
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0

F.3 Decision Point 3 Recommendations re: Candidate Completion of Culminating Experience

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted permission to move to next decision point	64.28
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to acquiring program completion status	35.7
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0

G. Program Completers from September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007

9

III. OTHER PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL ROLES PREPARATION

A. Admission to the Program

A.1 Number of Applicants Considered during the Academic Year for Admission to Other Professional School Roles Preparation Programs

40

A.2 Number of Applicants Accepted during the Academic Year for Admission to Other Professional School Roles Preparation Programs

78

A.3 Decision Point 1: Admission to the Program Data

A.3.1 General Knowledge Assessment I: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (3.00)	100
--	------------

A.3.2 Professional Dispositions Assessment I

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment I	
0	Insufficient evidence is available to make a judgment about the applicant being able to develop the expectation
1	There is little or no evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
2	There is some evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
3	There is strong evidence that the applicant can develop the expectation
4	There is evidence that the applicant has already met the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment I Applicant Proficiencies		
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Score
1.1	The applicant has an appreciation for the field in which he/she plans to work	2.55
1.2	The applicant has an appreciation for the impact that the field in which she/he plans to work has on current society and culture	2.474
1.3	The applicant has an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and school personnel as agents of change	2.301
1.4	The applicant has an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	2.324
1.5	The applicant has a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	2.37
1.6	The applicant has a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	2.052
1.7	The applicant has a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	2.468
Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (4 of 7 dispositions rated at 3 or higher)		41.62

B. Number of Candidates Enrolled in Other Professional School Roles Preparation Programs Across the Academic Year

114

C. Number of Candidates at Each Decision Point (2-3) Across the Academic Year

Decision Point 2: Admission to Culminating Internship	Decision Point 3: Completion of Culminating Internship
57	72

D. Decision Point 2: Admission to Culminating Internship Data [Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

D.1 General Knowledge Assessment II: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (3.00)	100
--	------------

D.2 Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency A.1.2): *Candidate demonstrates an understanding of the field of work.*

0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of the field of work for which he/she is preparing
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of the field of work for which she/he is preparing
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the field of work for which she/he is preparing

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency A.1.2	3.542	3.548

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.1): *Candidate demonstrates knowledge of students, families and communities..*

0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the students, families and community within the internship setting
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general knowledge of the students, families and community within the internship setting
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the students, families and community within the internship setting

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.1	3.492	3.521

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.2): *Candidate uses data and current research to inform practice.*

0	The candidate does not use data to inform his/her practice OR The candidate does not use current research to inform her/his practice
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate uses, on a limited basis, data and current research to inform his/her practice
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently uses data and current research to inform her/his practice

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.2	3.533	3.493

**Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills
 Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.3): *Candidate uses technology in practice.***

0	The candidate does not use technology in his/her practice
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate uses, on a limited basis, technology in her/his practice
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently use technology in his/her practice

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.3	3.675	3.603

**Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills
 Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.4): *Candidate supports student learning through professionals services.***

0	The candidate does not support student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate supports student learning on a limited basis
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently supports student learning

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.4	3.542	3.699

**Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills
 Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.5): *Candidate creates positive learning environments for student learning.***

0	The candidate does not create positive learning environments for student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate creates, on a limited basis, positive learning environments for student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently creates positive learning environments for student learning

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.5	3.542	3.767

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.6): <i>Candidate understands and builds upon the developmental levels of students.</i>	
0	The candidate does not demonstrate an understanding of the developmental levels of students OR The candidate does not build upon the developmental levels of students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of the developmental levels of students AND, on a limited basis, builds upon the developmental levels of students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the developmental levels of students and builds upon them

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.6	3.508	3.548

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment I (Candidate Proficiency B.1.7): <i>Candidate understands the policy contexts in which they work.</i>	
0	The candidate does not understand the policy contexts of the internship setting
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate has a limited understanding of the policy contexts of the internship setting
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate has a comprehensive understanding of the policy contexts of the internship setting

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.7	3.375	3.397

	Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 8 criteria rated at level 2 or higher)	99.17	100

D.3 Professional Dispositions Assessment II

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment II	
0	The candidate <i>never</i> demonstrates the expectation
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate <i>sometimes</i> demonstrates the expectation
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate <i>always</i> demonstrates the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment II Candidate Proficiencies			
Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Scores	
		Faculty Advisors	Candidates
1.1	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the field in which he/she plans to work	3.597	3.795
1.2	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the impact that the field in which he/she plans to work has on current society and culture	3.555	3.863
1.3	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and school personnel as agents of change	3.521	3.795
1.4	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.706	3.863
1.5	The candidate demonstrates a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	3.597	3.904
1.6	The candidate demonstrates a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	3.588	3.712
1.7	The candidate demonstrates a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.521	3.781
		Faculty Advisors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 7 dispositions rated at 3 or higher)		98.32	98.63

E. Decision Point 3: Completion of Culminating Internship Data [Measures of CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES]

E.1 General Knowledge Assessment III: Cumulative Grade Point Average

Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (3.00)	100
--	------------

E.2 Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency A.1.2): <i>Candidate demonstrates an understanding of the field of work.</i>	
0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of understanding of the field of work for which he/she is preparing
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of the field of work for which she/he is preparing
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the field of work for which she/he is preparing

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency A.1.2	3.648	3.659	3.756

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.1): <i>Candidate demonstrates knowledge of students, families and communities..</i>	
0	The candidate demonstrates a lack of knowledge of the students, families and community within the internship setting
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general knowledge of the students, families and community within the internship setting
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of the students, families and community within the internship setting

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.1	3.636	3.591	3.689

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.2): <i>Candidate uses data and current research to inform practice.</i>	
0	The candidate does not use data to inform his/her practice OR The candidate does not use current research to inform her/his practice
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate uses, on a limited basis, data and current research to inform his/her practice
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently uses data and current research to inform her/his Practice

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.2	3.591	3.545	3.6

**Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills
 Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.3): *Candidate uses technology in practice.***

0	The candidate does not use technology in his/her practice
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate uses, on a limited basis, technology in her/his practice
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently use technology in his/her practice

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.3	3.602	3.5	3.689

**Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills
 Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.4): *Candidate supports student learning through professionals services.***

0	The candidate does not support student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate supports student learning on a limited basis
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently supports student learning

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.4	3.67	3.659	3.756

**Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills
 Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.5): *Candidate creates positive learning environments for student learning.***

0	The candidate does not create positive learning environments for student learning
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate creates, on a limited basis, positive learning environments for student learning
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate consistently creates positive learning environments for student learning

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.5	3.693	3.75	3.911

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.6): <i>Candidate understands and builds upon the developmental levels of students.</i>	
0	The candidate does not demonstrate an understanding of the developmental levels of students OR The candidate does not build upon the developmental levels of students
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate demonstrates a general understanding of the developmental levels of students AND, on a limited basis, builds upon the developmental levels of students
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the developmental levels of students and builds upon them

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.6	3.67	3.477	3.844

Rubric for Field of Work and Professional Knowledge and Skills Assessment II (Candidate Proficiency B.1.7): <i>Candidate understands the policy contexts in which they work.</i>	
0	The candidate does not understand the policy contexts of the internship setting
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate has a limited understanding of the policy contexts of the internship setting
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate has a comprehensive understanding of the policy contexts of the internship setting

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Mean Score for Candidate Proficiency B.1.7	3.67	3.5	3.667

	University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Percent of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 8 criteria rated at level 3 or higher)	98.86	90.91	97.78

E.3 Praxis II Specialty Area Test:

Percentage of Candidates Passing Praxis II Specialty Area Tests	65.217
--	--------

E. 4 Professional Dispositions Assessment III

Rubric for Professional Dispositions Assessment III	
0	The candidate <i>never</i> demonstrates the expectation
1	Above level 0, but below level 2
2	The candidate <i>sometimes</i> demonstrates the expectation
3	Above level 2, but below level 4
4	The candidate <i>always</i> demonstrates the expectation

Professional Dispositions Assessment III Candidate Proficiencies

Proficiency Number	Proficiency	Mean Scores		
		University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
1.1	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the field in which he/she plans to work	3.831	3.75	3.891
1.2	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the impact that the field in which he/she plans to work has on current society and culture	3.787	3.636	3.891
1.3	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation of schools as a reflection of society and school personnel as agents of change	3.831	3.727	3.87
1.4	The candidate demonstrates an appreciation for the diversity and the worth of students, families and communities and cultures and backgrounds across all ethnic groups, genders, disabilities and socioeconomic levels	3.809	3.75	3.978
1.5	The candidate demonstrates a belief that all students can learn and achieve reasonable standards and expectations	3.831	3.886	3.891
1.6	The candidate demonstrates a willingness to use multiple data sources to drive decisions about student learning across all P-12 school age and demographic groups	3.831	3.591	3.652

1.7	The candidate demonstrates a willingness to study the best and most promising professional practices that have an impact on student learning	3.854	3.5	3.804
		University Supervisors	Mentors	Candidates
Percentage of Candidates at Criterion Level (6 of 7 dispositions rated at level 4)		78.65	54.55	71.74

F. Progression of Candidates Across Decision Points

F.1 Decision Point 1 Recommendations re: Applicant Admission to the Program

Recommendations	
Percentage of applicants granted admission	100
Percentage of applicants who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to admission	0
Percentage of applicants removed from consideration for admission	0

F.2 Decision Point 2 Recommendations re: Candidate Admission to Culminating Internship

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted permission to move to next decision point	100
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to movement to Decision Point 3	0
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0

F.3 Decision Point 3 Recommendations re: Candidate Completion of Culminating Internship

Recommendations	
Percentage of candidates granted permission to move to next decision point	87.5
Percentage of candidates who needed to demonstrate further performances prior to acquiring program completion status	13.03
Percentage of candidates removed from program	0

G. Program Completers from September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007

66

IV. UNIT MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS [scale: Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6)]

A. Candidates (N = 523)

A.1 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Placements

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
1	Field placements facilitate my development as a professional educator by providing opportunities to observe in schools and other agencies, assist school personnel, attend school board meetings, and participate in education-related community.	5.49
2	Field placements reflect the unit's conceptual framework and help me continue to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in standards.	5.34
3	Field placements allow me to use information technology to support teaching, learning and student services.	5.00
4	Field placements are sufficiently extensive and intensive for me to demonstrate proficiencies in the professional role for which I am preparing.	5.24
5	University supervisors provide regular and continuing support for me through such processes as observation, conferencing, group discussion, email correspondence, and the use of other technology.	5.16
6	School mentors provided regular and continuing support for me through such processes as observation, conferencing, group discussion, e-mail correspondence, and the use of other technology.	5.17

A.2 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
7	Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate my performance and its effect on student learning.	5.01
8	Candidates, school mentors, and professional education faculty jointly conduct assessments of my performance throughout field placements.	5.15
9	Field placements allow time for reflection and include feedback from peers and the university supervisor.	5.24
10	Field placements provide opportunities for me to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.	5.50
11	My field placements have included students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.	5.36

11	My field placements have included students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.	5.36
----	--	-------------

A.3 DIVERSITY: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
12	The proficiencies that I am expected to develop during my professional program are clearly articulated.	5.17
13	Curriculum and accompanying field placements were designed to help me understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning.	5.26
14	I have learned to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity.	5.30
15	I have learned to develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity.	5.44
16	I have become aware of different teaching and learning styles shaped by cultural influences and am able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities.	5.34
17	Assessment data are used to provide feedback to improve my knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.28
18	Assessments provide data on my ability to help all students learn.	5.27

A.4 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
19	I interact in classroom settings on campus and in schools with professional education faculty, other faculty from across campus, and school mentors from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups.	5.10
20	Faculty with whom I work in professional education classes and field placements have knowledge about and experiences with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and exceptionalities.	5.34
21	Professional education faculty and university supervisors value diversity.	5.55

A.5 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
22	I interact and work with other candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in professional education courses on campus and in schools.	4.81
23	Candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups work together on committees and education projects related to education and the content areas.	4.80
24	The affirmation of the values of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts made to increase or maintain candidate diversity.	5.07

A.6 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
25	Field placements in settings with exceptional populations and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups are designed to help me develop and practice my knowledge, skills, and dispositions and working with all students.	5.37
26	Feedback from peers and supervisors helps me reflect on my ability to help all students learn.	5.47

A.7 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
27	The professional education faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach.	5.47
28	Teaching by professional education faculty reflects the unit's conceptual framework and research, theories, and current developments in their fields and teaching.	5.41
29	The professional education faculty value my learning and assess my performance.	5.42
30	The professional education faculty's teaching encourages my development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.	5.51
31	The professional education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles.	5.24
32	The professional education faculty accommodate for diversity in their classes.	5.28
33	The professional education faculty integrate technology into their teaching.	5.23

B. Field Placement Coordinators (N = 31)

B.1 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
1	University personnel, P-12 school partners, and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field placements to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.52
2	University personnel and P-12 school partners jointly determine the specific field placements of pre-service candidates and interns for other professional roles to provide appropriate learning experiences.	5.32

B.2 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Placements

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
3	Field placements facilitate candidates' development as professional educators by providing opportunities to observe in schools and other agencies, assist school personnel, attend school board meetings, and participate in education-related community.	5.48

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
4	Field placements reflect the unit's conceptual framework and help candidates continue to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in standards.	5.55
5	Field placements allow candidates to use information technology to support teaching, learning and student services.	5.29
6	Field placements are sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate proficiencies in the professional roles for which they are preparing.	5.61
7	Expectations for school mentors are clear and understood by all of the involved parties.	5.35
8	University supervisors provide regular and continuing support for candidates through observation, conferencing, group discussion, email correspondence, and the use of other technology.	5.71

B.3 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Candidates' Development & Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
9	Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidate performance and its effect on student learning.	5.48
10	Field placements provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.	5.71
11	All candidates participate in field placements that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.	5.65

B.4 DIVERSITY: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
12	The proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during field placements are clearly communicated to university supervisors, school mentors and building administrators.	5.55
13	Field placements are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching, learning and student services.	5.61
14	Field placement assessments gather data regarding the ability of candidates to help all students learn.	5.32

B.5 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
15	University faculty and school mentors with whom candidates work in field placements have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds, including students with exceptionalities.	5.61
16	University supervisors value diversity.	5.87

B.6 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
17	Candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups are placed together in field placements.	5.23

B.7 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
18	Field placements provide experiences for candidates with exceptional populations and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.	5.65
19	Feedback from peers, school mentors and university supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.	5.58

C. Professional Education Faculty (N = 75)

C.1 DIVERSITY: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
1	The unit's conceptual framework clearly articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during their professional program.	5.46
2	The curriculum is designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching and learning.	5.49
3	Candidates learn to incorporate diversity in their work.	5.30
4	Candidates learn to develop classroom and school climates that value diversity.	5.38
5	Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles and student services shaped by cultural influences.	5.36
6	Candidates are able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students.	5.24
7	Candidates demonstrate dispositions that value fairness and learning by all students.	5.46
8	Assessment data are used to provide feedback to improve candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.37
9	Assessments provide data on the ability of candidates to help all students learn.	5.26

C.2 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
10	Candidates interact in classroom settings on campus with professional education faculty and faculty from across campus from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups.	5.14
11	Candidates interact in classroom settings on campus with professional education faculty and faculty from across campus from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups.	5.57

12	The affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts made to increase or maintain faculty diversity.	5.54
----	---	------

C.3 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
13	Candidates interact and work with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in professional education courses on campus.	4.88
14	Candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups work together on committees and education projects related to education and the content areas.	4.88
15	The affirmation of the values of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts made to increase or maintain candidate diversity.	5.36

C.4 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
16	The university faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach.	5.85
17	Teaching by professional education faculty reflects the unit's conceptual framework and research, theories, and current developments in their fields and teaching.	5.74
18	The professional education faculty value candidates' learning and assess candidate performance.	5.73
19	The instruction provided by the professional education faculty encourages candidates' development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.	5.78
20	The professional education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of different learning styles.	5.61
21	The professional education faculty integrate diversity and technology throughout their teaching.	5.50

C.5 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
22	The professional education faculty are actively involved with the professional world of practice in P-12 schools.	5.33

C.6 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
23	The unit provides opportunities for professional education faculty to develop new knowledge and skills, especially as they relate to performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices.	5.22

C.7 UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES: Unit Leadership and Authority

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
24	The unit effectively manages and coordinates all programs to ensure that candidates meet the standards.	5.41
25	The unit's recruiting and admission practices are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogs.	5.42
26	The unit ensures that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling.	5.61
27	The unit provides a mechanism for collaboration between unit faculty and other faculty from across campus involved in the preparation of professional educators.	4.93

C.8 UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES: Unit Budget

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
28	The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to provide programs that prepare candidates to meet the standards.	4.38
29	The budget adequately supports on-campus and field placements essential to the preparation of professional educators.	4.41

C.9 UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES: Personnel

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
30	Workload policies allow faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advising, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service.	4.18
31	The unit provides adequate resources and opportunities for professional development of faculty, including training in the use of technology.	4.48

C.10 UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES: Unit Facilities

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
32	The unit has adequate campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting the standards.	4.78
33	The facilities support faculty and candidates' use of information technology in instruction.	4.74

C.11 UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES: Unit Resources Including Technology

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
34	The unit has adequate information technology resources to support faculty and candidates.	4.77
35	Faculty and candidates have access to sufficient, current library and curricular resources as well as electronic information.	5.34

D. School Mentors (N = 270)

D.1 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
1	University personnel, P-12 school partners, and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field placements to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.11
2	University personnel and P-12 school partners jointly determine the specific field placements of candidates and interns to provide appropriate learning experiences.	4.71

D.2 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
3	Field placements reflect the unit's conceptual framework and help candidates continue to develop the content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in standards.	5.34
4	Field placements allow candidates to use information technology to support teaching, learning, and student services.	5.28
5	Field placements are sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate proficiencies for the role of professional educator.	5.22

6	Expectations for school mentors are clear and understood by all of the involved parties.	5.31
7	University supervisors provide regular and continuing support for candidates through observation, conferencing, group discussion, email correspondence, and the use of other technology.	5.20

D.3 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
8	Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidates' performance and effect on students.	5.00
9	Candidates, school mentors, and university supervisors jointly conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout field placements.	5.19
10	Field placements allow time for reflection and include feedback from peers, school mentors, and university supervisors.	5.25
11	Field placements provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.	5.52
12	Candidates participate in field placements that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.	5.44

D.4 DIVERSITY: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
13	The proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during field placements are clearly communicated.	5.19
14	The program's field placements are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching, learning, and student services.	5.33
15	Candidates learn to incorporate diversity and develop classroom and school climates that value diversity.	5.27
16	Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles and student services shaped by cultural influences.	5.26
17	Candidates are able to adapt instruction /services appropriately for all students, including students with exceptionalities.	5.18
18	Assessment data are used to provide feedback to inform candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.17
19	Assessments provide data on the ability of candidates to help all students learn.	5.11

D.5 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
20	Candidates interact in classroom settings in schools with school mentors from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups.	4.97
21	Professional education faculty with whom candidates work in professional education classes and field placements have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds, and students with exceptionalities.	5.27
22	University supervisors value diversity.	5.48

D.6 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
23	Candidates interact and work with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups during field placements.	4.94

D.7 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
24	Field placements in settings with exceptional populations and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups are designed for candidates to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with all students.	5.22
25	Feedback from peers and supervisors helps interns reflect on their ability to help all students learn.	5.42

E. University Supervisors (N = 76)

E.1 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
1	University personnel, its school partners, and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field placement to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.30

E.2 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Design, Implementation, & Evaluation of Field Placements

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
2	Field placements reflect the unit's conceptual framework and help candidates continue to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in standards.	5.28
3	Field placements allow candidates to use information technology to support teaching, learning, and student services.	4.98
4	Field placements are sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate proficiencies in the professional roles for which they are preparing.	5.40
5	Expectations for school mentors are clear to and understood by all of the involved parties.	5.02

E.3 FIELD PLACEMENTS: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
6	Multiple assessment strategies are used to evaluate candidate performance and its effect on student learning.	5.36
7	Candidates, school mentors, and university supervisors jointly conduct assessments of candidate performance throughout field placements.	5.44
8	Field placements allow time for reflection and include feedback from peers, school mentors, and university supervisors.	5.46
9	Field placements provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.	5.56
10	Candidates participate in field placements that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups.	5.43

E.4 DIVERSITY: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
11	The unit's conceptual framework clearly articulates the proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop during their professional program.	5.44
12	Field placements are designed to help candidates understand the importance of diversity in teaching, learning, and student services.	5.36
13	Candidates learn to incorporate diversity and develop classroom and school climates that value diversity.	5.39

14	Candidates become aware of different teaching and learning styles and student services shaped by cultural influences.	5.28
15	Candidates are able to adapt instruction and services appropriately for all students.	5.14
16	Candidates demonstrate dispositions that value fairness and learning by all students.	5.46
17	Assessment data are used to provide feedback to candidates to improve their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.	5.44

E.5 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
18	Candidates interact in schools with school mentors from diverse ethnic, racial, and gender groups.	4.93
19	School mentors value diversity.	5.42
20	University supervisors value diversity.	5.73

E.6 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
21	Candidates interact and work with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in field placements.	4.94
22	Candidates value diversity.	5.40

E.7 DIVERSITY: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Question Number	Expectations	Mean Score (1-6)
23	Field placements in settings with exceptional populations and students from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups are designed for candidates to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with all students.	5.34
24	Feedback from peers, school mentors, and university supervisors helps candidates reflect on their ability to help all students learn.	5.56

V. Teacher Quality Partnership Data (2006-2007 Preservice Teachers)

A. Perceptions of Preparation Program

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of program completers about their teacher preparation programs. Respondents were asked to rank each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Strongly Disagree*, *Somewhat Disagree*, *neither Disagree/Agree*, *Somewhat Agree* and *Strongly Agree* (1-5).

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	My teacher education instructors were knowledgeable about the standards and expectations of my teacher education programs as a whole.	92	4.43	0.89
2	My program was coherent.	92	4.14	1.02
3	The criteria by which I was evaluated as a student teacher were consistent with what I was taught in my methods courses.	89	4.22	1.15
4	I had the opportunity to develop understandings about teaching that were consistent across courses and clinical experiences.	91	4.26	0.99
5	My program required a strong disciplinary preparation that incorporated an understanding of a subject matter(s)' core concepts.	92	4.17	1.13
6	My program integrated teaching practice with the study of teaching.	92	4.4	0.95
9	My program was rigorous and academically challenging.	91	4.0	1.23
10	My program was extensive or comprehensive enough to acquire needed understanding and abilities.	91	4.27	1.03
11	Content in my program was supported by theoretical and empirical studies.	91	4.36	.95
12	The program adequately represented the realities and challenges of schools.	91	3.78	1.26
13	My program gave me an adequate foundation in adapting and modifying instruction and curriculum for meeting the needs of children with disabilities (i.e., special education labels) in general-education classrooms.	91	3.88	1.22
14	During my experiences in schools, I participated in a broad range of professional responsibilities (e.g., professional meetings, parent conferences, testing administration).	92	4.2	1.11
15	During my experiences in schools, I had the 1 opportunity to observe and work with several teachers.	92	4.51	0.92
16	During my experiences in schools, I had opportunities to work with successful teachers who had inclusive classes – that is, classes that contain both typical children and children with disabilities	92	4.15	1.08
17	During my experiences in schools, I had opportunities to work with school support services personnel (e.g., nurses, school psychologists, social workers).	92	3.34	1.36
18	During my experiences in schools, I had opportunities to observe outstanding veteran teachers	92	4.22	1.1
19	During my experiences in schools, I had opportunities to have outstanding veteran teachers explain the whys as well as the hows of their teaching to me.	92	3.97	1.25
20	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university spent little time helping candidates who were not making satisfactory progress.	92	3.39	1.18
21	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university made careful judgments about the quality of work that I completed.	91	4.08	0.95
22	Teacher education faculty at my college /university assessed my progress in relation to high standards for good teaching.	91	4.35	0.85
23	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university enabled me to evaluate and reflect upon my practice to improve instruction.	90	4.52	0.77

24	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university used “real-life” teaching strategies such as case studies and simulations.	92	4.05	1.03
25	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university taught in ways quite different than the practices they advocated.	92	3.04	1.32
26	Teacher education faculty at my college/university knew about the realities of contemporary schools and youth.	92	3.96	1.13
27	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university were available outside of class for conferences, meetings, and/or advising sessions.	92	4.17	1.08
28	Teacher education faculty at my college/ university did not have communication with cooperating teacher(s)	92	3.43	1.39
29	My cooperating teacher that I spent most time with knew very little about my program's goals, requirements, or expectations.	91	3.67	1.37
30	My cooperating teacher that I spent most time with taught in ways that were quite different from the methods advocated by my college-based instructors.	92	3.34	1.36
32	My cooperating teacher that I spent most time with was a worthy role model for me	92	4.34	1.1

B. Professional Knowledge and Skills

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of program completers about their professional knowledge and skills. Respondents were asked to consider their preparation, taking into account their coursework, field experiences, seminars, student teaching, and any other formal part of their preparation and rank each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Not At All*, *Poorly*, *Adequately*, *Well*, and *Very Well* (1-5).

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	Set appropriately challenging learning expectations for students	91	4.09	.84
2	Address special learning needs and/or difficulties	91	3.86	1.04
3	Improve the academic performance of difficult or unmotivated students	91	3.7	1.01
4	Tailor teaching and curriculum to individual students' needs	90	3.9	1.07
5	Develop curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests, and abilities	91	4.18	0.95
6	Help students become self-motivated and self-directed	90	3.97	1.01
7	Relate classroom learning to the real world	91	4.16	0.97
8	Use educational technology in instruction (e.g., word processing, spreadsheet, games)	91	4.13	1.01
9	Choose different teaching strategies to meet the needs of different levels of students	91	4.07	0.98
10	Maintain an orderly, purposeful learning environment	90	4.13	0.95
11	Engage students in cooperative group work	91	4.27	0.83
12	Plan instruction by using knowledge of learning, subject matters, curriculum, and student development	91	4.35	0.83
13	Create learning experiences that make the central concepts of the subject matter meaningful to students	91	4.32	0.83
14	Use the state's curriculum frameworks and performance standards to plan instruction	90	4.43	0.81
15	Motivate students to participate in academic tasks	91	4.03	0.95
16	Teach basic knowledge and skills	90	4.28	0.81

17	Refer students for special assistance when appropriate (e.g., speaking, reading)	91	3.64	1.15
18	Work with gifted and talented students	91	3.46	1.13
19	Work with students with a variety of special needs	90	3.76	1.12
20	Help parents and families to better understand their children and support their learning	91	3.68	1.12
21	Implement strategies to help students from different cultures interact positively with each other	91	3.85	1.13
22	Use community resources (e.g., library, museum, art center) to create a multicultural curriculum	91	3.9	1.15
23	Work with parents and families to help me understand students and support their learning	91	3.8	1.14
24	Develop a curriculum that includes the perspectives, experiences, and contributions of different cultural groups	91	4.04	1.0
25	Teach in ways that support students learning English as a second language	89	3.4	1.22
26	Address the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds	91	3.93	1.11
27	Encourage students to see, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives	91	4.14	0.91
28	Use knowledge about linguistic differences to create learning opportunities for students	91	3.54	1.06
54	Evaluate if students are learning	90	4.2	0.95
55	Use standardized assessments to guide your decisions about what skills, concepts, and processes to teach	90	4.1	1.02
56	Align assessments with expectations of what students should know and be able to do	90	4.3	0.93
57	Assess higher level objectives (problem-solving, critical thinking)	90	4.13	0.96
58	Analyze student work in order to assess and modify your own teaching strategies	89	4.3	0.88
59	Use alternative assessment practices (e.g., portfolios, performance tests, student self-assessment strategies)	90	4.27	0.90
60	Use student assessments to guide your decisions about what skills, concepts, and processes to teach	90	4.21	0.92
61	Monitor students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly	90	4.32	0.88
62	Use state proficiency test results to guide your instructional planning	88	3.47	1.39
63	Create assessments that prepare students to be successful in taking proficiency tests	90	3.6	1.33

C. Preservice Program Courses

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of program completers about the effectiveness of their preservice program courses. Respondents were asked to rate each question on a 5-point scale from ineffective to effective.

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	Instructional methods courses	82	3.3	1.04
2	Content-area courses	82	3.34	1.01
3	Courses about how schools operate	70	2.97	1.22
4	Education courses overall	83	3.3	1.0
5	Courses outside the Education overall	79	3.16	1.06

D. Current Professional and Competency Standards

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of program completers about the coverage of current standards in their preparation programs. Respondents were asked to rate each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *No Coverage*, *Limited Coverage*, *Moderate Coverage* and *In-depth Coverage* (1-4).

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	Ohio Academic Content Standards for Students	89	3.38	0.72
2	National Standards in the Candidates Content Area (e.g., NCTM)	89	3.07	0.85
3	Praxis II Standards	88	3.24	0.83
4	Praxis III Standards	89	3.1	0.99

VI. Teacher Quality Partnership Data (2006-2007 First-Year Teachers)

A. Perceptions of Preparation Program

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of first-year teachers about their teacher preparation programs. Respondents were asked to rank each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Strongly Disagree*, *Somewhat Disagree*, *neither Disagree/Agree*, *Somewhat Agree* and *Strongly Agree* (1-5).

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	My teacher education instructors were knowledgeable about the standards and expectations of my teacher education programs as a whole.	77	4.3	1.06
2	My program was coherent.	77	4.23	1.06
3	My program required a strong disciplinary preparation that incorporated an understanding of a subject matter(s)' core concepts.	76	3.95	1.14
4	My program integrated teaching practice with the study of teaching.	77	4.34	1.03
7	My program was rigorous and academically challenging.	76	4.16	1.12
8	My program was extensive or comprehensive enough to acquire needed understanding and abilities.	77	4.3	0.97
9	Content in my program was supported by theoretical and empirical studies.	77	4.38	0.97
10	The program adequately represented the realities and challenges of schools.	77	3.64	1.29

11	My program gave me an adequate foundation in adapting and modifying instruction and curriculum for meeting the needs of children with disabilities (i.e., special education labels) in general-education classrooms.	77	3.66	1.22
----	--	----	------	------

B. Professional Knowledge and Skills

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of first-year teachers about their professional knowledge and skills. Respondents were asked to consider their preparation, taking into account their coursework, field experiences, seminars, student teaching, and any other formal part of their preparation and rank each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Not At All, Poorly, Adequately, Well, and Very Well* (1-5).

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	Set appropriately challenging learning expectations for students	74	4.18	0.78
2	Address special learning needs and/or difficulties	74	3.73	0.94
3	Improve the academic performance of difficult or unmotivated students	74	3.43	0.98
4	Tailor teaching and curriculum to individual students' needs	74	3.89	0.93
5	Develop curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests, and abilities	74	4.23	0.77
6	Help students become self-motivated and self-directed	74	3.69	0.84
7	Relate classroom learning to the real world	73	4.1	0.92
8	Use educational technology in instruction (e.g., word processing, spreadsheet, games)	74	3.99	0.82
9	Choose different teaching strategies to meet the needs of different levels of students	74	4.01	0.90
10	Maintain an orderly, purposeful learning environment	74	4.08	0.84
11	Engage students in cooperative group work	74	4.2	0.78
12	Plan instruction by using knowledge of learning, subject matters, curriculum, and student development	72	4.25	0.82
13	Create learning experiences that make the central concepts of the subject matter meaningful to students	74	4.08	0.86
14	Use the state's curriculum frameworks and performance standards to plan instruction	73	4.29	0.81
15	Motivate students to participate in academic tasks	74	3.81	0.79
16	Teach basic knowledge and skills	74	4.18	0.82
17	Refer students for special assistance when appropriate (e.g., speaking, reading)	73	3.25	1.08
18	Work with gifted and talented students	73	3.36	1.07
19	Work with students with a variety of special needs	73	3.6	1.04
20	Help parents and families to better understand their children and support their learning	72	3.72	1.04
21	Implement strategies to help students from different cultures interact positively with each other	72	3.78	1.0
22	Use community resources (e.g., library, museum, art center) to create a multicultural curriculum	72	3.64	1.14
23	Work with parents and families to help me understand students and support their learning	72	3.78	1.08

24	Develop a curriculum that includes the perspectives, experiences, and contributions of different cultural groups	72	3.81	0.93
25	Teach in ways that support students learning English as a second language	71	3.07	1.26
26	Address the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds	72	3.71	1.03
27	Encourage students to see, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives	71	3.97	1.01
28	Use knowledge about linguistic differences to create learning opportunities for students	72	3.28	1.12
54	Evaluate if students are learning	70	3.37	1.18
55	Use standardized assessments to guide your decisions about what skills, concepts, and processes to teach	70	3.31	1.19
56	Align assessments with expectations of what students should know and be able to do	70	3.4	1.28
57	Assess higher level objectives (problem-solving, critical thinking)	68	3.0	1.32
58	Analyze student work in order to assess and modify your own teaching strategies	69	3.04	1.29
59	Use alternative assessment practices (e.g., portfolios, performance tests, student self-assessment strategies)	69	3.39	1.31
60	Use student assessments to guide your decisions about what skills, concepts, and processes to teach	69	3.49	1.47
61	Monitor students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly	69	3.35	1.34
62	Use state proficiency test results to guide your instructional planning	69	3.26	1.44
63	Create assessments that prepare students to be successful in taking proficiency tests	68	2.91	1.24

C. Current Professional and Competency Standards

The table below provides a summary of the data from the *Teacher Education Graduate Study* regarding the perceptions of first-year teachers about the coverage of current standards in their preparation programs. Respondents were asked to rate each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *No Coverage*, *Limited Coverage*, *Moderate Coverage* and *In-depth Coverage* (1-4).

	Survey Statement	N	Mean	S.D.
1	Ohio Academic Content Standards for Students	72	3.46	0.82
2	National Standards in the Candidates Content Area (e.g., NCTM)	71	3.08	0.89
3	Praxis II Standards	71	3.51	0.75
4	Praxis III Standards	71	3.54	0.77

VII. Follow-Up Study (School District Personnel)

- A. The table below provides a summary of the data from the Follow-Up Study Re: Graduates of The Ohio State University **Initial Teacher Preparation** (those who sought their very first licensure to teach) program. Respondents (school district personnel) were asked to rate each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Strongly Disagree*, *Disagree*, *Agree*, and *Strongly Agree* (1-4).

		Mean Score
1	Possess the subject-matter knowledge needed.	3.125
2	Plan and organize meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn.	3.000
3	Create conducive environments for student learning.	3.250
4	Facilitate and monitor student learning.	3.125
5	Reflect on their practice.	3.000
6	Collaborate with colleagues.	3.125
7	Work with parents.	2.875
8	Possess the general knowledge needed.	3.250
9	Demonstrate the dispositions expected of a teacher.	3.375

- B. The table below provides a summary of the data from the Follow-Up Study Re: Graduates of The Ohio State University **Advanced Teacher Preparation** (those who returned for additional preparation after receiving their first certificate/license to teach) program. Respondents (school district personnel) were asked to rate each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Strongly Disagree*, *Disagree*, *Agree*, and *Strongly Agree* (1-4).

		Mean Score
1	Possess the subject-matter knowledge needed.	3.375
2	Plan and organize meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn.	3.375
3	Understand the relationship between subject-matter and content specific pedagogy.	3.250
4	Select and use a broad range of instructional strategies to promote student learning.	3.250
5	Synthesize research and policies that impact their work.	2.875
6	Analyze student, classroom and school performance data.	3.000
7	Make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning.	3.000
8	Possess the general knowledge needed.	3.250
9	Possess the dispositions expected of a teacher.	3.250

- C. The table below provides a summary of the data from the Follow-Up Study Re: Graduates of The Ohio State University **Other Professional Roles Preparation** (those who returned for licensure as a school administrator, school counselor, school psychologist, and/or school speech-language pathologist-audiologist) program. Respondents (school district personnel) were asked to rate each item using a Likert-type scale with the following options: *Strongly Disagree*, *Disagree*, *Agree*, and *Strongly Agree* (1-4).

		Mean Score
1	Possess the knowledge needed regarding their field of work.	3.375
2	Know their students, families and communities.	3.250
3	Use data and current research to inform practice.	3.125
4	Use technology in their practice.	3.125
5	Support student learning through their professional services.	3.125
6	Create positive learning environments for student learning.	3.125
7	Understand and build upon the developmental levels of students.	3.125
8	Understand the policy contexts within which they work.	3.250
9	Possess the general knowledge needed.	3.250
10	Possess the dispositions expected of a professional in the school role in which they serve.	3.500