Program Report for the Initial Preparation of Physical Education Teachers
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance/National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE)

These standards can be used for program reports submitted through Spring 2010 (2/1/10). Beginning in Fall 2010 all programs must use the 2008 standards. NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

Grambling State University

2. State

Louisiana

3. Date submitted

MM   DD   YYYY

02 / 24 / 2010

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Dr. Phyllis A. Love

Phone: Ext.

(318) 274 - 2294

E-mail:

love@gram.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Dr. Patricia Johnson

Phone: Ext.

(318) 274 - 2251

E-mail:

johnsonp@gram.edu

6. Name of institution's program

Physical Education All-Levels

7. NCATE Category

Physical Education-First Teaching License

8. Grade levels[1] for which candidates are being prepared

Physical Education K-12

---

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

9. Program Type

- ◌ Advanced Teaching
- ◌ First teaching license
- ◌ Other School Personnel
- ◌ Unspecified

10. Degree or award level

- ◌ Baccalaureate
- ◌ Post Baccalaureate
- ◌ Master's
- ◌ Post Master's
- ◌ Specialist or C.A.S.
- ◌ Doctorate
- ◌ Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?

- ◌ Yes
- ◌ No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

Physical Education All-Levels

14. Program report status:

- ◌ Initial Review
- ◌ Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required, Recognition with Probation, or Not Nationally Recognized
- ◌ Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:
NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

j͏n Yes

j͏n No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of AAHPERD/NASPE standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

[ ]

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

[ ]

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

[ ]

4. Description of the relationship [2] of the program to the unit's conceptual framework. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

[ ]

(2): The response should describe the program's conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit's conceptual framework.

5. Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system[3]. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

[ ]

(3) This response should clarify how the key accessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

6. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

7. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

8. Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program:		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers[4]
2008-2009	6	3
2007-2008	11	4
2006-2007	10	3

(4) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

9. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	Howard Willis
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	MS Health, PE, & Recreation MS Sport Administration, Grambling State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Faculty member in the Kinesiology, Sport, and Leisure Studies Department
Faculty Rank[7]	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	☑ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1. Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Member, Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD), 3. Member, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD)
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	1. Seven years of teaching experience 2. Certified in K-12 HPE 3. Supervisor of Kinesiology Student Teachers

Faculty Member Name	Kathy Bayne*
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	MS Health and Physical Education, Louisiana Tech University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Adjunct, Cooperating Teacher
Faculty Rank[7]	Instructor
Tenure Track	☑ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and	1. Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and

Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Member, Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD) 3. Member, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD)
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	1. Thirty two years of HPE teaching experience (K-12) 2. Certified HPE teacher 3. Supervisor of Kinesiology Student Teachers

Faculty Member Name	Phyllis A. Love
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	Ph.D. Exercise Physiology/Biomechanics, Texas Woman's University; M.Ed. in Health and Physical Education, Northeast University; BS in HPE, Northwestern State University, LA
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Coordinator of Kinesiology
Faculty Rank[7]	Professor
Tenure Track	☒ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1. Past-President and Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Member, Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD) 3. Member, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) 4. Member, Louisiana State Physical Education Standards Committee
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	1. Six years of teaching experience 2. Certifications: K-12 HPE 3. Supervisor of Kinesiology student teachers

Faculty Member Name	Willie Daniel
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	Ed.D. in Educational Administration, University of Colorado, Boulder; MS in Health and Physical Education, Jackson State University; BS in HPER, Grambling State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Head, Department of Kinesiology, Sport, and Leisure Studies
Faculty Rank[7]	Professor
Tenure Track	☒ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1. Past-President and Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Member, Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD) 3. Member, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) 4. Vice President of SDAAHPERD
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	1. High school teaching experience (spring 1971) 2. Grant –The National Youth Sports Program (hired certified public school teachers)

Faculty Member Name	Mamie Hammock*
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	MS in Sport Administration, Grambling State University; BS in Health and Physical Education, Louisiana Tech University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Adjunct

Faculty Rank[7]	Instructor
Tenure Track	∈ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1. Vice-President and Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD); Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD); and American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) 2. LAHPERD Middle School Teacher of the Year 3. Louisiana State Physical Education Stands Committee 4. Member, LA Department of Education Committee for GLEs for Physical Education
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	1. Thirty one years of teaching experience 2. Certified Physical Education teacher 3. Supervisor of Kinesiology Student Teachers

Faculty Member Name	Aaron Livingston*
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	Ph.D. in Sport Administration, University of New Mexico; MS in Sport Administration, Grambling State University; BS in Health and Physical Education, Mississippi Valley State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Faculty
Faculty Rank[7]	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	b YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1.Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Member, Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD) 3. Member, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD)
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	

Faculty Member Name	Mertrude Douglas
Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	+30 post Masters Administration M.S. Health and Physical Education, Louisiana Tech University; BS Health and Physical Education, Grambling College
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Faculty
Faculty Rank[7]	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	∈ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1. Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Louisiana Association of African Americans in Higher Education
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	Two years secondary physical education; Instructor in Physical Education, Director of Intramurals, Director of Multicultural Affairs, Louisiana Tech University

Faculty Member Name	Obadiah Simmons, Jr.

Highest Degree, Field, & University[5]	Ph.D., Educational Administration (Higher Education), Texas A%M University; M.A.T., Physical education, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; BS, Secondary Education (Health, Physical Education and Safety), Grambling State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[6]	Faculty
Faculty Rank[7]	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	☑ YES
Scholarship[8], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[9]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[10]	1. Member, Louisiana Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (LAHPERD) 2. Member, Southern District of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD) 3. Member, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) 4. Chair, Research (General Division) LAHPERD
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[11]	

(5) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.
(6) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator
(7) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor
(8) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.
   Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.
(9) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.
(10) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.
(11) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

1. In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the AAHPERD/NASPE standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program. (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment [12]	Type or Form of Assessment [13]	When the Assessment Is Administered [14]
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	PRAXIS II – Physical Education Content Examination (0091)	Licensure Examination	Prior to Graduation
Assessment #2: Content knowledge in physical education (required)	Departmental Level Examinations		

		Level I – Sophomore Examination Level II – Junior Examination Level III – Senior Comprehensive Examination	Level I – upon completion of 200 level Kinesiology Classes Level II – upon completion of 300 level Kinesiology Classes Level III – upon completion of 400 level Kinesiology Classes
Assessment #3: Candidate ability to plan instruction (required)	Teacher Candidate Intern Evaluation – Planning Section	Student Teaching Evaluation Form Planning Section	Education 455 During Student Teaching
Assessment #4: Internship or clinical experiences (required)	Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation	Student Teacher Evaluation Form Management/Instruction/Professional Development Section	Education 455 During Student Teaching
Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student learning (required)	Impact on Student Learning	Student Teacher Impact on Student Learning	Education 455 During Student Teaching
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards (required)	Professional Teaching Portfolio	Student Teaching Portfolio	Education 455 During Student Teaching
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards (optional)	Technology Infused Lesson Plan	Instructional Technology Lesson Plan	Education 402 During Instructional Technology Integration Course
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards (optional)	Teacher Candidate Intern Evaluation (Physical Education)	SPA Specific (NASPE) Teacher Candidate Addendum	Education 455 At the end of Student Teaching

(12) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.
(13) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).
(14) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

1. For each AAHPERD/NASPE standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple AAHPERD/NASPE standards.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1. Content Knowledge. Physical education teachers understand physical education content and disciplinary concepts related to the development of a physically educated person.	b	b	e	e	e	b	e	b
2. Growth and Development. Physical education teachers understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development.	b	b	e	e	e	b	e	b
3. Diverse Students. Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning, and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.	e	e	e	b	e	b	e	b
4. Management and Motivation. Physical education teachers use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.	e	e	e	b	e	b	e	b
5. Communication. Physical education teachers use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to enhance learning and engagement in physical activity settings.	e	e	e	b	e	b	e	b
6. Planning and Instruction. Physical education teachers plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals, based on state and national (NASPE K-12) standards.	e	e	b	b	e	b	b	b
7. Student Assessment. Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of students in physical activity.	e	e	b	b	b	b	e	b
8. Reflection. Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on others (e.g., students, parents/guardians, fellow professionals), and seek opportunities to grow professionally.	e	e	e	b	e	b	e	b
9. Technology. Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.	e	e	e	b	e	b	b	b
10. Collaboration. Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students' growth and well being.	e	e	e	b	e	b	e	b

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Assessments and scoring guides should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards.

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE's unit standard 1:
- Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)

- Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
- Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare a document that includes the following items: a two page narrative that responds to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 (below) and the three items listed in question 5 (below). This document should be attached as directed.

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
3. A brief analysis of the data findings;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording; and
5. Attachment of assessment documentation, including:
(a) the assessment tool or description of the assignment;
(b) the scoring guide for the assessment; and
(c) candidate data derived from the assessment.

It is preferred that the response for each of 5a, 5b, and 5c (above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

All three components of the assessment (as identified in 5a-c) must be attached, with the following exceptions: (a) the assessment tool and scoring guide are not required for reporting state licensure data, and (b) for some assessments, data may not yet be available.

1. State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. AAHPERD/NASPE standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standard 1. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Assessment Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 1 - PRAXIS II Licensure Exam

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. Assessment of content knowledge in the field of physical education. AAHPERD/NASPE standards addressed in this assessment could include but are not limited to Standard 1. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, GPAs or grades,[15] and portfolio tasks.[16] (Assessment Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 2 - Departmental Level Exams

See **Attachments** panel below.

---

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom instruction. AAHPERD/NASPE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard 6. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans. (Assessment Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 3 - Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation - Planning Section

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice.[17] This assessment would be applicable to all AAHPERD/NASPE standards. The assessment instrument used in the internship or other clinical experiences should be submitted. (Assessment Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 4 - Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation - Management/Instruction/Professional Development Section

See **Attachments** panel below.

---

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning and the creation of supportive learning environments for student learning. AAHPERD/NASPE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 7 and 8. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Assessment Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 5 - Impact on Student Learning

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies. (Assessment Required)

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 6 - Professional Teaching Portfolio

See **Attachments** panel below.

7. Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 7 - Technology Infused Lesson Plan

See **Attachments** panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information (items 1-5) as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Assessment 8 - Teacher Candidate Evaluation - NASPE Specific Teacher Candidate Addendum

See **Attachments** panel below.

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

1. Content Knowledge
Reflecting on the assessment's results dealing with Content Knowledge, faculty are realigning course requirements in classes that address movement forms to assess an understanding of learning and development. The lower level courses have been reassigned from a faculty member with a Masters

degree to a faculty member with a terminal degree. This faculty member is collaborating with the faculty teaching the upper division courses. The textbooks used in these courses have also been updated. Exam questions have been more aligned with types of questions used with the PRAXIS and the Departmental Level Exams.

Faculty agree that the optional course KNES 349 – Accountability in Kinesiology has had a positive effect on student's content knowledge. The course will not only continue to provide self-testing opportunities for students prior to taking the PRAXIS exam, but faculty who teach the class are evaluating specific elements that are 'approaching acceptable or acceptable' on the PRAXIS exam scores to determine not only what the specific student needs are to improve, but in what classes in the program need to serve the students better.

With a more in depth analysis of data from the Departmental Level Exams, faculty have noted specific classes that need to re-evaluate either the content and/or the approach to teaching to especially reach the freshman and sophomore students. This will have a positive effect on the retention of pedagogy majors. Faculty are collaborating regarding analyzing the student's test results prior to retakes. Faculty are now providing students with direction regarding learning how to read test questions and evaluate possible answers. Class test questions are being restructured to resemble those of the Departmental Level Exams and faculty reviewing "why" the students may have missed certain questions.

A weak point noted by faculty within the department is a need for better understanding by those teaching techniques and methods courses of what is exactly needed for the teacher candidate portfolio. To enhance the program and the student's ability to develop a professional portfolio, Kinesiology faculty are collaborating with Curriculum and Instruction faculty prior to the seminar and student teaching experiences.

Departmental student teacher supervisor(s) have noted during the analysis of data that Kinesiology/Pedagogy teacher candidates perform at acceptable levels. Even with these findings, the difficulty in using only the COE Teacher Candidate Evaluation form has been discussed over time with the College Supervisor of Student Teachers. Kinesiology faculty have suggested changes to reflect the SPA specific areas. In response to the Reviewer's comments and these discussions, a SPA Specific (NASPE) Teacher Candidate Addendum has been constructed using the NASPE 2001 Rubric of Standards/Indicators (to be updated with newer standards). This will give the faculty a better understanding of the standards that the teacher candidate is meeting during student teaching. Faculty in methods courses are now utilizing the addendum to prepare candidates for the student teaching experience.

2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions
A weak point noted by faculty is the teacher candidate's ability to create appropriate instruction for a diverse group. To enhance the program the course involving adapted physical education has been redesigned to address the needs of pedagogy majors. In addition, faculty are collaborating in planning for expected outcomes in the methods and adapted physical education classes. Also the Department is requiring a designated number of observation hours in an adapted physical education class.

The analysis of data with respect to instruction showed the faculty that teacher candidates, although many were meeting the target level, most would benefit from more opportunities to actually teach a variety of age groups. In order to accomplish this, the methods classes will be offered at the Lab schools (elementary, middle, and high school) on campus.

3. Student learning
After viewing the analysis of data regarding impact on student learning during student teaching, Kinesiology faculty decided that teacher candidates should experience this earlier. Therefore the methods faculty and the measurement and evaluation faculty will collaboratively incorporate a mini version of the impact on student learning assignment beginning in the Fall, 2010.

   1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4 (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

In response to conditions the following changes and/or additions have been made:

Candidate Information - Revised information for Academic Years to reflect data span for years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. The number of candidates enrolled in the program refers to teacher candidates who have been accepted into the Degree Program and who are matriculating through the Pedagogy Curriculum.

Faculty Information - * indicates faculty members who are no longer employed in the department but who were employerd during the reporting period.

Faculty Information - Revised Faculty Information Chart to reflect current faculty responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, and administration of program.

MODIFICATIONS TO ASSESSMENTS (SECTION II)
(1) Revised the names under the type or form of Assessment 2 to be more specific.
(2) Revised Assessment 3 to be more specific by using the Planning Section of the Teacher Candidate Intern Evaluation form.
(3) Revised Assessment 5 to reflect the Impact on Student Learning project completed by all candidates during student teaching.
(4) Moved Oral Presentation of Portfolio from Assessment 8 to Assessment 6 and combined with Written Portfolio Assessment (to replace Field Experience Student Evaluation).
(5) Removed Assessment 7 – Departmental Dispositions and replaced with Technology Infused Lesson Plan.
(6) Added SPA Specific (NASPE) Teacher Candidate Evaluation Addendum as Assessment 8.

MODIFICATIONS TO RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENTS TO STANDARDS (SECTION III)
(1) Revisions were made, in response to the reviewers' comments, to identify the NASPE Standards that were truly aligned with each assessment.

EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS (SECTION IV)
(1) A revised Assessment 1-PRAXIS II – Physical Education Content Examination (0091) includes a table aligning the NASPE standards with the PRAXIS Content Knowledge elements, a summary chart of data findings, and a table comparing the teacher candidate's performance to the other examinees across the nation who took the same form of the test at the same national administration or comparable time period. By revising in response to comments from reviewers a clearer determination of the NASPE Standards that are truly aligned with the PRAXIS Content Exam are shown.
(2) A revised Assessment 2 – Departmental Level Examinations in response to comments from reviewers include: eliminating questions that were repeated, eliminating questions that were from other concentrations, a clear alignment of Level Exams questions with required courses, a clear alignment of Level Exam questions with NASPE Standards, performance of candidates on exam questions by aligning them with specific NASPE standard indicators, and the analysis of data to show how candidates performed on each Level Exam by standard. These adjustments have resulted in clearer determination of the NASPE Standards that are truly aligned with the Level Exams.

(3) A revision of Assessment 3 to the Teacher Candidate Intern Evaluation – Planning Section was in response to the reviewer's comments regarding eliminating co-mingled student assessment among multiple NASPE Standards. The Planning Section of the Teacher Candidate Intern Evaluation form was examined separately using a larger sample of teacher candidates resulting in a much clearer determination of which NASPE Standards were aligned with the Planning Section. Addition of the NASPE standards to the form shows an alignment with the components of the Domain I-Planning. There is also an addition of a data table showing all elements of the domain with respect to teacher candidate scores.

(4) The revision of Assessment 4 – Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation includes the addition of the NASPE standards that specifically align with the particular element included on the Teacher Candidate Evaluation form and the addition of a Teacher Candidate Evaluation Data Table. Only three sections (Management, Instruction, and Professional Development) were used in this assessment. In response to comments from reviewers, a SPA Specific (NASPE) Teacher Candidate Evaluation has been added as Assessment 8.

(7) The revision of Assessment 5 resulted in a change to the Impact on Student Learning and the use of a larger sample for data analysis. A description of the assignment, a scoring rubric with NASPE Standard indicators, and a data analysis table have been added.

(8) The revision of Assessment 6 – Professional Teaching Portfolio includes moving the oral presentation of the Portfolio from Assessment 8 to Assessment 6 and combining the evaluation with the written portfolio. The description of the assignment, a scoring rubric with NASPE Standard indicators, and a data analysis table is included.

(9) A new Optional Assessment 7 – Technology Infused Lesson Plan was added. This replaced the original Assessment 7- Departmental Dispositions in response to reviewer's comments. A new description, alignment, summary, and interpretations section has been added. A description of the technology infused lesson plan assignment, two rubrics (reflecting updating of rubric) with NASPE Standard indicators and two data analysis tables are included.

(10) An addition of Assessment 8 Teacher Candidate Intern Evaluation (Physical Education), the SPA Specific (NASPE) Teacher Candidate Addendum, was in accordance with the recommendation of the reviewers. The description, alignment, summary, and interpretation section has been added along with the rubric (based on the 2001 NASPE Standards/Rubrics) and data analysis tables that will be used.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Preparation of Educational Leaders
School Building Level

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Grambling State University, LA

Date of Review

MM	DD	YYYY
02	01	2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- ☐ Initial Review
- ☐ Revised Report
- ☐ Response to Conditions Report

Program(s) Covered by this Review

Educational Leadership-Principal

Program Type

Other School Personnel

Award or Degree Level(s)

- ☐ Master's
- ☐ Post Master's
- ☐ Specialist or C.A.S.
- ☐ Doctorate
- ☐ Endorsement only

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):

- ☐ Nationally recognized
- ☐ Nationally recognized with conditions
- ☐ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

j⬚ Yes

j⬚ No

j⬚ Not applicable

j⬚ Not able to determine

Comment:

Candidates in the program are required to take the SLLA exam which is aligned to the ELCC standards; however, the report states: "Data for this assessment is not available at this time. The first cohort will not complete the program until Summer 2009." Therefore, it is not possible to determine if there is an 80% pass rate on the state licensure exam. Candidates who achieve a score of 168 are determined to have achieved proficiency in the competency areas assessed by the SLLA examination for school building level leaders as determined by the Educational Testing Service and the state of Louisiana.

Summary of Strengths:

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community.

1.1 Develop a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j⬚	j⬚	j⬚

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

1.2 Articulate a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j⬚	j⬚	j⬚

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

1.3 Implement a School Vision of Learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j⬚	j⬚	j⬚

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

1.4 Steward a School Vision of Learning.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

j   j   j

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

1.5 Promote Community Involvement in School Vision.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

j   j   j

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

Standard 2.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

2.1 Promote a Positive School Culture.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

j   j   j

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

2.2 Provide Effective Instructional Program.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

j   j   j

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

2.3 Apply Best Practice to Student Learning.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

j   j   j

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

2.4 Design Comprehensive Professional Growth Plans.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

j   j   j

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

Standard 3.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

3.1 Manage the Organization.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ᶨn   ᶨn   ᶨn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

3.2 Manage the Operations.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ᶨn   ᶨn   ᶨn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

3.3 Manage the Resources.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ᶨn   ᶨn   ᶨn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

Standard 4.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

4.1 Collaborate with Families and Other Community Members.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ᶨn   ᶨn   ᶨn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

4.2 Respond to Community Interests and Needs.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ᶨn   ᶨn   ᶨn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

4.3 Mobilize Community Resources.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

Standard 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

5.1 Acts with Integrity.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

5.2 Acts Fairly.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

5.3 Acts Ethically.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

6.1 Understand the Larger Educational Context.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

6.2 Respond to the Larger Educational Context.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

6.3 Influence the Larger Educational Context.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.1, C.2, and C.3 of this report.

Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

7.1 Substantial.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

7.2 Sustained.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

7.3 Standards-based.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

See comments in Part C.2 of this report.

7.4 Real Settings.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j̇n	j̇n	j̇n

Comment:

[   ]

7.5 Planned and Guided Cooperatively.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j̇n	j̇n	j̇n

Comment:

[   ]

7.6 Credit.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j̇n	j̇n	j̇n

Comment:

[   ]

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidate knowledge of content

Assessment #2: The Course Grades assessment is vague and not clearly aligned to any specific standard elements. The course descriptions are vague and are aligned loosely to the ELCC standards as a whole (e.g., 1.0, 2.0, 3.0) rather than specific standard elements (e.g., 1.1 versus 1.3 versus 2.4). For instance, EDLD 501 is tied to ELCC standards 2.0, 5.0, and 6.0 - the course description states: "Provides candidates with fundamental concepts of American school law and its application to real school settings." For this assessment to provide evidence of meeting standards, the program would have to provide more specific course descriptions of activities, lectures, readings, etc. that have specific alignment to concepts found within the standard elements in 2.0, 5.0, and 6.0. Thus, the concern stated in the last report still stands:"To use grades as evidence, the program report must describe how the content that candidates have studied aligns with ELCC Standards, and to what level of proficiency in those standards the grades represent."

In Assessment #6, the Capstone Project II Problems and Issues in Education assessment, candidates are required to engage in a research project focusing on accurately using, interpreting, and communicating assessment results to stakeholders. Successful educational leaders must be capable of identifying, clarifying and addressing obstacles to student learning and to effectively and accurately communicate best practices in instruction and assessment. The instructions for completing the assignment (part 5A) is missing. In addition, the scoring rubric is missing (part 5B) from the report. A data chart (part 5C) is presented but it is not structured to show specific data on candidate proficiency on any single standard element. Instead groups of subelements have been combined, and data are presented separately - but do not relate to any single standard element. This is the same problem as was found in the report. The previous report from ELCC stated: "This assessment does not have a scoring rubric that is designed to measure candidate proficiency on specific tasks. Rubrics are not properly aligned, and group standard elements and subelements. Rubric criteria are not specific enough and do not utilize the language of

ELCC Standards. The assessment is not broad enough. As described, it only covers several standard sub-elements, therefore, it is not demonstrated that candidates are being assessed on the depth and scope of any particular standard element. Also, the associated rubric groups elements and sub-elements together in one criterion making it impossible to determine candidate mastery of an entire element."

C.2. Candidate ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

While an assessment description (5A) has been provided for Assessment #3, the Vision Assessment, outlining the assignment and cross-referenced to specific standard sub-elements, the assessment only covers a few sub-elements (e.g., 1.2b, or 1.3a, or 1.4a) - and lacks depth and scope to assess any particular standard element in its entirety (e.g., 1.2, 1.3, or 1.4). A data chart is given, but the scoring rubric is missing from the report.

Assessment #4: The intent of the Internship assessment is to provide candidates opportunities to engage in substantial, sustained, standards-based real life intern activities that are planned and guided cooperatively by university faculty and school district personnel and to reflect on administrative practice for appropriately adjusting their skills in order to optimize the learning environment for all stakeholders. The Internship evaluation form which outlines specific skills that are aligned to specific ELCC standard elements is not aligned to the scoring rubric data table. A scoring rubric is missing from the report - it is unclear if candidates will engage in the skills outlined on the evaluation form as these are different skills from those listed in the suggested activities outline given to the internship mentor, and are different from the items listed on the data table. The evaluation form asks mentors to check "Outstanding" or "Needing Attention," while the scoring rubric data table is categorized by "Target," "Acceptable," "Unacceptable." Which is the right form used to evaluate candidate skill competencies and what are the criteria definition for judging each of these categories? How does that align to the competencies outlined in the ELCC standard elements?

Assessment #7: The instructions to candidates for completing the assessment is missing from this report (part 5A). For this assessment, a "PowerPoint presentation of site visits/field experiences" was assessed. The activities that the candidates performed while conducting site visits are embedded in additional standard subelements (i.e., 5.1a; 5.2a; 6.1c; 6.1f; 6.1h; 6.2a and 6.2c) and are also assessed when presenting the Electronic Portfolio PowerPoint presentation, but no instructions are given for completing the activity nor are the expectations set for completing this assessment activity. The standard elements are listed in a generic rubric but it is not clear what the rubric is intended to evaluate. What is the performance being evaluated? What are the observable differences in expectation between "Target", "Acceptable", and "Unacceptable" categories?

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessment #5, a survey-based assessment, states: "Please mark the rating that best reflects your evaluation of GSU's Educational Leadership Program." It is not clear how the use of this survey to evaluate the program will adequately measure program candidates' abilities as leaders to support P-12 student learning. This is an assessment of the program, not an assessment of candidates' leadership skills - as perceived by program graduates or by others.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

It is impossible at this time to apply assessment results to program improvement, as the scoring rubrics and assessment descriptions are missing from several assessments.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

More work is needed to design assessment activities and scoring rubrics that are designed to measure candidate competency on specific standard elements (e.g., 1.2, 2.3). Essential parts of the report are missing (parts 5A, 5B) from the assessments. Faculty are strongly encouraged to visit the NCATE webinars on rubric development and contact the ELCC Coordinator for assessment design questions.

The program needs to link ALL assessments and activities, ALL rubics, and ALL data tables (instead of just "Data Summaries"), to ELCC Standards elements.

The program needs to broaden its assessments to ensure that standard elements are being assessed (e.g. 1.2, 1.3) and not one or just a few sub-elements (e.g., 4.2 a).

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

j◌ The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Terms and Subsequent Actions

j◌ **Further Development Required**: The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **one more opportunity** to submit a revised report addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The deadline for this report is cited below. After this date, NCATE will not accept a revised report. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Mar. 15 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

Comment on decision:

Although the program has exhausted its opportunity to submit another revised report according to the terms indicated in Part G of the previous national recognition report, NCATE and ELCC have agreed to extend the timeframe in order to give the program additional time and opportunity to address remaining

concerns. A second and final revised report may be submitted no later than September 15, 2010.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of Early Childhood Education Teachers

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Association for the Education for Young Children (NAEYC).

Cover Page

Name of Institution

Grambling State University, LA

Date of Review

MM   DD   YYYY

02 / 01 / 2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- ◯ Initial Review
- ◯ Revised Report
- ◯ Response to Conditions Report

Program covered by this Review

Early Childhood PK-3

Program Type

- ◯ First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

- ◯ Baccalaureate
- ◯ Post Baccalaureate
- ◯ Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):

- ◯ Nationally recognized
- ◯ Nationally recognized with conditions
- ◯ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

jn Yes

jn No

jn Not applicable

jn Not able to determine

Comment:

Determined in previous review to be not applicable.

Summary of Strengths:

The program has made some notable improvements in providing evidence consistent with the standards.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Promoting Child Development and Learning. Candidates use their understanding of young children's characteristics and needs, and of multiple interacting influences on children's development and learning, to create environments that are healthy, respectful, supportive, and challenging for all children.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program lists the following assessments as meeting this standard:

Assessment 1, Praxis II: Early Childhood Education, provides some evidence of the standard; however, the data from this assessment do not indicate that candidates (three total over two years) achieved competence in the standard.

Assessment 2, grades in required early childhood courses, consisted of a chart showing course prefixes, course titles, alignment with the NAEYC standards, and percentage of candidates in each course meeting the minimum expectations. The information provided shows alignment with the standard for 10 of the 11 courses, and candidate data indicate that 100 percent of the candidates meet the minimum expectations. There was no advising sheet, description of the course, or copy of the institution's grade policy or definitions for grades attached for the reviewers to determine the level of performance.

Assessment 3, written lesson plan, is a two-part assessment. The first part is a submission of a lesson plan written by the candidate, and the second part involves the on-site execution of the lesson plan during the student teaching experience. The program report indicates that there is an alignment with Standard 1 and the written lesson plan portion of the assessment. The scoring rubrics indicate that the candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of individual children's needs and characteristics and create appropriate learning environments. Data reported that the candidates scores are satisfactory and above.

Assessment 4, student teacher evaluations for candidates, occur three to five times during the student teaching experience. The assessment provides evidence of the standard, and candidates' performance is documented in the acceptable to excellent range.

Assessment 6, the early childhood thematic unit plan, is a new assessment that indicates alignment with the standard and will potentially provide evidence for the standard; however, no candidate data are reported for this new assessment.

Assessment 7, the technology-infused lesson plan, is an assessment that requires candidates to plan and design a technology-infused lesson plan in early childhood education. The scoring rubric indicated that there was a scoring item aligned with the standard.

Assessment 8, the early childhood lesson plan assessment, requires candidates to plan and implement a lesson that is developmentally and age appropriate. The scoring rubric provides evidence that candidates create healthy and supportive environments for young children; however, candidate performance for the one year of data reported indicated that candidates were not competent for the standard.

Together, three assessments (Assessments 3, 4, and 7) provide the strongest evidence that the standard is met.

Standard 2. Building Family and Community Relationships. Candidates know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children's families and communities. They use this understanding to create respectful, reciprocal relationships that support and empower families, and to involve all families in their children's development and learning.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

   jn   jn   jn

Comment:

The program lists the following assessments as meeting this standard:

Assessment 1, Praxis II: Early Childhood Education, was indicated in the NAEYC standard chart, but no description was provided of how this assessment supplies evidence of the standard.

Assessment 2, grades in required early childhood courses, consisted of a chart showing course prefixes, course titles, alignment with the NAEYC standards, and percentage of candidates in each course meeting the minimum expectations. The information provided shows alignment with the standard for two of the 11 courses, and candidate data indicate that 100 percent of the candidates meet the minimum expectations. There was no course description available for the ED300 course, and the reviewers were not able to determine an alignment with this course; however, an alignment with ED317 was noted. There was no institution policy or definitions of grades attached for the reviewers to determine the level of performance.

Assessment 4, student teacher evaluations, was indicated on the NAEYC standards chart as an assessment providing evidence for Standard 2. The reviewers found an item on the teacher candidate/intern evaluation form (VI2) that had a direct alignment but could not find data showing that this assessment provided evidence that candidates are competent in building family and community relationships.

Assessment 6, the early childhood thematic unit plan, is a new assessment that indicates alignment with the standard and will potentially provide evidence for the standard; however, no candidate data are reported for this new assessment.

The scoring rubric for Assessment 8, the early childhood lesson plan, provides some evidence that candidates involve parents/families in the learning process; however, the candidate performance data

indicated that candidates did not achieve competence in the standard.

In the evidence provided for this standard the reviewers found only minimal alignment and documentation of competence that candidates know about, understand, and value the importance and complex characteristics of children's families and communities.

Standard 3. Observing, Documenting, and Assessing to Support Young Children and Families. Candidates know about and understand the goals, benefits, and uses of assessment. They know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies in a responsible way, in partnership with families and other professionals, to positively influence children's development and learning.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

The program lists the following assessments as meeting this standard:

Assessment 1, Praxis II: Early Childhood Education, provides some evidence of the standard; however, the data from this assessment do not indicate that candidates (three total over two years) achieved competence in the standard.

Assessment 2, grades in required early childhood courses, consisted of a chart showing course prefixes, course titles, alignment with the NAEYC standards, and percentage of candidates in each course meeting the minimum expectations. The information provided shows alignment with the standard for six of the 11 courses, and candidate data indicate that 100 percent of the candidates meet the minimum expectations. There was no advising sheet, description of some courses, or copy of the institution's grade policy or definitions for grades attached for the reviewers to determine the level of performance.

Assessment 3, written lesson plan: The program report indicates that there is an alignment with the standard for the assessment. The scoring rubric indicates that the candidates must know about and use their knowledge of assessments. Data provided show that candidates scores are satisfactory and above.

Assessment 4, student teacher evaluations, were indicated as providing evidence for Standard 3. Items on the teacher candidate/intern evaluation form were directly aligned, and data provide evidence that candidates know about and use systematic observations, documentation, and other effective assessment strategies.

Assessment 5, impact on student learning, requires candidates to plan and teach a complete unit and calculate their impact on student learning in their assigned classroom. A scoring rubric shows alignment of the assessment items (assessment design, data analysis, and interpretation/reflection) to the standard. Data discussed but not presented in a chart form indicate that of the five candidates who have completed this assessment, all scored either acceptable or target (the highest possible score).

Assessment 7, the technology-infused lesson plan, requires candidates to plan and design a technology-infused lesson plan in early childhood education. The scoring rubric indicated that there was a scoring item (assessment strategies) aligned with the standard that allowed candidates to develop and describe multiple assessments, including pre-assessments, an authentic assessment, and an innovative assessment. This assessment provided some evidence of the standard, and candidate performance data indicated that candidates know and understand how to use assessments.

The scoring rubric for Assessment 8, the early childhood lesson plan, provides some evidence of alignment with the standard; however, the candidate performance data indicated that candidates had not achieved competence in the standard.

Standard 4. Teaching and Learning. Candidates integrate their understanding of and relationships with children and families; their understanding of developmentally effective approaches to teaching and learning; and their knowledge of academic disciplines to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that promote positive development and learning for all children.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

The program lists the following assessments as meeting this standard:

Assessment 1, Praxis II: Early Childhood Education, provides some evidence of the standard; however, the data from this assessment do not indicate that candidates (three total over two years) achieved competence in the standard.

Assessment 2, grades in required early childhood courses, shows alignment with the standard for eight of the 11 courses, and candidate data report that 100 percent of the candidates meet the minimum expectations. There was no advising sheet, description of the course, or copy of the institution's grade policy or definitions for grades attached for the reviewers to determine the level of performance.

Assessment 3, written lesson plan: The program report indicates that there is an alignment with the standard for this assessment. The scoring rubric and data presented show that candidates' scores are satisfactory and above.

Assessment 4, student teacher evaluations, was indicated as providing evidence for Standard 4. Items on the teacher candidate/intern evaluation form were directly aligned, and data provide evidence of the standard.

Assessment 5, impact on student learning requires candidates to plan and teach a complete unit and calculate their impact on student learning in their assigned classroom. A scoring rubric shows alignment of the assessment items (data analysis and interpretation/reflection) to the standard. Data discussed but not presented in a chart form indicate that of the five candidates who have completed this assessment, all scored either acceptable or target (the highest possible score).

Assessment 6, the early childhood thematic unit plan, is a new assessment that indicates alignment with the standard and will potentially provide evidence for the standard; however, no candidate data are reported for this new assessment.

The scoring rubric for Assessment 7, the technology-infused lesson plan, indicated that there was a scoring item (instructional strategies) aligned with the standard that allowed candidates to use instructional strategies to incorporate technological resources that are age and developmentally appropriate. This assessment provided some evidence of the standard, and candidate performance data indicated that candidates know and understand how to use assessments.

The scoring rubric for Assessment 8, the early childhood lesson plan, provides some evidence of alignment with the standard; however, the candidate performance data indicated that candidates had not achieved competence in the standard.

Standard 5. Becoming a Professional. Candidates identify and conduct themselves as members of the early childhood profession. They know and use ethical guidelines and other professional standards related to early childhood practice. They are continuous, collaborative learners who demonstrate knowledgeable, reflective, and critical perspectives on their work, making informed decisions that integrate knowledge from a variety of sources. They are informed advocates for sound educational practices and policies.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The program lists the following assessments as meeting this standard:

Assessment 1, Praxis II: Early Childhood Education, provides some evidence of the standard; however, the data from this assessment do not indicate that candidates (three total over two years) achieved competence in the standard.

Assessment 2, grades in required early childhood courses, shows alignment with the standard for eight of the 11 courses, and candidate data report that 100 percent of the candidates meet the minimum expectations. There was no advising sheet, description of the course, or copy of the institution's grade policy or definitions for grades attached for the reviewers to determine the level of performance.

Assessment 4, student teacher evaluations, were indicated as providing evidence for Standard 5. Items on the teacher candidate/intern evaluation form were directly aligned, and data provide evidence of the standard.

Assessment 6, the early childhood thematic unit plan, is a new assessment that indicates alignment with the standard and will potentially provide evidence for the standard; however, no candidate data are reported for this new assessment.

The scoring rubric for Assessment 8, the early childhood lesson plan, provides some evidence of alignment with the standard; however, the candidate performance data indicated that candidates had not achieved competence in the standard.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessments 1 and 2 potentially provide evidence of candidates' knowledge of content, although data from Assessment 1 do not reflect strong candidate performance.

C.2. Candidates's ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Assessments 3 and 4 provide evidence of candidates' application of professional knowledge and skills.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessments 5 and 6 potentially provide evidence of candidates' effect on student learning; however, the lack of data or a complete description of the assessment make it difficult to determine specific elements

of competence.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The revised report notes that changes in the program have been made due to analysis of assessment data. One example is the sequence of courses taught to better prepare candidates for the Praxis exam. The program reports that through review of course content and monitoring candidates' classroom performances and general demeanor, the program is able to determine if candidates are making reasonable progress within the first two years and identifying deficits early on.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

None.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

Only two faculty members were listed, neither of whom were tenure-track faculty and neither of whom held doctoral-level degrees in early childhood education or a related field.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None.

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

jn Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM   DD   YYYY

02 / 01 / 2012

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 3/15/10, 9/15/10, 3/15/11, or 9/15/11. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 3/15/11 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM	DD	YYYY
09	15	2011

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

Strengthen the alignment of the assessments to the NAEYC standards and key elements addressed and attach a copy of the new/revised assessment.
Provide additional documentation to show candidate competency in relation to the standards.
Attach descriptions of all courses and the institutional grading policy if using course grades for an assessment. See NAEYC/NCATE guidelines for using grades.
Provide data for Assessment 6 for all standards to which this assessment applies.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of Social Studies Teachers

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS).

<div style="background-color:#c5c5f5;">

COVER PAGE

</div>

Name of Institution

Grambling State University

Date of Review

MM	DD	YYYY
02	01	2010

This report is in response to a(n):

ʝ Initial Review

ʝ Revised Report

ʝ Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Social Studies Education

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

ʝ Baccalaureate

ʝ Post Baccalaureate

ʝ Master's

<div style="background-color:#c5c5f5;">

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

</div>

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):

ʝ Nationally recognized

ʝ Nationally recognized with conditions

ʝ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

ʝ Yes

- ◉ No
- ◉ Not applicable
- ◉ Not able to determine

Comment:

Because there have been fewer than 10 completers in the previous three years, NCATE guidelines indicate that the 80 percent requirement does not apply. However, the program will need to provide an additional measure of the strength of candidates' knowledge to support the course grade data expected for Assessment 2.

Summary of Strengths:

Grambling faculty have successfully provided resources for the program.

Faculty have been willing to revise assessments and to better address NCSS expectations for program content and alignment of assessments with NCSS standards.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

THEMES

Standard 1.1. Culture and Cultural Diversity. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of culture and cultural diversity.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
◉	◉	◉

Comment:

Candidates are exposed to content relevant to this standard.

Assessment 1: Praxis II data do not allow reviewers to understand the strength of candidates' performance in this content area.

Assessment 2: Course grades for an anthropology course indicate adquate candidate performance.

See Part C for further discussion of the assessments.

Standard 1.2. Time, Continuity, and Change. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of time, continuity, and change.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
◉	◉	◉

Comment:

Candidates are exposed to content relevant to this standard.

Assessment 1: Praxis II data do not allow reviewers to understand the strength of candidates' performance in this content area.

Assessment 2: Course grades in content courses relevant to this standard indicate strong candidate performance.

See Part C for further discussion of the assessments.

Standard 1.3. People, Places, and Environment. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of people, places, and environment.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

Same as 1.2.

Standard 1.4. Individual Development and Identity. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of individual development and identity.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

It is not clear that candidates are exposed to content relevant to this standard.

Standard 1.5. Individuals, Groups and Institutions. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of individuals, groups, and institutions.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

ʝn   ʝn   ʝn

Comment:

Candidates are exposed to content relevant to this standard.

Assessment 1: Praxis II data do not allow reviewers to understand the strength of candidates' performance in this content area.

Assessment 2: Course grades in content courses relevant to this standard indicate satisfactory performance.

See Part C for further discussion of the assessments.

Standard 1.6. Power, Authority, and Governance. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of power, authority and governance.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ

Comment:

Candidates are exposed to content relevant to this standard.

Assessment 1: Praxis II data do not allow reviewers to understand the strength of candidates' performance in this content area.

Assessment 2: Course grades in content courses relevant to this standard indicate satisfactory performance.

See Part C for further discussion of the assessments.

Standard 1.7. Production, Distribution, and Consumption. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and disposition to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ

Comment:

Candidates are exposed to content relevant to this standard.

Assessment 1: Praxis II data do not allow reviewers to understand the strength of candidates' performance in this content area.

Assessment 2: Course grades in content courses relevant to this standard indicate strong candidate performance.

See Part C for further discussion of the assessments.

Standard 1.8. Science, Technology and Society. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of science, technology and society.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ

Comment:

It is not clear that this standard is addressed in this program.

Standard 1.9. Global Connections. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of global connections and interdependence.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ	j͏ᴖ

Comment:

Same as 1.8.

Standard 1.10. Civic Ideals and Practices. Candidates in social studies should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of civic ideals and practices.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
ʝ	ʝ	ʝ

Comment:

Same as 1.6.

2.0 SOCIAL SCIENCE DISCIPLINES

Standard 2.1. History. Candidates who are to be licensed to teach history at all school levels should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of history.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met	Not Applicable
ʝ	ʝ	ʝ	ʝ

Comment:

Standard 2.2. Geography. Candidates who are to be licensed to teach geography at all school levels should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of geography.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met	Not Applicable
ʝ	ʝ	ʝ	ʝ

Comment:

Standard 2.3. Civics and Government. Candidates who are to be licensed to teach civics and/or government at all school levels should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of civics and government.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met	Not Applicable
ʝ	ʝ	ʝ	ʝ

Comment:

Standard 2.4. Economics. Candidates who are to be licensed to teach economics at all school levels should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of economics.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met	Not Applicable

jn   jn   jn   jn

Comment:

[ ]

Standard 2.5. Psychology. Candidates who are to be licensed to teach psychology at all school levels should possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the study of psychology.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met   Not Applicable

jn   jn   jn   jn

Comment:

[ ]

3.0 PROGRAMMATIC STANDARDS FOR INITIAL LICENSURE

Standard 3.1. Course or Courses on Teaching Social Studies. Institutions preparing social studies teachers should provide and require prospective social studies teachers to complete a course or courses dealing specifically with the nature of the social studies and with ideas, strategies, and techniques for teaching social studies at the appropriate licensure level.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

A course that would meet this standard was listed on the program of study, but there is no evidence the course is offered. NCSS would like assurance that the course is offered and that candidates must complete the course as a program requirement.

Standard 3.2. Qualified Social Studies Faculty. Institutions preparing social studies teachers should provide faculty in the social studies and social studies education components of the program who are recognized as (a) exemplary teachers, (b) scholars in the fields of social studies and social studies education, and (c) informed about middle and secondary school classrooms and teaching.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

There seems to be significant faculty turnover. It is not clear whether the program/social studies methods course is directed/taught by a social studies specialist, and it is also not clear who supervises field experiences including student teaching. NCSS expects faculty in those roles to have appropriate credentials in social studies or in one of the related disciplines. While there are faculty members who possess appropriate credentials, there is no indication that they are involved in the program. The report indicates that the institution is planning to hire a social studies education specialist to direct the program. NCSS would like assurance that faculty who are involved in the program possess appropriate credentials and that cooperating teachers for student teaching and other field experiences are highly qualified social

studies teachers.

No additional information regarding faculty qualifications and responsibilities was provided in this submission.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content.

Assessment 1, Praxis II exam: Since there were only five candidates reported as taking the Praxis II exam during the previous three years, it was difficult for faculty to utilize the data for program review and improvement. Without an indication of the overall scores of candidates and of an indication of how many met the state minimum acceptable score, it is difficult for reviewers to determine the pass rate. The data provided with this submission appear to be the same as that provided in the 2008 submission. Unless there were no additional completers, the data provided are insufficient to utilize to determine the strength of candidates' knowledge.

Assessment 2: A data table of aggregated candidate grades indicates satisfactory performance in content courses relevant to NCSS Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.10.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Assessment 3 provides adequate data to indicate that candidates can plan for teaching social studies content.

Assessment 4: Limited data from student teaching seem to indicate that candidates have been successful in the secondary classroom. One candidate was reported as having been assessed using the new social studies addendum to the standard form.

Assessment 6 is a generic teaching portfolio. While it might be a tool to collect candidate data indicating candidate strengths in teaching, it appears to be insufficient as a means of indicating candidates' strengths in teaching social studies. It might be possible (with additional directions) to direct social studies candidates to utlize parts of the assessment as a means of collecting social studies-specific data in areas not directly addressed in the current assessment plan.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning.

It is not clear that Assessment 5 is aligned with NCSS standards (even though it is stated that it is). This is a new assessment, and no social studies candidates have yet been assessed through it. It will be helpful to submit data from social studies candidates when they are available.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Faculty have revised some assessments since the previous submission.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

While it is difficult to maintain a small program, faculty seem to be aware of the need to provide a quality program. Making changes to some assessments would assist them in determining the strengths and areas in need of improvement for social studies candidates.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

None

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None

PART G - DECISIONS

Decision

jn   Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM	DD	YYYY
02	01	2012

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 3/15/10, 9/15/10, 3/15/11, or 9/15/11. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 3/15/11 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM   DD   YYYY

09 / 15 / 2011

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

1. Either the program should provide additional and more detailed data and analysis concerning candidate performance in the content areas represented in the Praxis II exam, or the program should complete an additional assessment of the strength of candidates' knowledge relevant to NCSS standards in addition to the existing assessment utilizing course grades in the current Assessment 2.

2. The program should indicate how NCSS Standards 1.4, 1.8, and 1.9 are addressed and provide candidate data accordingly.

3. The program should provide clear answers to questions raised regarding NCSS Standard 3.2 that address staffing and maintenance of the program.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of English Language Arts Teachers

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Grambling State University, LA

Date of Review

MM   DD   YYYY

02 / 01 / 2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- ⓘ Initial Review
- ⓘ Revised Report
- ⓘ Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

English Education

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level(s)

- ⓘ Baccalaureate
- ⓘ Post Baccalaureate
- ⓘ Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):

- ⓘ Nationally recognized
- ⓘ Nationally recognized with conditions
- ⓘ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- ⓘ Yes

jn No

jn Not applicable

jn Not able to determine

Comment:

Summary of Strengths:

Field experiences seem well planned. The program has done a good job of attempting to address the issues raised in the initial report. The institution is very invested in addressing issues and concerns, and has made great progress in self-analysis.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Candidates follow a specific curriculum and are expected to meet appropriate performance assessments for preservice English language arts teachers.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

There is a specific curriculum and there are minimum grades based on the university grading system. The explanation of what these grades mean remain unclear. Although there is a range of performance assessments, the data sets are very small and the analyses somewhat confusing.

Standard Category 2. Through modeling, advisement, instruction, field experiences, assessment of performance, and involvement in professional organizations, candidates adopt and strengthen professional attitudes needed by English language arts teachers.

Standard 2.1. Candidates create an inclusive and supportive learning environment in which all students can engage in learning.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 2.2. Candidates use ELA to help their students become familiar with their own and others' cultures.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 2.3. Candidates demonstrate reflective practice, involvement in professional organizations,

and collaboration with both faculty and other candidates.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

☐   ☐   ☐

Comment:

None.

Standard 2.4. Candidates use practices designed to assist students in developing habits of critical thinking and judgment.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

☐   ☐   ☐

Comment:

None.

Standard 2.5. Candidates make meaningful connections between the ELA curriculum and developments in culture, society, and education.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

☐   ☐   ☐

Comment:

Culture, society, and education connections are not explicitly addressed and measured in any of the assessments. There are general allusions to related topics but nothing specific is written and there is generic language found in Assessment #3. This standard cannot be met by PRAXIS II, a standardized examination that contains no reference to the focus of this standard.

Standard 2.6. Candidates engage their students in activities that demonstrate the role of arts and humanities in learning.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

☐   ☐   ☐

Comment:

There are general allusions to related topics but nothing specific is written and there is generic language found in Assessment #4.

Standard Category 3. Candidates are knowledgeable about language; literature; oral, visual, and written literacy; print and nonprint media; technology; and research theory and findings.

Standard 3.1. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of, and skills in the use of, the English language.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

☐   ☐   ☐

Comment:

This is addressed in both coursework and in lesson planning and student teaching assessment.

Standard 3.2. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the practices of oral, visual, and written literacy.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

There are general allusions to related topics but nothing specific is written and there is generic language found in in Assessment #3. There may be more evidence in Assessment #2 if the courses cited are described more thoroughly.

Standard 3.3. Candidates demonstrate their knowledge of reading processes.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

None of the assessments cited for this Standard are aligned in the Section III chart, although there are possibilities within the literature coursework if the descriptions are expanded to include approaches to various literary genres, which are usually part of these courses.

Standard 3.4. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of different composing processes.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

There are general allusions to related topics but nothing specific is written and there is generic language found in Assessment #3. There may be more evidence in Assessment #2 if the courses related to rhetoric and composition are described more thoroughly.

Standard 3.5. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of, and uses for, an extensive range of literature.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

The program does not reference the relevant assessments in Section III. Assessment #2 seems to provide the majority of evidence of content knowledge required by this standard with Assessments #3 and #4 surveying a narrow demonstration of that knowledge.

Standard 3.6. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the range and influence of print and nonprint media and technology in contemporary culture.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 3.7. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of research theory and findings in English language arts.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Assessment #2, which includes the methods course, is not relevant to this standard; the course description is generic and incorporates both elementary and secondary methodology. The majority of the evidence should come from Assessments #3 and #5 if the rubrics for those assessments are expanded to include research-based rationales for the lessons required.

Standard Category 4. Candidates acquire and demonstrate the dispositions and skills needed to integrate knowledge of English language arts, students, and teaching.

Standard 4.1. Candidates examine and select resources for instruction such as textbooks, other print materials, videos, films, records, and software, appropriate for supporting the teaching of English language arts.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Assessed in instructional delivery; student teaching evaluation.

Standard 4.2. Candidates align curriculum goals and teaching strategies with the organization of classroom environments and learning experiences to promote whole-class, small-group, and individual work.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 4.3. Candidates integrate interdisciplinary teaching strategies and materials into the teaching and learning process for students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Not explicitly addressed in any of the assessments cited. This could be easily inserted into one of the content pedagogy assessments with language specific to the use of teaching strategies and materials that cross the boundaries of the discipline.

Standard 4.4. Candidates create and sustain learning environments that promote respect for, and support of, individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender, and ability.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

Needs to be more broadly assessed, not simply in instructional delivery but also in instructional planning.

Standard 4.5. Candidates engage students often in meaningful discussions for the purposes of interpreting and evaluating ideas presented through oral, written, and/or visual forms.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 4.6. Candidates engage students in critical analysis of different media and communications technologies.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 4.7. Candidates engage students in learning experiences that consistently emphasize varied uses and purposes for language in communication.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 4.8. Candidates engage students in making meaning of texts through personal response.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

None.

Standard 4.9. Candidates demonstrate that their students can select appropriate reading strategies that permit access to, and understanding of, a wide range of print and nonprint texts.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The assessments do not directly address reading strategies in any way.

Standard 4.10. Candidates integrate assessment consistently into instruction by using a variety of formal and informal assessment activities and instruments to evaluate processes and products, and creating regular opportunities to use a variety of ways to interpret and report assessment methods and results to students, parents, administrators, and other audiences.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

The new alignment is a step in the right direction, but showing how candidates "consistently" integrate a variety of forms of assessment activities needs to be more explicit.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessment 1 - PRAXIS. See comments in conditions statement and test results sections.

Assessment #2, which is supposed to give information regarding how grades are used to assess content knowledge, is somewhat difficult to follow. The narrative states that the university grading system is used and the catalog is cited, but no copy is provided. Reviewers believe that the notations seem to be average grades based on an A being 4.0, it is not explicitly stated. While 100% of candidates meet minimum expectations, it must be surmised that grades of C(-) are acceptable--this is not clear. Standard 4.8, which can only be met in a teaching situation, is wrongly cited in this assessment.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Assessment #3 is much improved. The rubric still has places that lack consistency in language about what is expected, but overall it contains much more specific categories and better-defined standards. This is seen in the evaluations of the student instructional delivery; candidates are given a practice in which they present the lesson plan and then revise before delivering in front of students. More reflection is needed by the candidates, but this is a step in the right direction. Additional data are required.

Assessment #4 is also much improved. Student teaching supervision, though, may be impacted if the supervisor is not an English education professional. Data from at least one application of the assessment are required.

Assessment #6 - This assessments does not seem to have been implemented. There are no data. The rubric is not aligned with the cited NCTE standards.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessment #5 needs to have language that more explicitly addresses the standards in Category 2 and some elements of Category 4. The assignment could be expanded to incorporate standards not completely met by Assessment #4. No data are provided; data from at least one application of the assessment are required.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The program is to be commended for using this report as an assessment tool to improve the English Education candidates' performance. Improvement in the rubrics is noted. Until all the assessments are implemented and there are data supporting them, it is not possible to see that assessment results are being used in the appropriate manner.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

The Methods of Teaching class is described as providing "elementary and secondary level basic teaching methodology." It is not clearly explained why elementary methods would be covered in a 6-12 Secondary program. Many of the standards that could be covered by assignments (assessments) within this course are either covered in a cursory fashion or not at all. See comments in Parts C.2 and C.3.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

None.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None.

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

j̇ṅ Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM   DD   YYYY

02 / 01 / 2012

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 3/15/10, 9/15/10, 3/15/11, or 9/15/11. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 3/15/11 submission date noted above. However, the*

program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM	DD	YYYY
09	15	2011

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

1. Expand Assessment #2 to include a fuller description of the courses listed.
2. Resubmit Section III - Some standards do not have assessments marked as providing evidence although a review of the assessments shows that there is evidence, e.g. Standard 3.3 - no assessments; 3.5 - should include Assessments #1, #2). The program needs to ensure that the alignment in Section III matches the assessments, scoring guides and data tables submitted in Section IV.
3. Provide at least one application of data for Assessments #3-6. Present the data as required, disaggregated by standards cited.
4. Expand Assessments #3 and #4 to provide sufficient data for pedagogical Standards 4.3 and 4.9, which are not yet met.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of Mathematics Education Teachers at the Secondary Level

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM).

COVER PAGE

Name of institution

Grambling State University, LA

Date of review

MM	DD	YYYY
02	01	2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- ○ Initial Review
- ○ Revised Report
- ○ Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Secondary Mathematics

Program Type

First Teaching License

Award or Degree Level

- ○ Baccalaureate
- ○ Post Baccalaureate
- ○ Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):

- ○ Nationally recognized
- ○ Nationally recognized with conditions
- ○ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)
The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

jn Yes

jn No

jn Not applicable

jn Not able to determine

Comment:

Summary of Strengths:

There is improvement from the previous submission.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Knowledge of Problem Solving. Candidates know, understand and apply the process of mathematical problem solving.

Indicators:

1.1 Apply and adapt a variety of appropriate strategies to solve problems.

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

1.2 Solve problems that arise in mathematics and those involving mathematics in other contexts

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

1.3 Build new mathematical knowledge through problem solving.

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

1.4 Monitor and reflect on the process of mathematical problem solving.

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

Standard 1 comments:

Standard 2. Knowledge of Reasoning and Proof. Candidates reason, construct, and evaluate mathematical arguments and develop an appreciation for mathematical rigor and inquiry.

Indicators:

2.1 Recognize reasoning and proof as fundamentals aspects of mathematics.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

2.2 Make and investigate mathematical conjectures

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

2.3 Develop and evaluate mathematical arguments and proofs.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

2.4 Select and use various types of reasoning and methods of proof.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 2 comments:

Standard 3. Knowledge of Mathematical Communication. Candidates communicate their mathematical thinking orally and in writing to peers, faculty and others.

Indicators:

3.1 Communicate their mathematical thinking coherently and clearly to peers, faculty, and others.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

3.2 Use the language of mathematics to express ideas precisely.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

3.3 Organize mathematical thinking through communication

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

3.4 Analyze and evaluate the mathematical thinking and strategies of others.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 3 comments:

Standard 4. Knowledge of Mathematical Connections. Candidates recognize, use, and make

connections between and among mathematical ideas and in contexts outside mathematics to build mathematical understanding.

Indicators:
4.1 Recognize and use connections among mathematical ideas.

Met   Not Met

j̓n   j̓n

4.2 Recognize and apply mathematics in contexts outside of mathematics.

Met   Not Met

j̓n   j̓n

4.3 Demonstrate how mathematical ideas interconnect and build on one another to produce a coherent whole.

Met   Not Met

j̓n   j̓n

Standard 4 comments:

_____

Standard 5. Knowledge of Mathematical Representation. Candidates use varied representations of mathematical ideas to support and deepen students' mathematical understanding.

Indicators:

5.1 Use representations to model and interpret physical, social, and mathematical phenomena.

Met   Not Met

j̓n   j̓n

5.2 Create and use representations to organize, record, and communicate mathematical ideas

Met   Not Met

j̓n   j̓n

5.3 Select, apply, and translate among mathematical representations to solve problems

Met   Not Met

j̓n   j̓n

Standard 5 comments:

_____

Standard 6. Knowledge of Technology. Candidates embrace technology as an essential tool for teaching and learning mathematics.

Indicators:

6.1 Use knowledge of mathematics to select and use appropriate technological tools, such as but not limited to, spreadsheets, dynamic graphing tools, computer algebra systems, dynamic statistical packages, graphing calculators, data-collection devices, and presentation software.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 6 comments:

In Assessment 3 mathematical technology is expected to be used on "numerical activities." This narrow focus does not meet the intent of Standard 6. The other assessments do have the potential to document this standard if the assesments could be specific to the indicator. A variety of technologies are needed to meet this indicator.

Standard 7. Dispositions. Candidates support a positive disposition toward mathematical processes and mathematical learning.

Indicators:

7.1 Attention to equity

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

7.2 Use of stimulating curricula

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

7.3 Effective teaching

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

7.4 Commitment to learning with understanding

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

7.5 Use of various assessments

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

7.6 Use of various teaching tools including technology

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 7 comments:

It is unclear how 7.6 is met.

Standard 8. Knowledge of Mathematics Pedagogy. Candidates possess a deep understanding of how students learn mathematics and of the pedagogical knowledge specific to mathematics teaching and learning.

Indicators:

8.1 Select, use, and determine suitability of the wide variety of available mathematics curricula and teaching materials for all students, including those with special needs such as the gifted, challenged and speakers of other languages.

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.2 Select and use appropriate concrete materials for learning mathematics.

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.3 Use multiple strategies, including listening to and understanding the ways students think about mathematics, to assess students' mathematical knowledge.

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.4 Plan lessons, units and courses that address appropriate learning goals, including those that address local, state, and national mathematics standards and legislative mandates.

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.5 Participate in professional mathematics organizations and uses their print and on-line resources.

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.6 Demonstrate knowledge of research results in the teaching and learning of mathematics

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.7 Use knowledge of different types of instructional strategies in planning mathematics lessons.

Met   Not Met

ʝ◌   ʝ◌

8.8 Demonstrate the ability to lead classes in mathematical problem solving and in developing in-depth conceptual understanding, and help students develop and test generalizations

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

8.9 Develop lessons that use technology's potential for building understanding of mathematical concepts and developing important mathematical ideas.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

Standard 8 comments:

Although some of the indicators are met, it would help to provide more detail on what is expected for each indicator beyond the checklist indicating in an evaluator's opinion it is completed.

Standard 9. Knowledge of Number and Operations. Candidates demonstrate computational proficiency, including a conceptual understanding of numbers, ways of representing number, relationships among number and number systems, and meanings of operations.

Indicators:

9.1 Analyze and explain the mathematics that underlies the procedures used for operations invloving integers, rational, real and complex numbers.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

9.2 Use properties involving number and operations, mental computation, and computational estimation.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

9.3 Provide equivalent representations of fractions, decimals, and percents.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

9.4 Create, solve, and apply proportions.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

9.5 Apply the fundamental ideas of number theory.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

9.6 Makes sense of large and small numbers and number systems.

Met　　　　　　　　　　　　Not Met

j　　　　　　　　　　　　　j

9.7 Compare and contrast properties of numbers and number systems.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

9.8 Represent, use and apply complex numbers.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

9.9 Recognize matrices and vectors as systems that have some of the properties of the real number system.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

9.10 Demonstrate knowledge of the historical development of numbers and number systems including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

Standard 9 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 10. Knowledge of Different Perspectives on Algebra. Candidates emphasize relationships among quantities including functions, ways of representing mathematical relationships, and the analysis of change.

Indicators:

10.1 Analyze patterns, relations, and functions of one and two variables.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

10.2 Apply fundamental ideas of linear algebra.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

10.3 Apply the major concepts of abstract algebra to justify algebraic operations and formally analyze algebraic structures.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

10.4 Use mathematical models to represent and understand quantitative relationships.

Met   Not Met

j^n   j^n

10.5 Use technological tools to explore algebraic ideas and representations of information and in solving problems.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

10.6 Demonstrate knowledge of the historical development of algebra including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

Standard 10 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 11. Knowledge of Geometries. Candidates use spatial visualization and geometric modeling to explore and analyze geometric shapes, structures, and their properties.

Indicators:

11.1 Demonstrate knowledge of core concepts and principles of Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry in two- and three-dimensions from both formal and informal perspectives.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

11.2 Exhibit knowledge of the role of axiomatic systems and proof in geometry.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

11.3 Analyze characteristics and relationships of geometric shapes and structures.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

11.4 Build and manipulate representations of two- and three-dimensional objects and visual objects from different perspectives.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

11.5 Specify locations and describe spatial relationships using coordinate geometry, vectors and other representational systems.

Met   Not Met

ʝ   ʝ

11.6 Apply transformation and use symmetry, similarity, and congruence to analyze mathematical situations.

Met   Not Met

11.7 Use concrete models, drawings, and dynamic geometric software to explore geometric ideas and their applications in real-world contexts.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

11.8 Demonstrate knowledge of the historical development of Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometries including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 11 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 12. Knowledge of Calculus. Candidates demonstrate a conceptual understanding of limit, continuity, differentiation, and integration and a thorough background in techniques and application of calculus.

Indicators:

12.1 Demonstrate a conceptual understanding of and procedural facility with basic calculus concepts.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

12.2 Apply concepts of function, geometry, and trionometry in solving problems involoving calculus.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

12.3 Use the concepts of calculus and mathematical modleing to represent and solve problems taken from real-world context.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

12.4 Use technological tools to explore and represent fundamental concepts of calculus.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

12.5 Demonstrate knowledge of the historical development of calculus including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 12 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 13. Knowledge of Discrete Mathematics. Candidates apply the fundamental ideas of discrete mathematics in the formulation and solution of problems.

Indicators:

13.1 Demonstrate knowledge of basic elements of discrete mathematics such as graph theory, recurrence relations, finite difference approaches, linear programming, and combinatronics.

Met   Not Met

j⌐   j⌐

13.2 Apply the fundamental ideas of discrete mathematics in the formulation and solution of problems arising from real-world situations.

Met   Not Met

j⌐   j⌐

13.3 Use technological tools to solve problems involving the use of discrete structures and application of algorithms.

Met   Not Met

j⌐   j⌐

13.4 Demonstrate knowledge of the historical develpment of discrete mathematics including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

j⌐   j⌐

Standard 13 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 14. Knowledge of Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of concepts and practices related to data analysis, statistics, and probability.

Indicators:

14.1 Design investigations, collect data, and use a variety of ways to display the data and interpret data representations that may include bivariate data, conditional probability and geometric probability.

Met   Not Met

j⌐   j⌐

14.2 Use appropriate methods such as random sampling or random assignment of treatments to estimate population characteristics, test conjectured relationships among variables, and analyze data.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

14.3 Use appropriate statistical methods and technological tools to describe shape and analyze spread and center.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

14.4 Use statistical inference to draw conclusions from data.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

14.5 Identify misuses of statistics and invalid conclusions from probability

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

14.6 Draw conclusions involving uncertainty by using hands-on and computer-based simulation for estimating probabilities and gathering data to make inferences and conclusions.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

14.7 Determine and interpret confidence intervals.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

14.8 Demonstrates knowledge of the historical development of probability and statistics including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

Standard 14 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 15. Knowledge of Measurement. Candidates apply and use measurement tools.

Indicators:

15.1 Recognize the common representations and uses of measurement and choose tools and units for measuring.

Met   Not Met

jn   jn

15.2 Apply appropriate techniques, tools, and formulas to determine measurements and their

application in a variety of contexts.

Met   Not Met

j￩n   j￩n

15.3 Complete error analysis through determining the reliability of the numbers obtained from measures.

Met   Not Met

j￩n   j￩n

15.4 Demonstrate knowledge of the historical development of measurement and measurement systems including contributions from diverse cultures.

Met   Not Met

j￩n   j￩n

Standard 15 comments:

See comments in Part C.

Standard 16. Field-Based Experiences. Candidates complete field-based experiences in mathematics classrooms.

Indicators:

16.1 Engage in a sequence of planned opportunities prior to student teaching that includes observing and participating in both middle and secondary mathematics classrooms under the supervision of experienced and highly qualified teachers.

Met   Not Met

j￩n   j￩n

16.2 Experience full-time student teaching in secondary mathematics that is supervised by a highly qualified teacher and a university or college supervisor with secondary mathematics teaching experience.

Met   Not Met

j￩n   j￩n

16.3 Demonstrate the ability to increase students' knowledge of mathematics.

Met   Not Met

j￩n   j￩n

Standard 16 comments:

The assessments do not provide suffient information to demonstrate these two indicators are met.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

For Assessment 1, the program should use the alignment of Praxis II provided by NCTM. This

assessment claims that many more indicators are met than was determined by the NCTM/ETS panel.

On Assessment 2, when using grades to meet indicators the grade evidence must be accompanied by the institution's grade policy or definitions of grades. Limited data are provided for a few courses over two years, but no data are provided for any course for 2008-09. Please see the guidelines for using grades as an assessment that is available on the NCATE website (http://www.ncate.org/institutions/GuidelinesGrades.asp?ch=90).

Assessment 3 involves a unit plan. The content is not specific so it cannot meet any of the content knowledge indicators. It would be difficult to make one grade level appropriate lesson plan that meets 9.1-9.9; 10.1-10.4; 11.1 – 11.7; 12.1-12.4; 13.1-13.2; 14.1-14.7; 15.1; 15.3 as listed. While many of the points on the rubric for the lesson plan evaluation could have connections to some of the standards, that connection is not explicitly displayed. It is unclear how the selection of the topic and title meet indicators 5.2 and 7.3. Mathematical technology is expected to be used on 'numerical activities'. This narrow focus does not meet the intent of Standard 6.

Assessment 5 would have a variety of mathematical content, thus cannot be used to document the content knowledge indicators.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Assessment 4 is correlated directly to the standards. The report states it is given many times during the semester, but that data do not reveal how those different applications of the instrument is going to be reported.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

In Assessment 5, it is unclear what data are used to demonstrate candidate effects on student learning.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The authors of the report state how data will be used when more are provided to make interpretations.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

It would be beneficial to show what technologies are used and what is expected of the candidates. Statements on Assessment 4 match the indicators, but little is given to show how these indicators are being interpreted and applied.

Please note that in the fall of 2009, NCATE's Specialty Areas Studies Board approved a policy that will allow programs with very low enrollment numbers to be exempted from the national program review requirement, pending approval from the respective state agency. If this program wishes to consider that option in lieu of submitting a revised report, it should contact Dr. Margaret Crutchfield at NCATE (margie@ncate.org).

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

ᶜ The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Terms and Subsequent Actions

ᶜ **Further Development Required**: The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **one more opportunity** to submit a revised report addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The deadline for this report is cited below. After this date, NCATE will not accept a revised report. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Mar. 15 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

Comment on decision:

A second and final revised report must be submitted by Sept. 15, 2010. If a report is not submitted by that date, the program's status will revert to not recognized and any subsequent submission must be a new report.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT
Initial Preparation of Science Teachers

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Science Teachers Association.

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Grambling State University, LA

Date of Review

MM	DD	YYYY
02	01	2010

This report is in response to a(n):

- ⃝ Initial Review
- ⃝ Revised Report
- ⃝ Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Single Licensure: Biology, Chemistry, or Physics; Broadfield

Program Type

First teaching license

Award or Degree Level

- ⃝ Baccalaureate
- ⃝ Post Baccalaureate
- ⃝ Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA Decision on NCATE Recognition of the Program(s):

- ⃝ Nationally recognized
- ⃝ Nationally recognized with conditions
- ⃝ Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- ⃝ Yes

- ☐ No
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ Not able to determine

Comment:

No data about passing rates were provided.

Summary of Strengths:

The program has made significant improvements to its report. A more organized set of assessments is in place. Rubrics have been added to several assessments. A framework has been established from which to address the elements of the standards. Some indication is given that assessment results will be used to make program improvements.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. Content. Teachers of science understand and can articulate the knowledge and practices of contemporary science. They can interrelate and interpret important concepts, ideas, and applications in their fields of licensure; and can conduct scientific investigations. To show that they are prepared in content, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) understand and can successfully convey to students the major concepts, principles, theories, laws, and interrelationships of their fields of licensure and supporting fields as recommended by the National Science Teachers Association;
(b) understand and can successfully convey to students the unifying concepts of science delineated by the National Science Education Standards;
(c) understand and can successfully convey to students important personal and technological applications of science in their fields of licensure;
(d) understand research and can successfully design, conduct, report and evaluate investigations in science;
(e) understand and can successfully use mathematics to process and report data, and solve problems, in their field(s) of licensure.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
☐	☐	☐

Comment:

The data from the Praxis exam are not included in the report. The values in the summary table 4A are not defined. The report indicates that the institution has achieved an 80 percent pass rate, but the data are not provided.

Standards 1a, c, and e are not met by Assessment 2. A program of study was not included. The NSTA content analysis sheet is missing.

Evidence is provided that candidates understand the content portion of the standards (Assessments 1 and 2), but Assessments 3 and 5 do not provide evidence that candidates are able to use pedagogy (Assessment 3) to successfully convey to students (Assessment 5, impact on student learning) science-specific concepts.

Assessment 7 does not provide convincing evidence of candidates' ability to design, conduct, report on,

or evaluate investigations in science and use mathematics to process and report data, and solve problems in science as presented in the standard (d-e).

Assessment 8 provides evidence of candidates' ability to understand 1b and 1c. However, Standards 1d and e are not met by Assessment 8; the assessment is not aligned with these elements of the standard.

Standard 2. Nature of Science. Teachers of science engage students effectively in studies of the history, philosophy, and practice of science. They enable students to distinguish science from nonscience, understand the evolution and practice of science as a human endeavor, and critically analyze assertions made in the name of science. To show they are prepared to teach the nature of science, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) understand the historical and cultural development of science and the evolution of knowledge in their discipline;
(b) understand the philosophical tenets, assumptions, goals, and values that distinguish science from technology and from other ways of knowing the world;
(c) engage students successfully in studies of the nature of science including, when possible, the critical analysis of false or doubtful assertions made in the name of science.

Met	Met with Conditions		Not Met
jn	jn		jn

Comment:

The assessments used to provide evidence for this standard are not science specific; therefore, they cannot address candidates' knowledge of the nature of science (Assessment 8), use of pedagogy for the teaching of the nature of science (Assessment 3), or assess candidate's impact on students' knowledge of the nature of science (Assessment 5).

Assessment 8: The assessment used does not address the candidates' knowledge and understanding of the nature of science, Standard 2a. Generally, lesson plans demonstrate pedagogical knowledge but do not demonstrate background knowledge needed to understand the concepts.

Standard 3. Inquiry. Teachers of science engage students both in studies of various methods of scientific inquiry and in active learning through scientific inquiry. They encourage students, individually and collaboratively, to observe, ask questions, design inquiries, and collect and interpret data in order to develop concepts and relationships from empirical experiences. To show that they are prepared to teach through inquiry, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) understand the processes, tenets, and assumptions of multiple methods of inquiry leading to scientific knowledge;
(b) engage students successfully in developmentally appropriate inquiries that require them to develop concepts and relationships from their observations, data, and inferences in a scientific manner.

Met	Met with Conditions		Not Met
jn	jn		jn

Comment:

The assessments used to provide evidence for this standard are not science specific; therefore, they cannot address candidates' pedagogical knowledge of inquiry (Assessment 3), assess candidates' ability

to engage students successfully in developmentally appropriate inquiries (Assessment 5), or assess candidates' knowledge of inquiry (Assessment 8).

Assessment 8: The assessment used does not address the candidates' knowledge and understanding of inquiry.

Standard 4. Issues. Teachers of science recognize that informed citizens must be prepared to make decisions and take action on contemporary science- and technology-related issues of interest to the general society. They require students to conduct inquiries into the factual basis of such issues and to assess possible actions and outcomes based upon their goals and values. To show that they are prepared to engage students in studies of issues related to science, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) understand socially important issues related to science and technology in their field of licensure, as well as processes used to analyze and make decisions on such issues;
(b) engage students successfully in the analysis of problems, including considerations of risks, costs, and benefits of alternative solutions; relating these to the knowledge, goals and values of the students.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
jn	jn	jn

Comment:

The assessments used to provide evidence for this standard are not science specific; therefore, they cannot address candidates' knowledge and ability to understand socially important issues related to science and technology in their field of licensure. They also cannot address processes used to analyze and make decisions on such issues and engage students successfully in the analysis of problems, including considerations of risks, costs, and benefits of alternative solutions, relating these to the knowledge, goals, and values of the students.

Assessment 3 does not address the candidates' ability to develop lesson plans that address this standard, 4b.

Assessment 5 does not assess candidates' ability to engage students successfully in the analysis of problems and relate these to the knowledge, goals, and values of the students.

Assessment 8 does not address the candidates' knowledge and understanding of the issues, Standard 4a. Generally, lesson plans demonstrate pedagogical knowledge but do not demonstrate background knowledge needed to understand socially important issues related to science and technology in their field of licensure, as well as processes used to analyze and make decisions on such issues.

Standard 5. General Skills of Teaching. Teachers of science create a community of diverse learners who construct meaning from their science experiences and possess a disposition for further exploration and learning. They use, and can justify, a variety of classroom arrangements, groupings, actions, strategies, and methodologies. To show that they are prepared to create a community of diverse learners, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) vary their teaching actions, strategies, and methods to promote the development of multiple student skills and levels of understanding;
(b) successfully promote the learning of science by students with different abilities, needs, interests, and backgrounds;
(c) successfully organize and engage students in collaborative learning using different student group

learning strategies;
(d) successfully use technological tools, including but not limited to computer technology, to access resources, collect and process data, and facilitate the learning of science;
(e) understand and build effectively upon the prior beliefs, knowledge, experiences, and interests of students;
(f) create and maintain a psychologically and socially safe and supportive learning environment.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard 5 is met.

Standard 6. Curriculum. Teachers of science plan and implement an active, coherent, and effective curriculum that is consistent with the goals and recommendations of the National Science Education Standards. They begin with the end in mind and effectively incorporate contemporary practices and resources into their planning and teaching. To show that they are prepared to plan and implement an effective science curriculum, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) understand the curricular recommendations of the National Science Education Standards, and can identify, access, and/or create resources and activities for science education that are consistent with the standards;
(b) plan and implement internally consistent units of study that address the diverse goals of the National Science Education Standards and the needs and abilities of students.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Evidence is lacking that candidates understand the curricular recommendations of the National Science Education Standards or Louisiana State Standards and can plan to use resources and activities for science education that are consistent with the standards.

Standard 7. Science in the Community. Teachers of science relate their discipline to their local and regional communities, involving stakeholders and using the individual, institutional, and natural resources of the community in their teaching. They actively engage students in science-related studies or activities related to locally important issues. To show that they are prepared to relate science to the community, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) identify ways to relate science to the community, involve stakeholders, and use community resources to promote the learning of science;
(b) involve students successfully in activities that relate science to resources and stakeholders in the community or to the resolution of issues important to the community.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standard 7 is not met. The assessments used to provide evidence for this standard are not science

specific; therefore, they cannot address candidates' knowledge and ability to identify ways to relate science to the community, involve stakeholders, and use the resources to promote the learning of science, or candidates' ability to involve students successfully.

Assessment 3: Assessment 3 is generic and does not clearly address the science-specific goals or substance of Standard 7b.

Standard 8. Assessment. Teachers of science construct and use effective assessment strategies to determine the backgrounds and achievements of learners and facilitate their intellectual, social, and personal development. They assess students fairly and equitably, and require that students engage in ongoing self-assessment. To show that they are prepared to use assessment effectively, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) use multiple assessment tools and strategies to achieve important goals for instruction that are aligned with methods of instruction and the needs of students;
(b) use the results of multiple assessments to guide and modify instruction, the classroom environment, or the assessment process;
(c) use the results of assessments as vehicles for students to analyze their own learning, engaging students in reflective self-analysis of their own work.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Assessment 3 includes evidence that candidates have addressed most areas of the standard (8a and 8b). However, the assessment is weak in the use of results as vehicles for students to analyze their own work as presented in the standard (8c).

Standard 9. Safety and Welfare. Teachers of science organize safe and effective learning environments that promote the success of students and the welfare of all living things. They require and promote knowledge and respect for safety, and oversee the welfare of all living things used in the classroom or found in the field. To show that they are prepared, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) understand the legal and ethical responsibilities of science teachers for the welfare of their students, the proper treatment of animals, and the maintenance and disposal of materials.
(b) know and practice safe and proper techniques for the preparation, storage, dispensing, supervision, and disposal of all materials used in science instruction;
(c) know and follow emergency procedures, maintain safety equipment, and ensure safety procedures appropriate for the activities and the abilities of students;
(d) treat all living organisms used in the classroom or found in the field in a safe, humane, and ethical manner and respect legal restrictions on their collection, keeping, and use.

Met   Met with Conditions   Not Met

jn   jn   jn

Comment:

Standards 9a and d are not met by Assessment 2; the assessment is not aligned with these elements of

the standard. An overall grade point average for lecture and laboratory courses is not sufficient evidence for levels of proficiency in aspects of safety.

Standards 9a-d are partially met by Assessment 6. The assessment addresses only portions of the candidate's knowledge of the elements of the standard. Reviewers recommend that the rubric should address each element individually and completely and the rubric should contain observable criteria to distinguish levels of proficiency for the candidates. Three lines of a rubric are not sufficient to address this standard.

The current report does not include any information on the candidate's proficiency to demonstrate the elements of safety and welfare in practice. Reviewers recommend that Assessment 4, column "NSTA 9 Environment for Learning," would follow the current standards better if it were identified as "Safety and Welfare." That would provide an opportunity to align and assess this standard in a practical setting. The same is probably true for both Assessments 5 and 8, although the standard being used is not described in the alignment table for those assessment tools.

Reviewers note that a program must meet Standard 9a, b, and c in order to receive either national recognition or national recognition with conditions. Evidence must be shown in Assessment 4 and Assessment 6. Further information is available at the following URL: www.nsta.org/preservice .

Standard 10. Professional Growth. Teachers of science strive continuously to grow and change, personally and professionally, to meet the diverse needs of their students, school, community, and profession. They have a desire and disposition for growth and betterment. To show their disposition for growth, teachers of science must demonstrate that they:

(a) Engage actively and continuously in opportunities for professional learning and leadership that reach beyond minimum job requirements;
(b) reflect constantly upon their teaching and identify ways and means through which they may grow professionally;
(c) use information from students, supervisors, colleagues and others to improve their teaching and facilitate their professional growth;
(d) interact effectively with colleagues, parents, and students; mentor new colleagues; and foster positive relationships with the community.

Met	Met with Conditions	Not Met
☐	☐	☐

Comment:

Assessment 4 provides evidence that candidates have adequately addressed the standard.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

The program does not provide strong evidence for the candidates' content knowledge. The results of the Praxis II exam are not discussed in the Section IV narrative nor clearly presented in the referenced table. The candidate's program of study listing required science courses for the degree was not included. There were no criteria given for the science-course GPA assessment. The content analysis form to demonstrate broadfield preparation was not a part of the report. Rubrics for other assessments are missing science-specific content elements based on NSTA standards.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

This area is addressed, and some supporting evidence is provided. Assessment 3 is a single lesson plan, which does not meet the minimum cited in the report instructions: "A minimum indicator might include performance in the design of at least one major demonstration teaching unit (not a single lesson plan) …." Awareness of this was expressed in the narrative for Assessment 3, but no further details were provided about the transition from a single lesson to a unit plan. The rubric for this area would benefit from the integration of measurable criteria focused on science-specific criteria. The minimum required score for the elements of concern in the rubrics is set below "acceptable" for many assessments, which weakens this evidence. The teacher work sample is a powerful instrument for improving general teaching skills; however, it is not science specific. Science specific areas that have not been addressed include 1a, 2c, 3b, and 4c (science concepts and principles, nature of science, inquiry, and issues in science).

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessment 5 fulfills requirements of the construction and application of assessments. However, there is insufficient evidence for the elements of the content standards that relate to the candidate's proficiency to "engage students …" in science content, nature of science, inquiry and issues in science (1a, 2c, 3b, and 4b). The student teaching portfolio does not contain assurance of evidence of the candidate's effect on students' learning.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

No evidence was given that the program uses diverse sources of data as the basis for making changes in the program.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

None.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

The program is encouraged to refer to the NSTA website at www.nsta.org/preservice for additional information and to contact Erica Brownstein, the preservice accreditation coordinator, at ebrownst@capital.edu.

Reviewers strongly recommend that the following criteria be addressed in the next report:
1. Assessment 1: Reviewers recommend that the program include and discuss Praxis II data, define the information in the summary table, and provide evidence for the pass rate.
2. The content analysis form is required to be included and is available at www.nsta.org/preservice or www.ncate.org. Content GPA for science has not been included.
3. Evidence of planning in science has not been provided for nature of science (2c), issues in science (4b), and science in the local community (7b). This is generally Assessment 3. Reviewers recommend that the scoring guide explicitly evaluate the science standards, include criteria using operational terms,

have required
minimum levels of performance for all candidates, and provide data for each standard separately.
4. Evidence of safe practices during student teaching has not been provided. Assessment 4 contains criteria that encompass all of this NSTA standard. Reviewers recommend that the next scoring guide provide data so that subscores are disaggregated.
5. Evidence of student learning in science is required for science concepts and principles (Standards 1a, 2c, 3b, and 4b). This is generally Assessment 5. Reviewers recommend that the scoring guide explicitly evaluate the science standards, include criteria using operational terms, have required minimum levels of performance for all candidates, and provide data for each standard separately.
5) A safety-specific assessment that evaluates the knowledge a science teacher needs is required to be included. This is generally Assessment 6. The standards are 9a, 9b, 9c and 9d. Reviewers recommend that the scoring guide needs to explicitly evaluate the science standards, include criteria using operational terms, have required minimum levels of performance for all candidates, and provide data for each standard separately.

Reviewers note that to be eligible for "met with conditions," the program will need to address concerns on safety (Assessments 4 and 6). Science teaching is unique in handling and use of chemicals, instruments, and animals in school settings. The safety of students, pre-service teachers, and all individuals in the school setting is paramount. Safety includes legal and ethical responsibilities, maintenance and disposal of materials, understanding and following emergency procedures, and care and use of animals. Reviewers note that it is critical that programs provide performance assessments for all areas of safety that a science teacher needs to know.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None.

PART G -DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

ȷ The program does not currently satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. See below for details.

PROGRAM DOES NOT MEET SPA REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL RECOGNITION

Terms and Subsequent Actions

ȷ **Further Development Required**: The program does not satisfy SPA requirements for national recognition. The program has **one more opportunity** to submit a revised report addressing unmet standards and other concerns noted in the recognition report. The deadline for this report is cited below. After this date, NCATE will not accept a revised report. However, the institution may submit a new program report (rather than a revised report) addressing all standards, at either Mar. 15 or Sept. 15 of a calendar year (submission dates for new program reports). In states that require NCATE program review, another program report must be submitted before the next NCATE accreditation visit.

Comment on decision:

A second and final revised report must be submitted by Sept. 15, 2010. If a report is not submitted by that date, the program's status will revert to not recognized and any subsequent submission must be a new report.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.