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Introduction

As an institution that prepares teachers in the State of Nevada, the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) is required to conduct a follow-up survey of its previous year’s teacher education program completers and their principals/supervisors in accordance with NAC 391.560. This report conveys the results of the 2013-14 surveys.

Procedures

The College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno had 159 teacher education program completers between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014, making up the population for this survey. This year’s survey was conducted using an electronic survey instrument on e-tablets and iPads and was administered to fall 2013 and spring 2014 completers attending the annual Education Career Fair, April 2014. A total of 78 program completers responded to the survey, resulting in a response rate of approximately 49% of the total population. Since procedures were not conducted to determine if the non-respondents would have responded similarly to the respondents, one must be cautious about how the data in this report are interpreted. Results of this survey cannot be generalized to the entire population of 2013-14 UNR teacher education program completers.

The instruments used for this survey were developed by a statewide task force to assure uniformity in the data collected across all teacher education programs. An electronic survey instrument for principals/supervisors was also used this year. The survey was emailed to principals but only 9 responded; this response rate was similar to last year’s. Since many principals attend the annual Education Career Fair as recruiters and many of them are also employers of our program completers, the survey was administered with e-tablets and iPads to 36 of those principals. This, combined with the 9 email responses, netted a total of 45 responses were received from principals.

Findings

The findings of these follow-up surveys will be categorized by program completers and principals. The type of data collected was determined by the statewide task force that developed the survey instruments in order to have uniform reporting by all institutions preparing teachers in the state.

Data from Program Completers

Demographic data about the program completers were collected. Table 1 reports the number and percent of respondents by teacher education program. A total of 41.3% of the respondents were in the integrated elementary education teaching program (items 1-3 below), 46.2% were in the secondary education teaching program (items 4 and 7-9 below), and 24.4% were in the special education teaching program (items 1 and 9 below). Music is a P-12 teaching program that is
housed in the secondary program and one completer responded other (item 7 below). The responses in “other” categories included secondary majors with minors in ESL and special education (items 8 and 9 below).

**Table 1: Teacher education program of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My teacher education program prepared me for licensure in:</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  IETP + Special Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  IETP + ESL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  IETP + Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Secondary Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Early Childhood Education only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Elementary Education only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Other: Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Other: Secondary Education + ESL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Other: Secondary Education + Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program completers were asked to report the licenses that they held or anticipated holding. As noted in Table 2, 1.3% of the respondents held only an elementary education license while 51.3% held an elementary license plus a license or endorsement in special education, ESL, or early childhood; and 39.8% held a secondary license. All respondents held a substitute license.

**Table 2: Licensure held by respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I hold or anticipate holding the following license(s):</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Elementary Education + Special Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Elementary Education + ESL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Elementary Education + Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Secondary Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Special Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  No License</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Other: Elementary Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Other: Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other: Music Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 No response for items 1-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Substitute License</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reports the type of teacher education program in which the respondents were enrolled. Sixty five or 83.3% were enrolled in the regular undergraduate program, while 13 or 6.7% were enrolled in a program leading to a Master’s degree.

**Table 3: Type of teacher education program respondents completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My teacher education program was a:</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Regular undergraduate program</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  1st Time Licensure (Master’s)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 7 or 9% of the respondents were teaching full-time, while 48 or 61.5% were substituting as indicated in Table 4. Two respondents were teaching part-time and fifteen were not teaching in any capacity.

**Table 4: Employment situation of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your employment situation:</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Teaching full-time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Teaching part-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Substitute</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Employed outside of teaching</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Attending College/obtaining more education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  In the military on active dutyNot employed outside the homeemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  not employed outside the home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  not employed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty two or about 28.2% of the respondents were teaching in an elementary school (Table 5). Seven or 9% were teaching in a pre-school and 51.1% were teaching in a secondary, middle or high school. Item 3 (secondary) may have been construed by some respondents to mean both middle and high school. In addition to housing the K-12 music program, the secondary teaching program also houses the K-12 art program. Music and art account for the 6 or 7.7% teaching in elementary, middle and high school.

**Table 5: Teaching Level of respondents under contract**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate the level of your contract</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Pre-school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Elementary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Secondary (N adjusted:10 respondents also checked items 4 and 5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Middle School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  High School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Other: elementary, middle and high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if they were teaching in a Title I school. Table 6 reveals that 28.2% of the respondents answering this question were teaching in a Title I school and 70.5% were not. One respondent did not answer this question.

**Table 6: Number of respondents teaching in Title I schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you teaching in a Title I School?</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher education program completers were provided a list of twenty-one questions that related to the quality of their teacher preparation program. Last year a four-point scale was used. For
data collection this year, a five-point scale was used consisting of: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. Respondents were also given the choice of leaving the item blank to indicate no response.

Table 7 reports the number and percent of how the respondents responded to each question. Additionally, the mean and standard deviation are reported for each question. This discussion will focus on the mean scores as a way to report the aggregated findings of the respondents’ perceptions of their preparation for teaching.

Considering the 1 – 5 point scale used in the survey instrument, a 3 becomes the median between agreeing and disagreeing with a question. Table 7 reveals 21 of the 21 questions had a mean higher than the median indicating agreement. Questions receiving the highest rating by the UNR program completer respondents were:

- “My teacher education program prepared me to develop lesson plans” (question 5).
- “My teacher education program prepared me to use a variety of teaching methods appropriate to my students and age level” (question 6).
- “My teacher education program prepared me to be a reflective educator” (question 15).

Though 55% answered affirmatively, the question with the largest percentage indicating disagree or strongly disagree was, “My teacher education program prepared me to work with parents and families” (question 13).

The culminating question, “I was prepared to be a teacher by my teacher education program” received a mean of median, indicating the 2013-14 program completers agreed with this item.
My field experiences prior to internship prepared me for the procedures.

My teacher education program prepared me to develop and informal assessment strategies appropriate to the students and subject matter I am teaching.

My coursework in the content areas (math, English, science, social sciences, and other teaching areas) prepared me to teach in my subject matter content and address the academic standards of my district.

My teacher education program prepared me to work with parents and families.

My teacher education program prepared me to develop and awareness of my school and community.

My teacher education program prepared me to be a reflective educator.

My teacher education program prepared me for teaching students with disabilities in the regular classroom or in the role of a special education teacher, if applicable.

My teacher education program prepared me to develop lesson plans.

My teacher education program prepared me to use a variety of teaching methods appropriate to my students and age level.

My teacher education program prepared me to use formal and informal assessment results to improve my teaching and students and subject matter I am teaching.

My teacher education program prepared me to use formal and informal assessment results to improve my teaching and students learning.

My coursework in the content areas (math, English, science, social sciences, and other teaching areas) prepared me to teach in my subject matter content and address the academic standards of my district.

My teacher education program prepared me to work with parents and families.

My teacher education program prepared me to develop and awareness of my school and community.

My teacher education program prepared me to be a reflective educator.

My teacher education program prepared me for the legal and procedural requirements of my role (i.e. school law, standardized testing regulations, special education procedures).

My teacher education program prepared me to provide developmentally appropriate instruction.

My teacher education program prepared me to provide effective communication skills in the school setting.

My field experiences prior to internship prepared me for the supervised internship/student teaching.

My supervised internship/student teaching prepared me to assume the role of class room teacher.

I was prepared to be a teacher by my teacher education program.
**Data from Principals**

The survey instrument developed for teacher education program completers’ principals asked only two demographic questions – the type of school in which they worked, urban, suburban, or rural and the teaching level of the teacher who provided their principal’s name and email address. There were 45 responding principals as reported in Tables 8, 9, and 10. Sixty percent of the principals responding indicated they were from rural schools. The other category represents other settings such as programs serving youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am in the following type of school:</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Urban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rural</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Charter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Type of School

Table 9 reports the teaching level of the UNR program completers and the school level in which the principals worked. The largest number of principals were at secondary schools (60% combined middle and high schools).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teaching level of the candidate I am evaluation is:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Pre-school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elementary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Middle school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 High school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other: counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other: human development and family studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other: special education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Teaching level of teaching program completer under contract

Questions that principals would be asked relating to their perceptions of the quality of the teacher education program paralleled the program quality questions of the program completers, including the same rating scale. Table 10 reports the results reflecting how 45 principals responded.

Table 10 indicates that 84.6% of the 45 principals surveyed responded above the median, indicating they agree or strongly agree with all 21 questions. Questions receiving the highest level of agreement were:

- “The teacher preparation program prepared him/her for teaching students with disabilities in the regular classroom” (question 3).
- “The teacher preparation program prepared him/her to develop lesson plans” (question 5).
- “The teacher preparation program prepared him/her to use a variety of teaching methods appropriate to the students and age level” (question 6).
- “The teacher preparation program prepared him/her to use appropriate technology and/or media in the teaching” (question 7).
Principals and program completers are in agreement regarding questions 5 and 6 in that approximately 40% of the program completer responses and 37.8% of the 45 principals strongly agreed with these two questions.

Though 86% of the principals agreed or strongly agreed with question 7, there were 5 principals or 11.1% who disagreed: “The teacher education program prepared him/her to use appropriate technology and/or media in the teaching.”
Forty one of the 45 principals agree that “the teacher education program prepared him/her to be a teacher” (question 21).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her for teaching students of diverse cultures and ethnicities.</td>
<td>12  26.7%</td>
<td>0.27  6.59</td>
<td>29  64.4%</td>
<td>0.64  7.14</td>
<td>1  2.2%</td>
<td>0.02  2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her for teaching English language learners.</td>
<td>10  22.2%</td>
<td>0.22  6.20</td>
<td>18  40.0%</td>
<td>0.40  7.30</td>
<td>14  31.1%</td>
<td>0.31  6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her for teaching students with disabilities in the regular classroom or in the role of a special education teacher, if applicable.</td>
<td>17  37.8%</td>
<td>0.38  7.23</td>
<td>21  46.7%</td>
<td>0.47  7.44</td>
<td>3  6.7%</td>
<td>0.07  3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher education program addressed the Nevada K-12 Content Standards and Benchmarks.</td>
<td>10  22.2%</td>
<td>0.22  6.20</td>
<td>31  68.9%</td>
<td>0.69  6.90</td>
<td>3  6.7%</td>
<td>0.07  3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to develop lesson plans.</td>
<td>17  37.8%</td>
<td>0.38  7.23</td>
<td>25  55.6%</td>
<td>0.56  7.41</td>
<td>2  4.4%</td>
<td>0.04  3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to use a variety of teaching methods appropriate to the students and age level.</td>
<td>17  37.8%</td>
<td>0.38  7.23</td>
<td>26  57.8%</td>
<td>0.58  7.39</td>
<td>0  0.0%</td>
<td>0.00  0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to use appropriate technology and/or media in the teaching.</td>
<td>18  40.0%</td>
<td>0.40  7.30</td>
<td>21  46.7%</td>
<td>0.47  7.44</td>
<td>1  2.2%</td>
<td>0.02  2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to address student behavior in the classroom.</td>
<td>4  8.9%</td>
<td>0.09  4.24</td>
<td>36  80.0%</td>
<td>0.80  5.96</td>
<td>3  6.7%</td>
<td>0.07  3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to manage the classroom and/or labs.</td>
<td>7  15.6%</td>
<td>0.16  5.40</td>
<td>35  77.8%</td>
<td>0.78  6.20</td>
<td>3  6.7%</td>
<td>0.07  3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to use formal and informal assessment strategies appropriate to the students and subject matter I am teaching.</td>
<td>14  31.1%</td>
<td>0.31  6.90</td>
<td>25  55.6%</td>
<td>0.56  7.41</td>
<td>4  8.9%</td>
<td>0.09  4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to use formal and informal assessment results to improve the teaching and student learning.</td>
<td>8  17.8%</td>
<td>0.18  5.70</td>
<td>32  71.1%</td>
<td>0.71  6.78</td>
<td>3  6.7%</td>
<td>0.07  3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The coursework in the content areas (math, English, science, social sciences, and other teaching areas) prepared him/her to teach in the subject matter content and address the academic standards of the district.</td>
<td>11  24.4%</td>
<td>0.24  6.41</td>
<td>25  55.6%</td>
<td>0.56  7.41</td>
<td>2  4.4%</td>
<td>0.04  3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to work with parents and families.</td>
<td>4  8.9%</td>
<td>0.09  4.24</td>
<td>28  62.2%</td>
<td>0.62  7.23</td>
<td>9  20.0%</td>
<td>0.20  5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to develop and awareness of the school and community.</td>
<td>12  26.7%</td>
<td>0.27  6.59</td>
<td>22  48.9%</td>
<td>0.49  7.45</td>
<td>9  20.0%</td>
<td>0.20  5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to be a reflective educator.</td>
<td>11  24.4%</td>
<td>0.24  6.41</td>
<td>29  64.4%</td>
<td>0.64  7.14</td>
<td>5  11.1%</td>
<td>0.11  4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her for the legal and procedural requirements of the role (i.e. school law, standardized testing regulations, special education procedures).</td>
<td>6  13.3%</td>
<td>0.13  5.07</td>
<td>27  60.0%</td>
<td>0.60  7.30</td>
<td>9  20.0%</td>
<td>0.20  5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to provide developmentally appropriate instruction.</td>
<td>11  24.4%</td>
<td>0.24  6.41</td>
<td>26  57.8%</td>
<td>0.58  7.36</td>
<td>8  17.8%</td>
<td>0.18  5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to use effective communication skills in the school setting.</td>
<td>10  22.2%</td>
<td>0.22  6.20</td>
<td>25  55.6%</td>
<td>0.56  7.41</td>
<td>7  15.6%</td>
<td>0.16  5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The field experiences prior to internship prepared him/her for the supervised internships/student teaching.</td>
<td>10  22.2%</td>
<td>0.22  6.20</td>
<td>33  73.3%</td>
<td>0.73  6.59</td>
<td>2  4.4%</td>
<td>0.04  3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The supervised internships/student teaching prepared him/her to assume the role of classroom teacher.</td>
<td>15  33.3%</td>
<td>0.33  7.03</td>
<td>20  44.4%</td>
<td>0.44  7.41</td>
<td>10  22.2%</td>
<td>0.22  6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The teacher education program prepared him/her to be a teacher.</td>
<td>13  28.9%</td>
<td>0.29  6.76</td>
<td>28  62.2%</td>
<td>0.62  7.23</td>
<td>3  6.7%</td>
<td>0.07  3.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plans for Program Improvement

The teacher education program completer follow-up studies provide data that can be used as input for program improvements. Yet, these studies do not provide the only data used for program improvements. This study and data from other assessments lead to the following suggestions for program improvements:

- It is difficult to draw any correlations between the 2012-13 survey results and the 2013-14 survey results due to the significant increase in respondents this year. Administering the survey at the annual Education Career Fair resulted in significantly higher response rates from both program completers and principals. Therefore, we have decided to use this venue to administer these surveys in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of survey administered</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program completers</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Effective July 2014, a state mandated ‘families’ course has been added to the secondary teaching program. A ‘families’ course already exists in all other teaching programs.
- The technology course, EDU 214, will be revamped so that it includes the most current technologies for teachers. Furthermore, we are in the process of developing a curriculum map showing how and what technologies are infused in the teaching program’s courses.
- The unit has completely reorganized its Elementary Education Teaching program so that all Elementary students will major in one of three areas: Elementary/Special Education; Elementary/Early Childhood Education; or Elementary/ESL. This is to address teacher shortages as well as preparing our candidates more thoroughly to teach to all students.
- The unit has infused the Common Core State Standards curriculum into the content of our pedagogy classes.
- Both the Elementary Education (Integrated Elementary Teacher Program) and Secondary Education programs have instituted new rubrics for the Portfolios that allows for students to be graded at the appropriate levels of the development which should yield more meaningful data on where the students stand.
- We have implemented a full-day practicum (EDES 4/613) in spring, 2014 for math and science. The unit did this in part to better prepare our candidates to go into their fulltime student teaching experiences. Previously, student teaching interns’ first day student teaching was their first full day in the schools. We wanted our students to have had full day experiences so that it would not be so new to them on their first student teaching day.
- We have a new dean for the COE and have appointed an Assessment Director. We have found that our data is housed in various locations which makes our abilities to use the data somewhat limited. Beginning July 2014, Assessment Director will work with the staff to develop process to gather and disseminate data. The Associate Dean has convened bi-monthly Assessment Committee Advisory Council meetings made up of stakeholders, including the public, to help determine what and how the data will be used.
We are in an active state with regards to setting up a PDS school and the Memorandums of Understanding have been developed. This new direction should vastly help students be “teacher” ready when they complete their internships.