



**COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION**

---

**EPP ANNUAL REPORT – SECTION 7 – INQUIRY BRIEF**

Prepared by:

**CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON  
HIGHER EDUCATION OUTCOMES (CRHEO)**

Laura Davis

Kimberly Woo

Gregory Wolniak

April 2015

## CONTENTS

---

Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R).....	3
New York State Teacher Certification Exams (NYSTCE) .....	7
Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Surveys (ETFQ) .....	10
Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS) .....	13
Grade Point Averages.....	16
Program Exit and Follow-Up Surveys.....	19
References.....	24

**Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R)**

---

The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R) is an observation protocol for rating the teaching performance of student teachers, based on the work of Charlotte Danielson as presented in her book, *Enhancing Professional Practices: A Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 2007). The DRSTOS-R has been used to assess the pedagogical proficiency of NYU's student teachers with few modifications from fall 2004 through the present. The items of the DRSTOS-R are aligned with national frameworks for teaching, including the widely used standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

Items on the DRSTOS-R also correspond with items on other measures of pedagogical proficiency including the edTPA certification rubrics and the Danielson rubric used by the New York City Department of Education to evaluate teacher quality. DRSTOS-R data are collected for multiple purposes and help to facilitate discussion and comparison between programs.

The data in this report are intended to provide feedback that can be used to support programmatic planning in several ways. Administrative data identifying field supervisors who have submitted protocols provides accountability and speaks to internal consistency of program field supervision. In addition, this information provides a context for understanding student performance data and the extent to which the results may be generalized to the full population of students in the program. DRSTOS-R data on student performance, in conjunction with information from other sources, may be used to identify domains in need of additional program-wide attention and facilitate discussions concerning program improvement (e.g. increased emphasis in course curricula and field mentorship, etc.).

Table 1 below presents DRSTOS-R ratings for students in their final student teaching placement for the Classes of 2014 for a total of 154 BS students and 225 MA students. For both BS and MA cohorts, the program standard is for 80% or more of the students to achieve a mean of at least 3.0 for all four domains and the Total Scale. Consistent with data from the previous year, the BS students fell below the program standard for all domains, except Professional Responsibilities. However, similar to the previous years' data, BS students are exceeding or close to exceeding a proficiency score 3.0 for 70% of students in Classroom Environment and Instruction. Among MA students, the 80% standard was met for all four domains.

Disaggregated results by program options are displayed in Table 2. For BS students, the program standard was met for three out of nine groups: English Education, Social Studies Education, and Science Education. For MA students, the program standard was met for six out of eleven program options, including: Art Education, Dance Education, Dual Childhood/Childhood Special Education, Dual Early Childhood/Childhood Special Education, Science Education, and Teachers of World Languages. Science Education showed the highest percentages scoring means of at least 3.0 for both undergraduates and graduates. It is important to note that the number of cases differs widely by program and the percent meeting standards may vary to a large extent based on only small changes in scores for programs containing relatively few students.

**Table 1****Mean Scores and Percentages Meeting Standards on the Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale-Revised (DRSTOS-R) for Steinhardt Teacher Education Students in their Final Student Teaching Placement: Fall 2013 - Summer 2014**

Scale Domain	Number of Items	N	Mean Score <sup>1</sup>	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
<b>BS Students</b>					
Planning and Preparation	6	154	3.00	0.51	64.30%
Classroom Environment	7	154	3.22	0.48	73.40%
Instruction	7	154	3.16	0.50	71.40%
Professional Responsibilities	3	154	3.43	0.58	84.40%†
Total Score	23	154	3.17	0.46	68.20%
<b>MA Students</b>					
Planning and Preparation	6	225	3.31	0.55	80.90%†
Classroom Environment	7	225	3.40	0.50	85.80%†
Instruction	7	225	3.35	0.53	82.20%†
Professional Responsibilities	3	225	3.58	0.57	89.30%†
Total Score	23	225	3.39	0.49	80.90%†

<sup>1</sup> Scale: 1=Not Yet Proficient; 2=Partially Proficient; 3=Entry Level Proficient; 4=Proficient.

† Values meeting the program standard that 80% of students at or above a Mean Score of 3.0. The standard for proficiency is 3.0.

SOURCE: 2013-14 DRSTOS-R, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

**Table 2****Summary of Performance on DRSTOS-R Total Scores for Student Teachers in their Last Placements by Program Certification Area: Fall 2013 – Summer 2014**

Program	N	Mean Score <sup>1</sup>	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
<b>BS Students</b>				
Dual Childhood/ Childhood Special Education	53	3.21	0.45	73.6%
Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education	44	3.08	0.46	61.4%
Ed. Theatre	8	3.36	0.51	75.0%
English Education	10	3.26	0.36	80.0% †
Math Education	7	3.05	0.38	57.1%
Music Education	18	3.01	0.51	44.4%
Science Education	5	3.43	0.28	100.0% †
Social Studies Education	6	3.33	0.43	83.3% †
Teachers of World Languages	3	‡	‡	‡
<b>MA Students</b>				
Art Education	16	3.33	0.31	81.3% †
Dance Education	5	3.10	0.16	80.0% †
Dual Childhood/ Childhood Special Education	33	3.45	0.43	90.9% †
Dual Early Childhood/Childhood Special Education	37	3.34	0.52	83.8% †
English Education	18	3.28	0.35	77.8%
Ed Theater	14	3.30	0.57	78.6%
Math Education	3	‡	‡	‡
Music Education	16	2.68	0.49	25.0%
Science Education	22	3.88	0.25	95.5% †
Social Studies Education	8	3.32	0.47	75.0%
Teachers of World Languages	53	3.52	0.41	86.8% †

<sup>1</sup> Scale: 1=Not Yet Proficient; 2=Partially Proficient; 3=Entry Level Proficient; 4=Proficient.

† Values meeting the program standard that 80% of students at or above a Mean Score of 3.0. The standard for proficiency is 3.0.

‡ Reporting standards not met (fewer than five cases).

SOURCE: 2013-14 DRSTOS-R, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

**New York State Teacher Certification Exams (NYSTCE)**

---

In order to receive New York State certification as a teacher, candidates must pass examinations in their certification area administered through the New York State Teacher Certification Exam (NYSTCE) program. The 2013-14 academic year marked a change in certification exam requirements and, to this end, the graduating class of 2014 reflect a mixed cohort of test takers.

Graduates applying for certification on or before April 30, 2014 were required to pass the same exams which have been historically reported. Under these guidelines, elementary education teachers must pass the Liberal Arts and Science Test (LAST), the Elementary Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W), and the Multi-Subject Content Specialty Test (CST). Secondary education teachers must pass the LAST, the secondary ATS-W, and the CST for their area(s) of specialization.

Graduates applying for certification after the cutoff are required to pass a series of new exams: the Academic Literacy Skills Test (ALST) which replaces the LAST, the Educating All Students (EAS) exam which replaces the elementary and secondary ATS-W, and the edTPA performance measure for their area of specialization. Additionally, mirroring original policy, candidates must pass either multi-subject or specialization CSTs.

The NYSTCE program will continue to undergo a period of transition from 2014 to 2017 as revised CSTs are rolled out for each of the subject areas, rescaled from a range of 100-300 to 400-600. Also during this time, further refinements will be made in the procedures for administering, scoring, and reporting the edTPA performance measure. As New York was one of the first states to adopt the edTPA and has faced challenges in its rollout, a provision has been put in place for candidates applying for certification until June 2015 in which the ATS-W will continue to be offered as a “safety net” for those who fail the edTPA. As per the NYSTCE website,

Any candidate who applies for and meets the requirements of an initial certificate on or before June 30, 2015, except he/she does not receive a passing score on edTPA, may either (1) take and pass the Assessment of Teaching Skills (ATS-W) after receipt of his/her score on edTPA and prior to June 30, 2015, or (2) if the candidate had previously passed the ATS-W on or before April 30, 2014 (before the new certification examination requirements became effective) and the candidate has taken and failed edTPA prior to June 30, 2015, the candidate will be issued an initial certificate... The same safety net exists for Transitional C certificate holders (career changes and others holding a graduate academic or graduate professional degree) who apply for and meet all requirements for a professional certificate, except the candidate does not receive a passing score on edTPA. ([http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/NY17\\_whoshouldtest.asp](http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/NY17_whoshouldtest.asp))

Recognizing this transitional period, for purposes of teacher education program evaluation, the CST is used as a measure of candidates' subject matter knowledge, the ATS-W and EAS as a measure of pedagogical knowledge, and the LAST and ALST as a measure of general liberal arts content knowledge. In order to qualify for state certification, students must obtain a scaled score



of at least 220 on a scale of 100-300 for the LAST, ATS-W, and original CSTs, or a scaled score of at least 520 on a scale of 400-600 for the ASLT, EAS, and revised CSTs. Note that the edTPA is not included as a program evaluation measure because of the issues surrounding its implementation (described above) and because of its distinct measurement format (performance-based rather than a standardized exam) and rating scale (different numbers of items exist per task depending on subject area rubric).

Table 3 displays the results of the performance of the class of 2014 graduates on the NYSTCE exams in 2014. Test score data are matched with individual program graduates. With the exception of MA students on the ALST, graduates showed strong performance on the three sets of exams by exceeding the dual program standards of 90% passing and an effect size of at least 0.80, indicating that the mean scale score exceeded passing to a large and educationally meaningful extent. The mean scores of both BS and MA Steinhardt students exceeded the passing score for each respective test, i.e. 220 for the LAST, ATS-W, and CSTs or 520 for the ALST and EAS. Because the scores represent a mixture of old and new tests with differing scales, comparison between the tests does not render meaningful information.

**Table 3****Mean Scaled Scores, Effect Sizes, and Passing Rates for Teacher-Education Graduates on the NYSTCE Exams: Class of 2014**

	N	Mean Scaled Score (MSS)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Effect Size (ES) <sup>1</sup>	% Passing <sup>2</sup>
<b>Liberal Arts - LAST</b>					
BS	18	271.83	17.41	2.98	100.0%
MA	73	295.51	18.17	4.16	100.0%
Total	91	269.97	17.95	2.78	100.0%
<b>Liberal Arts - ALST</b>					
BS	57	541.88	19.23	1.14	93.0%
MA	81	537.73	24.0	0.74	82.7%
Total	138	539.44	22.16	0.88	87.0%
<b>Knowledge of Pedagogy - ATS-W (Elementary &amp; Secondary)</b>					
BS	29	269.17	13.74	3.58	100.0%
MA	85	268.12	14.68	3.28	100.0%
Total	114	268.39	14.40	3.36	100.0%
<b>Knowledge of Pedagogy - EAS</b>					
BS	58	537.57	17.77	0.99	87.9%
MA	81	536.58	15.52	1.07	90.1%
Total	139	536.99	16.44	1.03	89.2%
<b>Content Knowledge – CSTs</b>					
BS	78	248.14	21.73	1.29	94.9%
MA	178	259.83	23.79	1.67	97.2%
Total	256	256.27	23.76	1.53	96.5%

<sup>1</sup> Depending on the test,  $ES = (MSS - 220)/SD$  or  $(MSS - 520)/SD$ ; the program standard is an  $ES \geq 0.80$ , large and meaningful.

<sup>2</sup> Depending on the test, passing score = 220 on a scale of 100 – 300 or 520 on a scale of 400-600. The program standard is 90% passing.

NOTE. If a student has multiple tests, data are based on the most recent exam

SOURCE. 2014 New York State Teacher Certification Exams

**Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Surveys (ETFQ)**

---

Faculty and staff designed the Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Questionnaire (ETFQ) as an integral component of the evidence base for self-inquiry. Designed and administered as an online questionnaire, the ETFQ elicits feedback from teacher-education students concerning the extent to which they perceive that the semester's student-teaching experience has enhanced their professional knowledge and expertise. The ETFQ format includes a combination of forced-choice and open-ended items divided into three parts. The first part (items 1 and 2) asks about the school environment, the second part (items 3–14) focuses on the cooperating teacher, and the third part (items 15–25) focuses on the contributions of the student-teacher supervisor. In the context of the student teaching experience, the items ask students to evaluate how well their cooperating teachers and supervisors contribute to their growth as teachers using a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from "Very poorly" to "Very well." An open-ended prompt asks the students to describe the specific ways in which the cooperating teachers and supervisors helped their professional growth, as well as any specific experiences that were problematic. All student teachers in teacher education programs are asked to complete the ETFQ at the end of each semester of student teaching.

Table 4 below displays the results of three scales based on ETFQ data, each corresponding to one of the Teacher Education Program claims. These data reflect students who participated in student teaching during the 2013-14 year. The total mean scores for each of the three scales met the criterion of 4.0 (nominally equivalent to a rating of "Well") for student teachers in both the BS and MA programs. Means for both undergraduate and graduate student teacher exceeded the program standard on all three claim scales, however, the differences were only statistically significant for MA students.

**Table 4****Mean Scores on the End of Term Feedback Questionnaire Claim Scales for Teacher-Education Students in Student Teaching Placements: 2013-14**

Scale	N	Mean <sup>1,2</sup>	Standard Deviation
<b>Content Knowledge: Claim Scale 1<sup>3</sup></b>			
BS	86	4.16	0.95
MA	166	4.15	1.00
Total	252	4.16 <sup>†</sup>	0.98
<b>Pedagogical Knowledge: Claim Scale 2<sup>4</sup></b>			
BS	86	4.20	1.02
MA	167	4.18 <sup>†</sup>	0.95
Total	253	4.19 <sup>†</sup>	0.97
<b>Clinical Knowledge: Claim Scale 3<sup>5</sup></b>			
BS	86	4.19	0.93
MA	167	4.22 <sup>†</sup>	0.91
Total	253	4.21 <sup>†</sup>	0.91

<sup>†</sup> The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 4.0 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

<sup>1</sup> Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale with values: 1= Very Poorly, 2=Poorly, 3=Average, 4=Well and 5= Very Well.

<sup>2</sup> The program criterion for each claim is a mean score of at least 4.0 for both BS and MA program completers.

<sup>3</sup> Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their contribution towards developing content knowledge specific to students' field and age group.

<sup>4</sup> Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their assistance in furthering organizational teaching skills in areas such as planning, structuring lessons and assessment methods.

<sup>5</sup> Scale consists of mean scores on four items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their contribution towards (1) enhancing teaching practices, such as instructional philosophies, and methods used in the classroom, and (2) developing classroom management skills such as establishing routines and approaches to discipline.

SOURCE. 2014 End of Term Feedback Questionnaire, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

**Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS)**

---

The Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) is an NYU Steinhardt-developed measure of teacher candidates' developing dispositions toward teaching. EBMAS consists of 29 items developed to measure preservice teachers' beliefs about education in multicultural settings, some of which were initially drawn from the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) (Gibson and Dembo, 1984) and the Teacher Multicultural Attitudes Survey (TMAS) (Ponterotto, et al., 1998). All items were developed or selected based on clarity and alignment with the goals of NYU's teacher education program.

The EBMAS is administered with candidates at two points during their enrollment in teacher education programs – once during their first semester and then again shortly before program completion. EBMAS yields the following five scales: General teacher efficacy (GTE), defined as the overall belief that teachers' work can promote the learning of all students regardless of home background or community; Two measures of Personal Teacher Efficacy (i.e., candidates' beliefs that they as individuals can effectively educate all children regardless of background or community) - one focused on the ability to address challenges in classroom management and instruction, and the other related to personal responsibility for student success; and two scales designed to measure Multicultural Attitudes and Social Justice based on teachers' awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity toward issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom and their belief in the moral and social responsibility of teachers to educate all children equitably. The items within every scale are statements of beliefs that candidates respond to using a six-point Likert scale of agreement (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 6=Strongly Agree) and are balanced across positive and negative statements.

Table 5 below displays the comparison of mean EBMAS scale scores against the program standard of 4.5 for BS and MA program finishers in the Classes of 2014. As shown in the table, two scales of Personal Teacher Efficacy (Student Problem Solving and Student Success) are associated with Claim 3. General Teacher Efficacy and Social Justice scales are associated with Claim 4, and Multicultural Awareness is associated with Cross Cutting Theme 2. For both BS and MA program completers, the observed mean scores met or exceeded the program standard of 4.50 on four of the five scales. Both groups fell short on the Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success scale, with mean scores of 4.25 for undergraduate-level completers and 4.18 for graduate-level completers. Consistent with previous graduating cohorts, the 2013-2014 cohort's highest mean scores corresponded with Multicultural Awareness and Social Justice scales.

**Table 5****Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) Scores by Degree: Class of 2013**

Scale <sup>1</sup>	BS			MA		
	N	Mean <sup>2,3</sup>	Standard Deviation	N	Mean <sup>2,3</sup>	Standard Deviation
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Problem Solving	70	4.47	0.81	162	4.43	0.79
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success	70	4.25 †	0.71	162	4.18 †	0.71
General Teacher Efficacy	70	4.77 †	0.78	162	4.81 †	0.83
Multicultural Awareness	70	5.4 †	0.61	162	5.53 †	0.44
Social Justice	70	5.1 †	0.48	162	5.19 †	0.58

† The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 4.50 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

<sup>1</sup> Scales were constructed from the multiyear EBMAS database using principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. Internal consistency (alpha) for the scales were moderate to large, confirming reliability as follows: PTE (Student Problem Solving, 5-item scale) alpha = 0.729, PTE (Student Success, 4-item scale) alpha = 0.716, General Teacher Efficacy (5-item scale) alpha = 0.541, Multicultural Awareness (8-item scale) alpha = 0.760, Social Justice (6-item scale) alpha = 0.589.

<sup>2</sup> Responses are measured on a 6-point scale of agreement, where: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Moderately Disagree; 3=Slightly Disagree; 4=Slightly Agree; 5=Moderately Agree; and 6=Strongly Agree.

<sup>3</sup> The program standard is to meet or exceed a mean score of 4.50.

SOURCE. 2014 Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS), NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO



## **Grade Point Averages**

---

Grade Point Averages (GPA) are among the measures used to assess teacher education students' mastery of the content and skills required to be a competent and qualified teacher. Across the university, students are graded in each course from A to F with GPAs computed on a four-point scale, weighted for course hours. Grades are awarded for achievement of course objectives. The grading criteria are described in the syllabus for each course.

Teacher education students pursuing the BS or B Mus. degrees must have a program concentration in a subject that is related to their certification area. These courses are taken in the College of Arts and Science (CAS) and Steinhardt and are designed to build the deep content knowledge, understanding and skill required for graduates to teach their subjects effectively. The **Content Knowledge** GPA for undergraduates is computed as a weighted average of these courses. For MA students, admissions and licensure requirements dictate that all candidates must have successfully completed a given number of credits in their content area. Given the logistics of isolating content-specific coursework from undergraduate transcripts, a comparable GPA is not calculable for graduate-level students.

Undergraduate students also receive a broad and deep education in the liberal arts and sciences in large part by meeting the requirements of the College Core Curriculum (CCC), a common core of courses in the CAS. The College Core Curriculum and the other courses taken at NYU help undergraduates develop a set of intellectual skills, tools and ideas that enable them to learn on their own; knowledge of cultural perspectives, practices and traditions; and facility with the tools of modern technology - cross-cutting theme skills for which evidence must be provided in the accreditation process. Accordingly, the GPA for the **Cross-Cutting Themes (CCT)** of Learning to Learn is calculated from the aggregate CCC courses and other contributing courses for both CAS and Steinhardt. Students pursuing the MA degree took their liberal arts and science courses as undergraduates. The composite undergraduate GPA is used as a proxy CCT measure for MA students.

Students in both BS and MA teacher education programs take courses that comprise a common, required Pedagogical Core. Grades from these courses were used to calculate students' **Pedagogical Knowledge** GPA and include Inquiries into Teaching and Learning, Teaching Students with Disabilities, courses in pedagogical content knowledge, and courses in human development. Grades in student-teaching and practicum courses and seminars are used to compute a **Clinical Teaching Skills** GPA as a measure of clinical practice.

Contained in Table 6 are the Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of Teacher Education Graduates in the class of 2014. Four types of GPAs are presented based on the grades achieved in courses related to different program claim areas, including: Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Teaching Skill, as well as the Cross Cutting Theme of Learning to Learn. GPAs are reported separately for BS and MA graduates.

As can be seen in the table, the program standard of 3.0 was exceeded by undergraduate and graduate-level program completers for the claim areas Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, and Clinical Skill. For GPAs within the Cross Cutting – Learning to Learn claim, MA students exceeded the 3.0 standard while the BS students were slightly below at 2.83. However, BS students’ Cross cutting grades were close enough to the standard that the mean value did not differ from 3.0 on a statistically significant basis.

**Table 6**

**Mean Grade Point Averages (GPA) of NYU BS and MA Teacher Education Graduates by Claim area: Class of 2014**

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<b>Content Knowledge</b>			
BS	121	3.06	0.68
MA	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Pedagogical Knowledge</b>			
BS	122	3.56 †	0.43
MA	266	3.84 †	0.29
<b>Clinical Teaching Skill</b>			
BS	96	3.82 †	0.31
MA	118	3.83 †	0.37
<b>Cross Cutting Theme: Learning to learn</b>			
BS	104	2.83	1.01
MA	224	3.29 †	0.65

† The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 3.0 ( $p < 0.05$ ).

SOURCE. 2014 Class Rosters and Grades, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

## **Program Exit and Follow-Up Surveys**

---

**Program Exit.** CRHEO conducts surveys of Steinhardt’s teacher education students shortly before their graduation for the purpose of evaluating the quality of the teacher education program, to obtain data to inform Steinhardt’s efforts toward continuous program improvement, and to assess the readiness of program completers to begin teaching. The survey consists of both Likert-type and free-response questions organized into the following sections: (i) Candidate Background, including degree, certification, and program areas; (ii) Candidate Perceptions on how well their teacher education program prepared them for teaching; (iii) Feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their pre-service programs; and (iv) Professional Plans for the future. Data from the section measuring perceptions of preparation for teaching are used to assess the programs’ influence on the teaching skills and knowledge of the students. Program completers are asked to use a four-point scale ranging from “Very well prepared” to “Not well at all” to report their perceptions of preparation in 15 areas of essential teaching skill and knowledge. Eleven of these items were drawn from Arthur Levine’s national study of the effectiveness of schools of education (Levine, 2006). The other four items refer to skills that faculty identified as key goals of the NYU program that extended beyond the Levine study.

Program standards were established using data from the Levine study as a set of norms. For the Levine sample, the percentages responding that they were “Very well” or “Moderately well” prepared by their programs to teach ranged from 27% for *Address the needs of students with disabilities* to 81% for *Understand how students learn*. For the 11 items drawn from the Levine survey, the percentages reporting “Very well” or “Moderately well” were less than 60% for five items, ranged between 60 and 69% for three items, in the 70% range for two items, and exceeded 80% for one item. Using these data as references to set a high, uniform program standard, Steinhardt faculty established 80% as the program standard for all 15 items.

**Follow-Up.** Similar to the Program Exit survey, CRHEO administers a One-Year Follow-up survey intended to assess the perceptions of graduates concerning the extent to which the program had prepared them to teach and the quality of their educational experience. This survey provides information about program completers’ early professional experiences and the degree to which their programs prepared them for teaching. Since many of the questions are identical to the Program Exit survey, the results from the two surveys can be compared to assess changes in perceptions of preparation and perceived program quality during the first year of teaching. The survey also inquires about the employment of graduates, including their teaching assignments and the locations and types of schools in which they were teaching. The employment data are used to supplement those collected through employment records.

Tables 7 and 8 below present the results from the Program Exit and One-Year Follow-Up surveys among the classes of 2014 and 2013, respectively. Percentages of respondents who reported feeling “Very well” or “Moderately well” prepared are shown across a parallel set of items related to Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Skill, Caring Professionals, and two Cross-Cutting Themes (Integration of Technology and Teaching Diverse Learners).

As can be seen in Table 7 below, undergraduate program completers met or exceeded standards for some but not all of the items under the domains of Content Knowledge and Clinical Skill, with at 80% or more of respondents feeling “Moderately Well” or “Very Well” prepared to implement curricular standards and maintain order and discipline in the classroom. Undergraduate scores fell well below program targets on a number of items; items assessing candidates’ perceived preparedness for “Work(ing) with parents” (44.3%) and “Address(ing) needs of students with limited English language proficiency” (48.6%) achieved the lowest ratings.

Graduate-level program completers met the program standard on three of the Pedagogical Knowledge items and on both items under Clinical Skill, and fell just below the 80% threshold for the two Content Knowledge items. Similar to the undergraduate sample, the lowest scores for graduate-level students corresponded with candidates’ sense of preparedness to implement instruction for English Language Learners and Work with Parents; less than half of respondents reported feeling “Moderately” or “Very Well” prepared in these areas. In general, results of graduate-level program completers were stronger than those for undergraduate program completers. Graduate ratings exceeded those of undergraduates by a margin of 11 percentage points on the item “Use different pedagogical approaches,” and by 10 points on “Impact my students’ ability to learn.” Overall, responses indicate that undergraduate- and graduate-level program completers felt that their programs least prepared them to work with parents, address the needs of English language learners, and engage with their community by utilizing neighborhood resources and through active participation in the community. Conversely, responses to items encompassed by Content Knowledge and Clinical Skill domains were among the highest rated.

Table 8 summarizes the responses of NYU alumni to survey items designed to measure their perceptions of their teacher preparation programs one year after graduation. Alumni responses on the One-Year Follow-Up Survey were, in general, less favorable than of the exiting cohort (i.e., the class of 2013-2014). In contrast to the graduating cohort of 2014, for alumni of 2013, undergraduate alumni’s scores were higher than graduate alumni’s for all 15 items. Though ratings on the Follow-Up survey were, in general, lower than on the Program Exit Survey, existing research on teacher induction and teacher beliefs accounts for a decline in novices’ self efficacy during the transition from pre-service preparation to in-service teaching (Friedman, 2000; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Undergraduate responses to the One-Year Follow-Up Survey met the program target for some but not all of the items linked to Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge, with a high percentage of respondents feeling Moderately or Very Well Prepared with respect to “Mastery of Subject Area” (87.8%), “Understand(ing) how students learn” (83%), and “Us(ing) different pedagogical approaches” (85.4%). The least favorable responses corresponded with items assessing alumni’s sense of preparedness to “Address needs of students with limited English proficiency” (51.3%), “Work with Parents” (56.1%), and “Participate as a stakeholder in the community” in which they taught (51.2%). As with the Exit Survey, graduate-level alumni’s responses to these items were also below target. Graduate responses to the Follow-Up survey met

the target of 80% on only one of the fifteen items, with 83.1% of alumni feeling Moderately or Very Well Prepared to use different pedagogical approaches. The item-level response patterns were not inconsistent with those reported for the same items on the Program Exit Survey. Once again, alumni reported higher levels of perceived preparedness with regards to Content Knowledge and several aspects of Pedagogical Knowledge. The results suggest the need for continued focus on improving curriculum and instruction to support candidates' development for work with diverse populations, students with special needs, and local communities.

**Table 7**

**Percentage of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who reported their Programs Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching: Class of 2014**

	Undergraduates (N=70)			Graduates (N=157)		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total
<b>Content Knowledge</b>						
Have a mastery of your subject area	41.4%	30.0%	71.4%	27.0%	47.1%	73.6%
Implement state/district curriculum & standards	45.7%	35.7%	81.4% †	42.2%	36.4%	78.6%
<b>Pedagogical Knowledge</b>						
Understand how students learn	48.6%	30.0%	78.6%	43.0%	45.2%	87.8% †
Use different pedagogical approaches	41.4%	35.7%	77.1%	39.6%	48.7%	88.3% †
Use student performance assessment techniques	38.6%	40.0%	78.6%	42%	39.4%	81.3% †
Address needs of students with disabilities	35.7%	35.7%	71.4%	32.9%	35.5%	68.4%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	25.7%	22.9%	48.6%	17.4%	28.4%	45.8%
Work with parents	20.0%	24.3%	44.3%	10.3%	23.9%	34.2%
<b>Clinical Skill</b>						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	55.7%	24.3%	80.0% †	46.8%	39.0%	85.8% †
Impact my students' ability to learn	44.1%	32.4%	76.5%	42.6%	43.9%	86.5% †
<b>Caring Professionals</b>						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	40.0%	31.4%	71.4%	29.9%	35.0%	64.9%
Identify & use resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach	25.7%	28.6%	54.3%	21.3%	33.5%	54.8%
Engage as an active participant (i.e., stakeholder) in the community where you teach	20.0%	30.0%	50.0%	21.0%	33.5%	54.8%
<b>Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners</b>						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	38.6%	28.6%	67.2%	33.5%	37.4%	70.9%
<b>Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology</b>						
Integrate technology into teaching	26.1%	31.9%	58.0%	25.8%	39.4%	65.2%

† Total percentage meet or exceeds the program criterion of 80%.

NOTE. Responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

SOURCE. 2014 Program Exit Survey, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO



**Table 8**  
**Percentage of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who reported their Programs Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching: Class of 2013**

	Undergraduates (N=41)			Graduates (N=71)		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total
<b>Content Knowledge</b>						
Have a mastery of your subject area	58.5%	29.3%	87.8% †	33.8%	42.3%	76.1%
Implement state/district curriculum & standards	51.2%	26.8%	78.0%	38.0%	39.4%	77.4%
<b>Pedagogical Knowledge</b>						
Understand how students learn	61%	22%	83.0% †	46.5%	32.4%	78.9%
Use different pedagogical approaches	43.9%	41.5%	85.4% †	38.0%	45.1%	83.1% †
Use student performance assessment techniques	48.8%	29.3%	78.1%	28.2%	42.3%	70.5%
Address needs of students with disabilities	48.8%	26.8%	75.6%	19.7%	39.4%	59.1%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	22.0%	29.3%	51.3%	16.9%	23.9%	40.8%
Work with parents	19.5%	36.6%	56.1%	16.9%	21.1%	38%
<b>Clinical Skill</b>						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	41.5%	26.8%	68.3%	15.5%	43.7%	59.2%
Impact my students' ability to learn	43.9%	31.7%	75.6%	36.6%	38.0%	74.6%
<b>Caring Professionals</b>						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	43.9%	34.1%	78.0%	32.4%	39.4%	71.8%
Identify & use resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach	34.1%	39.0%	73.1%	25.4%	21.1%	46.5%
Engage as an active participant (i.e., stakeholder) in the community where you teach	24.4%	26.8%	51.2%	16.9%	25.4%	42.3%
<b>Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners</b>						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	48.8%	26.8%	75.6%	43.7%	29.6%	73.3%
<b>Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology</b>						
Integrate technology into teaching	41.5%	31.7%	73.2%	22.5%	36.6%	59.1%

† Total percentage meet or exceeds the program criterion of 80%.

NOTE. Responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

SOURCE. 2014 One Year Follow-Up Survey, Class of 2013, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

## Reference

---

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*, 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Friedman, I.A. (2000). Burnout in teachers: Shattered dreams of impeccable professional performance. *In Session: Psychotherapy in Practice*, 56, 595-606.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). *Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, D.C.: The Evaluation Schools Project.

Ponterotto, J.G., Baluch, S., Greig, T., and Rivera, L. (1998). Development and initial score validation of the teacher multicultural attitude survey. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 1002-1016.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202-248.