COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION

EPP ANNUAL REPORT – SECTION 7 – INQUIRY BRIEF

Prepared by:

New York University, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development

John Lyons

Amanda Dudley

Jessica Sears

Cesar Benjumea

April 2017

Contents

Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R)

The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale – Revised (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 skill 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 are used 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. Additionally, this information provides a context for understanding student performance data and the extent that 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 areas 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 student final teaching placement for the class of 2016, for a total of 63 BS students and 94 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. Similar to data from the previous year, the BS students fell below the program standard for three domains, but met the program standard for Professional Responsibilities with a mean score of 82.54%. Among MA students, the 80% standard was exceeded on all four domains.

Disaggregated results by program options are displayed in Table 2. For BS students, the program standard was met for three groups: Social Studies, Ed Theater and Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education. For MA students, the program standard was met for six programs, including: Teachers of World Languages, Social Studies, Arts, Educational Theater, Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education, and Dance. It is important to note that the number of cases differs by program option and the percent meeting standards is influenced to a large extent based on only small changes in scores for program options containing 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: Class of 2016

Scale Domain[1]	Number of Items	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
BS Students					
Planning and Preparation	6	63	3.08	.49	69.84%
Classroom Environment	7	63	3.25	.50	76.19%
Instruction	7	63	3.17	.51	76.19%
Professional Responsibilities	3	63	3.40	.66	82.54%†
Total Score	23	63	3.20	.48	71.43%
MA Students					
Planning and Preparation	6	94	3.37	.46	85.87%†
Classroom Environment	7	94	3.43	.44	89.13%†
Instruction	7	94	3.44	.46	86.96%†
Professional Responsibilities	3	93‡	3.69	.46	93.48%†
Total Score	23	94	3.45	.40	88.04%†

SOURCE. 2016 Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale - Revised (DRSTOS-R) NYU-Steinhardt.

[1] 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.

‡ This number discrepancy is due to missing data in the Professional Responsibilities domain for one student. The data from the other three domains was used for this student.

Table 2

Summary of Performance on DRSTOS-R Total Scores for Student Teachers in their Final Placements by Program Certification Area: Class of 2016

Program	N	Mean Score[1]	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
BS Students				
Dual Childhood/ Childhood Special Education	18	3.30	.45	72.22%
Dual Early Childhood/ Early Childhood Special Education	8	3.30	.38	75.00%
Educational Theater	6	3.53	.24	100.00%†
English Education	11	2.90	.55	63.64%
Math Education	6	2.93	.27	50.00%
Music Education	10	3.30	.43	80.00%†
Science Education	1	‡	‡	‡
Teachers of World Languages	3	‡	‡	‡
MA Students				
Arts Education	6	3.19	.39	66.67%
Dance Education	5	3.27	.30	80.00%†
Dual Childhood/ Childhood Special Education	14	3.59	.44	85.71%†
Dual Early Childhood/ Early Childhood Special Education	5	3.37	.28	80.00%†
Educational Theater	14	3.53	.25	100.00%†
English Education	2	‡	‡	‡
Math Education	2	‡	‡	‡
Music Education	6	2.99	.47	66.67%
Social Studies Education	2	‡	‡	‡
Teachers of World Languages	38	3.52		86.84%†

SOURCE. 2016 Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale Revised (DRSTOS-R) NYU-Steinhardt.

[1] 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).

New York State Teacher Certification Exams (NYSTCE)

In order to receive New York State certification as a teacher, a candidate must pass examinations in his or her 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 2016 reflect a mixed cohort of test takers.

Graduates applying for elementary certification are required to pass a series of exams: the Academic Literacy Skills Test (ALST); the Educating All Students (EAS) exam which replaced the elementary and secondary Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W); the Multi-Subject Content Specialty Test (CST); and, the edTPA performance measure for their area of specialization. Secondary education teachers must pass the ALST, EAS, and the CST for their area(s) of specialization.

The NYSTCE program will continue to undergo a period of transition from 2014 to 2018 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 extended for candidates applying for certification until June 2018 in which the ATS-W will continue to be offered as a "safety net" for those who fail the edTPA. As of its March, 2017 the New York State Board of Regents has yet to adopt a new passing score for the edTPA. (https://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PageView.aspx?f=HTML_FRAG/GENRB_SafetyNet.html)

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 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 ATS-W, and original CSTs, or a scaled score of at least 520 on a scale of 400-600 for the ALST, and revised CSTs. The NYSTCE web site explains the ALST safety net as follows:

> The ALST safety net as amended allows any candidate who takes and fails the ALST on or before June 30, 2017, to complete and submit an attestation stating that they have demonstrated comparable literacy skills consistent with what would be assessed by the ALST through course completion and that they received a 3.0 grade point average or higher in such coursework. In addition, candidates must submit a transcript identifying such coursework along with the attestation. An attestation form is available on the Office of Teaching Initiatives website. This safety net will be implemented retroactively and will apply to anyone who has failed the ALST.
>
> (http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PageView.aspx?f=HTML_FRAG/GENRB_SafetyNet.html)

Because this safety net calls for an attestation letter, students who have used this route to pass this component of certification are not accounted for in this report.

The EAS, on a scale of 400-600, also has a safety net in place which lowers its passing score by 20 points, from the original 520 to 500. As per the NYSTCE website:

> The Board of Regents directed the Department to establish a "safety net passing score," which has been set to 500. The original passing score was 520.
>
> All previous EAS submissions have been reviewed to determine if those who failed the EAS would have passed the assessment under the safety net passing score. Candidates who previously failed the EAS, but scored at or above the safety net passing score, have been notified that they have now been deemed to have passed the assessment. No action is required on the part of any candidate whose passing status has changed. The updated passing status has been reported directly to NYSED and any reporting institutions that candidates indicated when registering.
>
> Candidates currently taking the EAS through June 30, 2017, need not take any action; their submission will be evaluated under the safety net passing score automatically. After June 30, 2017, the original EAS passing score (non-safety net) will be used to determine if a candidate has passed the assessment.
>
> (http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PageView.aspx?f=HTML_FRAG/GENRB_SafetyNet.html)

Note that the edTPA is not yet being included as a program evaluation measure because of the issues surrounding its implementation (described above) and its distinct measurement format (performance based rather than a standardized exam) and its 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 2016 graduates on the NYSTCE exams. Test score data are matched with individual program graduates. With the exception of 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. And, as noted above, graduates who utilized the ALST safety net of an attestation letter are not accounted for in this report which would mean that that the actual passing rates for that component of certification are higher than reported in the ALST pass rate calculation. It should be noted that the pass rates on the ALST, a relatively new exam have been very low across the state to the point that in its March 2017, effective immediately, meeting the NYS Board of Regents has eliminated it as a certification assessment: (http://www.nysed.gov/news/2017/board-regents-act-amend-states-teacher-certification-requirements-based-recommendations) Though this does not affect the 2016 graduates, it is worth noting that due to presumed misalignment, it will not be a exam for certification. Otherwise, the mean scores of both BS and MA Steinhardt students exceeded the passing score for each respective test. 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 2016

	N[1]	Mean Scaled Score (MSS)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Effect Size (ES)[2]	% Passing[3]	Passing Score
Liberal Arts - ALST						
BS	89	529.80	27.89	0.35	73.0%	520
MA	188	524.84	28.59	0.17	63.3%	
Total	277	526.43	28.41	0.23	66.4%	
Knowledge of Pedagogy - ATS-W (Elementary & Secondary)						
BS	8	274.50	16.66	3.27	100.0%	220
MA	25	271.20	11.94	4.29	100.0%	
Total	33	272.00	13.03	3.99	100.0%	
Knowledge of Pedagogy - EAS						
BS	93	535.88	18.07	1.99	96.8%	500
MA	179	530.20	22.13	1.36	94.4%	
Total	272	532.14	20.98	1.53	95.2%	
Content Knowledge (Old)						
BS	19	244.26	19.15	1.27	94.7%	220
MA	126	260.21	24.80	1.62	96.8%	
Total	145	258.12	24.67	1.55	96.6%	
Content Knowledge (New)						
BS	68	554.43	19.04	1.81	96.4%	520
MA	83	550.66	20.18	1.52	97.1%	
Total	151	552.36	19.70	1.64	96.7%	

SOURCE. 2016 New York State Teacher Certification Exams

[1] **Note:** If a student has multiple tests, data are based on the most recent exam.
[2] ES = (MSS-Passing Score)/SD; the program standard is an ES >= 0.80, large and meaningful.
[3] The Program Standard is 90% passing.

Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Questionnaire (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 asks about the school environment, the second part focuses on the cooperating teacher, and the third part 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 "Poor" to "Excellent." 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 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 at both the BS and MA program levels during the 2015-2016 year. The total mean scores for each of the three scales met or exceed the program standard criterion of 4.0 (nominally equivalent to a rating of "Good") for student teachers in all areas with the exception of undergraduate students' response on claim 1, Content Knowledge, with a mean score of 3.95 which it should be noted is not significantly different from the program standard of 4.0.

Table 4

Mean Scores on the End of Term Feedback Questionnaire Claim Scales for Teacher Education Students in Student Teaching Placements: Class of 2016

Scale	N	Mean[1,2]	Standard Deviation
Content Knowledge[3]: Claim Scale 1			
BS	128	3.95†	.94
MA	122	4.20	.83
Pedagogical Knowledge[4]: Claim Scale 2			
BS	128	4.03†	.86
MA	122	4.29	.81
Clinical Knowledge[5]: Claim Scale 3			
BS	128	4.09†	.81
MA	122	4.32	.75

[1] Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale with values: 1= Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Average, 4=Good and 5= Excellent.

[2] The program criterion for each claim is a mean score of at least 4.0 for all program completers.

[3] 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.

[4] 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.

[5] 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.

† The Mean value is **not** significantly different from the program standard of 4.0 ($p<0.05$).

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 25 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 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 2016 academic year. As shown in the table, two scales of Personal Teacher Efficacy (Student Problem Solving and Student Success) are associated with Claim 3. The 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 exceeded the program standard of 4.50 on three of the five scales. Both groups fell short on the Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Problem Solving and Student Success scales, with mean scores ranging from 4.11 to 4.33. Consistent with previous graduating cohorts, the 2016 cohort's highest mean scores corresponded with Multicultural Awareness. However, with this cohort we saw a slight decrease in Social Justice scales means, making it more closely aligned with the means for General Teacher Efficacy.

Table 5
Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) Scores by Degree: Class of 2016

Scale[1]	BS			MA		
	N	Mean[2,3]	Standard Deviation	N	Mean[2,3]	Standard Deviation
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Problem Solving	58	4.33	.79	124	4.22†	.69
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success	58	4.17†	.69	124	4.11†	.70
General Teacher Efficacy	58	4.87†	.75	124	4.87†	.90
Multicultural Awareness	58	5.48†	.78	124	5.38†	.68
Social Justice	58	4.82†	.70	124	4.87†	.71

SOURCE. 2016 Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS), NYU-Steinhardt

[1] 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.

[2] All 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.

[3] The program standard is to meet or exceed a mean score of 4.50.

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

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. MA students take their post-graduate course in Steinhardt and their grades in these courses are used to compute their Content Knowledge GPA.

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 Skill GPA as a measure of clinical practice.

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 Cross-Cutting Themes (CCT) GPA 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. Therefore, composite undergraduate GPAs are used as a proxy CCT measure for MA students.

Contained in Table 6 are the Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of Teacher Education Graduates in the class of 2016. 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 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 all claim areas.

Table 6

Mean Grade Point Averages (GPA) of NYU BS and MA Teacher Education Graduates by Claim area: Class of 2016

GPA Category	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Content Knowledge			
BS	89	3.61†	.18
MA	144	3.87†	.26
Pedagogical Knowledge			
BS	90	3.66†	.18
MA	186	3.87†	.14
Clinical Skill			
BS	78	3.82†	.29
MA	159	3.89†	.22
Cross Cutting: Learning to Learn			
BS	95	3.08†	.67
MA	150	3.41†	.35

† The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 3.0 ($p<.05$)

Program Exit Survey

The Program Exit surveys evaluates 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.

Tables 7 below presents the results from the Program Exit surveys among the class 2016. 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 seen in Table 7, undergraduate program completers met or exceeded standards for all of the items under the domain of Clinical Skill, one item of Content Knowledge and two items of Pedagogical Knowledge with at 80% or more of respondents feeling "Moderately Well" or "Very Well". Undergraduate scores fell well below program targets on a number of items; items assessing candidates' perceived preparedness for Work(ing) with parents (43.7%) and Address(ing) needs of students with limited English language proficiency (55.1%) achieved the lowest ratings.

Graduate-level program completers met the program standard on two of the Pedagogical Knowledge items (87.3% for Understand(ing) how students learn and 81.6% for Use(ing) different pedagogical approaches) and fell below the standard in the Caring Professionals domain. Overall, responses indicate that undergraduate- and graduate-level program completers felt that their programs least prepared them to work with parents (33.8% for graduates). Conversely, responses to items encompassed by Content Knowledge and Clinical Skill domains

were among the highest rated. The perception of undergraduates is better than the graduates in 12 of the 15 items, the three exceptions are the items related to Address(ing) needs of students with limited English language proficiency, Understand(ing) how students learn and Use(ing) different pedagogical approaches.

The results suggest the need for continued focus on improving curriculum and instruction to support candidates' development for work with parents, English language learners and the items contained in the Caring Professionals domain.

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 2016

	Undergraduates (N=49)			Graduates (N=71)		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total
Content Knowledge[1]						
Have a mastery of your subject area	34.7%	44.9%	79.6%	38.0%	32.4%	70.4%
Implement state/district curriculum & standard	44.9%	44.9%	89.8%†	46.5%	29.6%	76.1%
Pedagogical Knowledge						
Understand how students learn	49.0%	36.7%	85.7%†	39.4%	47.9%	87.3%†
Use different pedagogical approaches	24.5%	53.1%	77.6%	40.8%	40.8%	81.6%†
Use student performance assessment techniques	36.7%	49.0%	85.7%†	42.2%	32.4%	74.6%
Address needs of students with disabilities	42.9%	34.7%	77.6%	22.5%	42.2%	64.7%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	24.5%	30.6%	55.1%	22.5%	42.2%	64.7%
Work with parents	8.3%	35.4%	43.7%	15.5%	18.3%	33.8%
Clinical Skill						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	51.0%	34.7%	85.7%†	38.0%	31.0%	69.0%
Impact my students' ability to learn	38.8%	51.0%	89.8%†	35.2%	43.7%	78.9%
Caring Professionals						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	28.6%	38.8%	67.4%	21.1%	32.4%	53.5%
Identify & use resources within the neighborhood/community where you teach	26.5%	36.7%	63.2%	18.3%	35.2%	53.5%
Engage as an active participant (i.e., stakeholder) in the community where you teach	26.5%	40.8%	67.3%	18.6%	38.6%	57.2%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	40.8%	36.7%	77.5%	38.0%	32.4%	70.4%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology						
Integrate technology into teaching	30.6%	44.9%	75.5%	33.8%	35.2%	69.0%

[1] **Note:** All 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).

† Total percentage meeting or exceeding the program criterion of 80%.

References

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: a framework for teaching* (2nd ed). Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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.