

Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE)
School of Human Movement, Sport and Leisure Studies
Kinesiology Division
Summary of Student Achievement Assessment (SAAC)
2008-2009 Academic Year

Submitted by: Adrian Turner, PETE Program Coordinator
--

Date: June 8, 2009

Learning Outcomes:

At the completion of baccalaureate degree studies in the Physical Education Teacher Education program, the student will:

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

These specific learning outcomes are taken from the NASPE/NCATE Standards for Beginning Physical Education Teachers (AAHPERD, 2003).

Annual Report

The 2002-2003 academic year resulted in the graduation of the first class of students under the new single multi-age (PreK-12) licensure PETE program. The PETE program has also undergone considerable change in the 2004-2009 academic years primarily due to changes in personnel. During 2003-2004 much time was spent developing a master assessment plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the revised PETE program in meeting each of the identified program learning outcomes (designated by NASPE/NCATE). In late Fall 2004 NCATE elected to revise its requirements for program accreditation in PETE. Consequently most of the previous academic year's work spent developing 3-5 assessment rubrics for each of the 10 NCATE standards was rendered useless. During 2005-2006 the intent was to develop 6-8 newly required NCATE program assessments. The 2006-2009 SAAC reports, therefore, represent efforts in piloting eight key assessments for all ten program outcomes. The eight key assessments have generated student data for program accreditation that were submitted in Fall 2007. PETE received national program recognition (no conditions) from its SPA (NASPE) in January, 2008. PETE program faculty also participated enthusiastically in the unit accreditation visit in October 2008. The program has continued to collect data for the 2008-2009 academic year as mandated by NCATE/NASPE.

1. Learning (or Service) Outcomes assessed this year:

During the 2008-2009 academic year, the PETE program again focused on all 10 learning outcomes:

1. Content Knowledge
2. Growth and Development
3. Diverse Students
4. Management and Motivation
5. Communication
6. Planning and Instruction
7. Student Assessment
8. Reflection
9. Technology
10. Collaboration

2. Assessment Methods and Procedures:

The eight key assessments used to gather assessment information for each standard/outcome selected are indicated in the two ensuing tables in Section II. The first table indicates the name of each key assessment and when it is administered in the program. The second table indicates the relationship of the assessment to the specific PETE program standards that it addresses.

SECTION II— LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

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

	Name of Assessment ¹	Type or Form of Assessment ²	When the Assessment Is Administered ³
1	[Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment] Praxis II PE Content Knowledge Exam (KA 1)	PE Content Knowledge Exam	Before teacher licensure is granted
2	[Assessment of content knowledge in physical education] Movement Performance Assessment (KA 2)	Portfolio, practical movement assessment	Required courses: Educational Dance (KNS 137), Educational Gymnastics (KNS 138), Adv. Perf./Content Dev. In: Invasion Games (232), Net/Wall games (KNS 232), Educ. Gymnastics (KNS 238), Educ. Dance (KNS 337)
3	[Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction] Lesson Planning (KA 3)	Lesson plans	Required courses: Teaching/Learning Process in MC-YA PE (KNS 472),
4	[Assessment of internship or clinical experiences] Student Teaching Assessment (KA 4)	Assessment of Student Teaching Performance (seven categories) and Teaching portfolio	Required courses: E-MC PE Internship (KNS 492) or MC-YA PE Internship (KNS 497)
5	[Assessment of candidate effect on student learning] PETE Teacher Work Sample (KA 5)	PETE Teacher Work Sample Project	Required courses: E-MC PE Internship (KNS 492) or MC-YA PE Internship (KNS 497)

¹ Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

² Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

³ Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

	Name of Assessment ¹	Type or Form of Assessment ²	When the Assessment Is Administered ³
6	Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards (<i>required</i>)] Teaching Effectiveness Electronic Portfolio (KA 6)	Teaching Effectiveness Electronic Portfolio	Required courses: Teaching/Learning Process in MC-YA PE (KNS 472),
7	Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards (<i>optional</i>)] Reflection and Collaboration Assignment (KA 7)	Daily reflection journal, Professional Development Project, Advocacy and Teacher Resources Projects	E-MC PE Internship (KNS 492) or MC-YA PE Internship (KNS 497)
8	Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards (<i>optional</i>)] Teaching Diverse Students in Physical Activity (KA 8)	Teaching log book	Adapted Physical Activity (KNS 433)

SECTION III—RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENTS TO STANDARDS

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

AAHPERD/NASPE STANDARD	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II			
1. Content Knowledge. Physical education teachers understand physical education content and disciplinary concepts related to the development of a physically educated person.	X #1	X #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3	#4
	<input type="checkbox"/> #5	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
2. Growth and Development. Physical education teachers understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development.	X #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	X#3	X#4
	X#5	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
3. Diverse Students. Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning, and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.	<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3	X#4
	<input type="checkbox"/> #5	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	X#8

AAHPERD/NASPE STANDARD

4. Management and Motivation. Physical education teachers use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

5. Communication. Physical education teachers use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to enhance learning and engagement in physical activity settings.

6. Planning and Instruction. Physical education teachers plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals, based on state and national (NASPE K-12) standards.

7. Student Assessment. Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of students in physical activity.

8. Reflection. Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on others (e.g., students, parents/guardians, fellow professionals), and seek opportunities to grow professionally.

9. Technology. Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.

10. Collaboration. Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students' growth and well-being.

APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II

<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	X#3	X#4
<input type="checkbox"/> #5	X#6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3	X#4
<input type="checkbox"/> #5	X#6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	X#3	X#4
X#5	X#6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	X#3	X#4
X#5	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	X#3	X#4
X#5	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	X#7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3	X#4
X#5	X#6	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3	X#4
<input type="checkbox"/> #5	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	X#7	<input type="checkbox"/> #8

For the purpose of the 2008-2009 SAAC Report a two-page synopsis is provided for each of the eight key assessments (including a brief description of the specific assessment, its alignment with the relevant NASPE/NCATE standards, a brief analysis of the data findings and interpretation of the data/inferences from the assessment. The individual assignments, scoring rubrics and associated data for each key assessment are available upon request in hard copy) and electronically as a series of individual attachments (24) from Dr. Adrian Turner (Program Coordinator in PETE). All of the relevant teacher candidate assessment data has been entered into the PETE database for the 2008-2009 academic year. The figures delineated in this report are all factual and can be located in specific spreadsheets upon request from the program coordinator.

Key Assessment 1 (KA 1): Praxis II Physical Education Content Knowledge State Licensure Exam

1. Brief Description of the Assessment

In Ohio, all PETE teacher candidates are required to pass the Praxis II Physical Education Content Knowledge Exam, which means achieving a score of 153 or higher in order to obtain state licensure. According to test preparation materials provided by Educational Testing Service (ETS) “the Content Knowledge Test in Physical Education is designed to measure the professional knowledge of prospective teachers of physical education in elementary through senior high schools. The test assesses whether an examinee has the knowledge and competencies necessary for a beginning teacher of physical education” (ETS, 2005, p. 1). The examination has been used for the past two decades, including its earlier iteration as the National Teachers’ Exam (NTE). For 2008-2009 passing Praxis II is not a requirement for graduation from the PETE program at BGSU although many teacher candidates do elect to take the exam during their student teaching internships. PETE program faculty perceive that the physical education content knowledge examined on this test is material that teacher candidates must master as a prerequisite to becoming excellent teachers. Praxis II data is provided to institutions a year later by ETS therefore up-to-date candidate scores and sub-scores on the six categories of the physical education content knowledge test are for the 2007-2008 academic year.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

The Physical Education Content Knowledge Test consists of 120 multiple-choice questions and covers six major areas: (I) Fundamental Movements, Motor Development, and Motor Learning, (II) Movement Forms, (III) Fitness and Exercise Science, (IV) Social Science Foundations, (V) Biomechanics, and (VI) Health and Safety. Teacher candidates have two hours to complete the test. According to test preparation materials provided by ETS “knowledge of these subject areas enables teachers to understand the nature and purpose of the activities in the physical education curriculum; to evaluate and interpret the physical characteristics and performances of students in physical education classes; and to make decisions about the ongoing conduct of physical education classes and the needs of students in those classes. Questions test knowledge of essential facts, including the meaning of terms and placement of content elements in proper categories; understanding of relationships between and among areas of content, and the ability to apply concepts appropriately” (ETS, 2005, p. 1). The test is not intended to assess teaching skills per se, but rather to demonstrate teacher candidates’ fundamental knowledge in the major areas of physical education.

3. Analysis of the Data Findings

For the 2007-2008 academic year there were 21 program completers in PETE (15 took the Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam and 14 passed). The pass rate was 93.3% according to data received by BGSU from ETS and verified by the PETE program coordinator. For the 2006-2007 academic year there were 14 program completers in PETE (12 took the Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam and 11 passed). The pass rate was 91.7% according to data received by BGSU from ETS. For the

2005-2006 academic year there were 34 program completers in PETE (28 took the Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam and 25 passed). The pass rate was 89.3%. For the 2004-2005 academic year there were 19 program completers in PETE (17 took the Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam and 14 passed). The pass rate was 82.3%. The data reported from ETS suggest that 18 program completers took the exam (2004-2005) and only 14 passed (for a pass rate of 77.8%). It does not appear to the PETE faculty that the ETS figure is necessarily accurate for that year based on our detective work. Furthermore, there have been instances in several programs where individuals have claimed BGSU as their home institution, but who were not actually enrolled in a BGSU program. (Until 2006-2007 there had not been an accurate system to confirm who was, and was not, a program completer that took Praxis II). For the 2003-2004 academic year there were 32 program completers in PETE (30 took the Praxis II Content Knowledge Exam and 26 passed). The pass rate was 86.7%.

For 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 academic years a Microsoft Excel data file is used to house Praxis II data for this key assessment. As is customary with excel workbooks separate data worksheets are located with the labeled tabs at the bottom of the workbook. The data for all 8 BGSU PETE Key Assessments (KA's 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009) are located in Microsoft Excel data files for each KA available from the PETE Program Coordinator (Adrian Turner). Individual worksheets (with tabs at the bottom) are used to represent different tables and permit ease of review. The Praxis II summary scores for the academic years 2003-2008 are located in a bar chart (Chart 1—worksheet 1). There is also a table representing the overall scores for the 2007-2008 program completers in PETE who took Praxis II: Physical Education Content Knowledge exam (Table 2—worksheet 2) and a similar table (Table 3—worksheet 3) representing the Praxis II category scores (2007-2008). The data from Chart 1 indicate five-year trends for pass rates of BGSU PETE program completers in relation to the state of Ohio average.

On average (over 5 years) BGSU PETE candidates are passing the Praxis II content exam above the required 80% threshold required for national program recognition but just below the state average for PETE graduates which has been at 92% over an equivalent time span. The program faculty believes that a portion of the problem was related to teacher candidates standardized test-taking skills. Tutorial efforts have been undertaken during the PETE student teaching seminar to increase teacher candidate success rates. For the past three years a seminar class has been conducted to better acquaint teacher candidates with Praxis II test specifics for both the Physical Education Content Knowledge and the Principles of Learning and Teaching exams. PETE program faculty has also attempted to provide teacher candidates with additional resource materials (including reference to the electronic test preparation resources available via the internet—i.e., PEPraxis.com). The 2006-2007 (91.7%) and 2007-2008 (93.3%) pass rate data suggest that these efforts have made a difference to the performance of PETE teacher candidates on the Praxis II content knowledge exam.

4. Interpretation of the Data

While the overall mean score for teacher candidates was 157 for 2007-2008 (see Table 2) PETE teacher candidates have typically performed poorly in categories I (Fundamental Movements, Motor Development, and Motor Learning) and V (Biomechanics) on Praxis II (see Table 3). The data for 2007-2008 are indicative of this trend with BGSU teacher candidates averaging 20.4 points out of 27/36 points and 5.47 points out of 7/8 points for these respective categories. The data for biomechanics—category V does represent an improvement in mean teacher candidate scores from the previous academic year. In order to facilitate improved performance in these two categories as of Spring 2006 Kinesiology (KNS) Division 200 level courses in Motor Development for Physical Educators and Coaches (KNS 240), Principles of Motor Skill Acquisition (KNS 250), and Biomechanics for Teachers, Performers and Coaches (KNS 270) were

eliminated. Instead, teacher candidates now undertake an additional three hours (one hour in each course) and take Motor Development across the Lifespan (KNS 340), Motor Learning (KNS 350) and Biomechanics of Human Movement (KNS 370). By having teacher candidates undertake 300 level classes the Kinesiology faculty is attempting to facilitate a higher level of performance on the Praxis II examination and improve potential teachers' content knowledge to better inform their physical education instruction. Kinesiology faculty who teach these movement foundations courses have been provided with examples of resource materials during a Kinesiology Division seminar and have promised to make a concerted effort to address Praxis II preparation in their courses. Furthermore, the PETE program has recently been modified in response to student's performances on the Praxis II test. Beginning with the 2008-2009 PETE check-sheet teacher candidates are now required to pass Praxis II prior to undertaking their student teaching internships. The program faculty contends that this will place the Praxis II exam closer to the content knowledge (movement foundations) portion of the PETE program and also provide a stronger theoretical foundation for student teaching internships.

Key Assessment 2 (KA 2): Movement Performance

1. Description and Use

As indicated on the 2008-2009 BGSU PETE checksheet, the program is based on three main areas of study: Foundations of Human Movement, Movement Performance, and Professional Education (includes Curriculum and Instruction Courses). While the Praxis II (Content Knowledge Exam) assesses a teacher candidate's content knowledge via a standardized test, the PETE faculty developed KA 2 as a comprehensive measure of movement performance content knowledge. The assessment transgresses three movement content areas in physical education (Games, Dance, and Gymnastics) that are representative of the BGSU PETE program philosophy. It also addresses physical fitness in each of the three areas. The purpose of the movement performance assessment is for teacher candidates to acquire a higher level of movement performance knowledge and skill in Games, Dance and Gymnastics and to develop competence in learning and applying the epistemological principles that underlie inter-skill and intra-skill/movement progressions.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

The movement performance assignment addresses three NASPE Standards (1, 7, & 8), but the focus is primarily on the first NASPE Standard. **Standard 1-Content Knowledge (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6)**. A teacher candidate must know and understand the physical education content and disciplinary concepts that are involved in the development of a physically educated person. The teacher candidate must document movement performance correctly and perform at a high level in each of the three content areas. Finally, a teacher candidate must demonstrate knowledge of the state and national content standards and how these relate to learning goals. **Standard 7-Student Assessment (7.3)**. Physical education teachers must be able to understand and use a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques to improve skill/performance, increase understanding of content, and develop socially and emotionally. Specifically in this assessment teacher candidates will demonstrate the ability to effectively participate in self and peer evaluations in each content area (7.3). **Standard 8- Reflection (8.1)**. The ability to effectively reflect on the content and method of instructional delivery is a skill that needs to be developed by each teacher candidate. Specifically outcome 8.1 is addressed as each teacher candidate demonstrates an awareness of the reflective cycle when the introspective journal is selected as part of the assessment for a course.

3. Brief Analysis of Data

Teacher candidates' aggregated data for Fall 2008 (Table D1 through D3) represents candidates who had completed KNS 232 (Invasion Games), KNS 138 (Gymnastics), and KNS 137 (Dance) in Fall 2008. Teacher candidates' aggregated data for Spring 2009 (Table B1 through B3) represents a second cohort of students that had completed KNS 233 (Net/Wall Games), KNS 138 (Gymnastics), and KNS 137 (Dance) by the culmination of Spring 2009. **Standard 1-Content Knowledge-** In Fall 2008 the teacher candidates in KNS 232 (Invasion Games) were able to effectively document movement performance (100% earned a rating of either Acceptable or Target on all outcomes 1.1, 1.3, & 1.6). Teacher candidates were also competent in documenting movement performance in Dance (KNS 137) content as 63% of them achieved an acceptable rating (outcomes 1.1, 1.3 & 1.6) and 38% scored at the target level on the same three outcomes. The Fall 2008 data suggests that teacher candidates were generally competent in documenting movement performance in Gymnastics (KNS 138). In KNS 138, 100% of teacher candidates earned a rating of Acceptable or Target on outcomes 1.1 & 1.3, but 25% failed to demonstrate Acceptable or Target performance on outcome 1.6. These results may be indicative of the strong Invasion Games background many teacher candidates possess versus a lack of prior experience in gymnastics. One explanation for the low scores on outcome 1.6 was that teacher candidates failed to consistently identify the class learning objectives relative to the National Physical Education Content Standards in the Gymnastics (KNS 138) course. The results are particularly encouraging for Dance where last year (2007-2008) 60% of students failed to achieve an acceptable rating on outcome 1.6.

In Spring 2009 100% of teacher candidates scored at the Acceptable or Target level on outcomes 1.1, 1.3 & 1.6 in Dance (KNS 137) and Gymnastics (138). This was an improvement from 2007-2008 for dance and gymnastics perhaps due to the focus program faculty placed on these outcomes in Dance and Gymnastics courses during 2008-2009. The Net/Wall Games course (KNS 233) in Spring 2009 demonstrated surprisingly that students had more difficulty with this content. On three outcomes teacher candidates demonstrated unacceptable performance 1.1 (21%), 1.3 (36%) & 1.6 (14%). There are two potential explanations for this result. First, it was noted by the instructor that the teacher candidates failed to record or write the complete learning objectives in the lesson files and often failed to identify the tactic or concept that was covered during class. Second, it was assumed that the students would take the initiative and refer to the textbook or course outline to find the learning objectives and in multiple cases this did not occur. In terms of movement competence (outcome 1.2), the data indicate that BGSU teacher candidates are typically competent movers as only one student earned an unacceptable rating in Games, Dance, and Gymnastics over both semesters. The data indicate that teacher candidates could effectively (100% Acceptable or Target) apply bioscience principles (1.4) in dance and gymnastic classes in 2008-2009. They were less successful with net/wall games (86%)—Acceptable or Target. Additionally, 100% of teacher candidates could apply choreographic or fitness concepts to improve performance and maintain safety (1.3) and 93% could apply tactical concepts effectively in the Net/Wall games class in Spring 2009. **Standard 7-Student Assessment-** Aggregated data provides evidence that 100% of BGSU teacher candidates were able to participate in initial peer assessment activities with fellow students and conduct practical self-assessment of skill in Invasion games, Dance, and Gymnastics courses using assessment rubrics for the 2008-2009 academic year. For Net/Wall games 86% achieved an acceptable or target rating. **Standard 8-Reflection-** When the movement journal was used as the mode of assessment in both Invasion games and Dance classes aggregated data shows that 100% of the teacher candidates were effectively able to describe the movement experience in detail and provide a sound rationale for their likes and dislikes across two semesters.

4. Interpretation of the Data

Standard 1- BGSU teacher candidates were physically skilled in Games, Dance, and Gymnastics. Many of the PETE students have an extensive background in sport and generally appear to be skilled in Dance and Gymnastics where they have less experience. While physical competence and knowledge of invasion games is an area of strength for PETE students, it appears that recording and documenting content knowledge in net/wall games is more challenging for some teacher candidates. It is very encouraging to see that the overall assessment ratings improved for both Gymnastics and Dance content from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 suggesting that faculty efforts to provide concrete examples for teacher candidates written narratives may have assisted in their comprehension and analysis of the movement content in these two areas. PETE faculty will continue to analyze the differences in content knowledge scores between Games, Dance and Gymnastics in an ongoing effort to refine the movement performance assessment process.

Key Assessment 3 (KA 3): Planning Instruction

1. Brief Description of the Assessment

NASPE Key Assessment 3 is designed to be an “assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom instruction.” In the PETE program teacher candidates receive comprehensive training in lesson and unit planning. They are introduced to the PETE lesson plan format in the sophomore level course Introduction to Teaching Physical Education (KNS 247) and gain additional experience in planning and teaching their peers and K-12 students in the Instructional Strategies in Physical Education (KNS 312) class (usually undertaken in the junior year). In KNS 432 (elementary methods) and KNS 472 (secondary methods) senior students have the opportunity to plan their teaching extensively across 15-week semesters prior to their culminating student teaching experiences (KNS 492/497). In addition to planning two units of instruction in KNS 472 teacher candidates plan consecutive individual lessons facilitating their understanding of physical education content development. For the past nine semesters each teacher candidate has submitted an individual lesson plan for assessment each week (for NASPE Key Assessment 3). Each teacher candidate provides a lesson plan to the course instructor for initial examination prior to instruction. After teaching the lesson the reflection section is completed by the teacher candidate and the final plan is submitted for assessment at the next class meeting. The assessment data for each teacher candidate over the past year (Fall 2008-Spring 2009) is presented in Tables E & F. It represents an average rating for individual teacher candidates on each of the nine lesson plan components (Objectives, Organization, Developmentally Appropriate Practice, Instructional Model, Task Presentation, Learning Experience, Feedback/Cues, Assessment & Reflection) across 10 lesson plan assessments.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

The PETE planning assessment is an authentic learning experience that is aligned to selected NASPE Beginning Teacher Standards and outcomes.

Standard 6: Planning and Instruction (6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.8, 6.9). The teacher candidate writes instructional objectives for cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains including task (behavior), situation (context/setting/condition), and criteria for assessing learning in the plan (6.1). He/she identifies an instructional strategy based on selected content and student needs (6.3) and designs safe learning experiences that incorporate task progression (6.4). Learning experiences are also planned to include effective demonstrations (6.8) and instructional cues/feedback are indicated on the lesson proforma to facilitate students’ skillful movement performances (6.9).

Standard 2: Growth and Development (2.3). The teacher candidate designs developmentally appropriate practices (experiences) and is able to accommodate the student by providing variations in both the task and environment in the lesson plan.

Standard 4: Management & Motivation (4.2). In order to provide optimal learning experiences the teacher candidate must indicate how to organize, allocate, and manage resources (e.g., students, time/space, equipment) in the lesson plan.

Standard 7: Student Assessment (7.2). On an individual lesson basis, information is derived on student performance by either well-planned authentic or traditional assessments. The assessment data is used to provide feedback to the students and facilitate subsequent instructional planning by the teacher candidates

Standard 8: Reflection (8.1). In response to eight post-teaching reflection questions (Post-Teaching Reflection Form in the plan) the teacher candidate critically analyzes his/her teaching and sets new teaching goals. The teacher candidate uses this information to plan and implement changes in the subsequent lessons.

3. Analysis of the Data Findings

In reference to NASPE standards 2, 4, 6, 7, & 8 (and their specific outcomes) aggregated data tables (E2, F2) indicate that BGSU PETE teacher candidates are effectively able to plan for instruction. Overall 99% of teacher candidates for Fall 2008 (64% Acceptable, 35% Target) and Spring 2009 (75% Acceptable, 25% Target) received passing scores for their 10 lesson plan submissions across 5 NASPE Standards.

4. Interpretation of the Data

Standard 6-- While teacher candidates scored at Acceptable or Target levels on all standards for planning several had difficulty with specific planning outcomes in Standard 6. In Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 outcome 6.4 was scored as Acceptable for just over 63% of teacher candidates each semester. Learning to effectively time the components of a lesson and organize people, space and equipment efficiently is a frequent problem for novice teachers. The specific lesson component “Learning Experience” that addressed outcome 6.4 was planned adequately in all candidates’ lesson documentation, however, when this issue coincided with the use of advanced instructional models like Sport Education and Games for Understanding (tactical approach)--where secondary students are expected to transition from activities, e.g., non-playing roles to scrimmages (Sport Education) or from modified games to technique practices and returning to modified games (Games for Understanding)—difficulties frequently emerge. The data suggest that only 37% of teacher candidates performed at the target level in this area. All of the teacher candidates in fall 2008 and spring 2009 benefited from information derived from previous data (2007-2008) and were cautioned about the importance of documenting specific and congruent task feedback statements and learning cues on their instructional plans (outcome 6.9). In Spring 2009, 100% scored at an acceptable level and during Fall 2008 69% scored at an acceptable level and 31% at a target level on the aforementioned planning component (NASPE outcome 6.9).

Standard 2—In Spring 2009, 88% and during Fall 2008, 46% of teacher candidates scored at an Acceptable level for “developmentally appropriate practice”. The remainder all achieved Target ratings for NASPE outcome 2.3 during both semesters. The data indicated that teacher candidates were effective at selecting tasks appropriate to students’ developmental levels and experiential backgrounds. They also included appropriate task accommodations in their plans particularly during fall 2008.

Standard 4—During 2008-2009 academic year 75% of teacher candidates scored at an Acceptable level and 25% received a Target rating for their plans to organize students and manage resources that would provide equitable learning experiences (outcome 4.2). Small class sizes may have assisted the teacher candidates in meeting this standard.

Standard 7—Ninety percent of teacher candidates achieved Acceptable ratings across both semesters (Spring 2009-Fall 2008) replicating the results from the previous academic year for assessment planning. One student recorded an Unacceptable rating during Fall 2008 and also struggled with this component of the planning process during his teaching internship in Spring 2009. With a single exception teacher candidates planned assessments aligned with lesson objectives and analyzed and interpreted data to make future instructional decisions at an acceptable level (outcome 7.2). Only one additional student really excelled in this task at a target level during the 2008-2009 academic year

Standard 8—The percentage of students scoring at either Acceptable or Target ratings showed little variation across the academic year (Spring 2009--75% Acceptable, 25% Target and Fall 2008--64% Acceptable, 35% Target). However, no individual candidate averaged an Unacceptable rating for Reflection during either semester, indicating that teacher candidates analyzed the success of their lessons and identified areas for improvement adequately in subsequent plans (outcome 8.1).

**Key Assessment 4 (KA 4):
Assessment of Student Teaching Internship**

1. Brief description of the Assessment

NASPE Key Assessment 4 is an assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice. The Assessment of the Student Teaching Internship is aligned with the seven categories developed by the College of EDHD at BGSU. These seven domains are as follows: (A) Organizing content knowledge for student learning, (B) Creating an environment for student learning, (C) Teaching for student learning, (D) Teacher professionalism, (E) Sensitivity and response to diverse students and contexts, (F) Technology competency and utilization, and (G) Collaborative interaction with colleagues, parents/guardians, and/or community members. The PETE program faculty aligned the NASPE standards and outcomes with the seven EDHD categories in the development of the accompanying rubric. These seven categories represent the general skills and competencies all EDHD teacher candidates are assessed on, but this assessment rubric is specific to PETE teacher candidates.

Assessment data is compiled from the Spring 2009 (Tables H1, H2, H3) and Fall 2008 (Tables I1, I2, I3) student teaching internships. Each teacher candidate is assessed on the basis of observations of teaching, lesson plans and reflections, and completion of other required assignments.

2. Alignment with the NASPE Standards

The student teaching assessment is an authentic learning experience that addresses outcomes across the 10 NASPE standards, as the capstone teacher candidate experience. For the purpose of NASPE/NCATE accreditation the focus will be on the following six standards:

Standard 3: Diverse Students (3.1, 3.2) is incorporated in Domain E as the teacher candidate develops and presents appropriate lessons that are sensitive to the needs, abilities, and developmental levels of the students in various classes.

Standard 4: Management and Motivation (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5) is addressed in Domain B as the teacher candidate creates a learning environment that incorporates managerial routines, organizational techniques; uses a variety of developmentally appropriate teaching practices, strategies for personal and social responsibility; and creates an effective behavior management plan.

Standard 5: Communication (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4) is addressed in both Domains C and E as the teacher candidate demonstrates effective communication skills while teaching and presents information using various forms of delivery.

Standard 6: Planning and Instruction (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10) is addressed in Domains A, B, and C through creating and implementing unit and lesson plans. Developing and executing effective learning experiences for students also met this standard. The NASPE outcomes are integral to organizing content, creating an appropriate learning environment, and teaching for student learning.

Standard 7: Student Assessment (7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4) is addressed by components of Domains C and D through utilizing assessment during instruction to assess student learning. These outcomes are essential components of the overall teaching-learning process.

Standard 9: Technology (9.1, 9.2, 9.3) is the primary focus of Domain F. The teacher candidate infuses technology in various learning experiences for his/her classes and when completing several student teaching internship assignments.

3. Analysis of the Data on Student Teaching Internship

Data are presented in the seven college-mandated categories (Tables H2—Spring 2009 & I2—Fall 2008) and translated into the NASPE standards for ease of review for Spring 2009 (Table H3) and Fall 2008 (Table I3). The data for the six NASPE Standards (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9) are highlighted in these tables. The data from the Student Teaching Internship Assessment indicated

the teacher candidates were successful in meeting these six standards and their associated outcomes at the Acceptable or Target levels, (Fall 2008, 96%; Spring 2009, 98%). The data replicated within one percentage point the levels for the 2007-2008 academic year.

4. Interpretation of the Data

Standard 3 (3.1, 3.2)- For the *outcome 3.1* and *3.2*, 100% of the teacher candidates in Fall 2008 were rated as either Acceptable (46%) or Target (56%). In Fall all teacher candidates demonstrated strong skills in working with students having diverse needs by planning and implementing appropriate learning experiences. They were also able to identify available resources and services for their students. In Spring 2009 96% were rated as either Target (54%) or Acceptable (42%). One teacher candidate was rated as unacceptable after demonstrating a weakness in this area and had difficulty working with students from diverse backgrounds.

Standard 4 (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)- The vast majority of teacher candidates met these outcomes at the Acceptable or Target levels, (Fall 2008, 96%, Spring 2008, 100%). Most were able to effectively manage and motivate their students. Only *outcomes 4.4 and 4.5*, in Fall 2008, indicated that two teacher candidates had difficulty with establishing effective behavior management plans.

Standard 5 (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)- For Fall 2008 93% of the teacher candidates rated at the Acceptable or Target levels and for Spring 2009 98% rated at the Acceptable or Target levels. Generally teacher candidates effectively communicated with their students although for *outcomes 5.2 & 5.4* (Fall 2008) two teacher candidates did not communicate managerial information in a variety of ways (i.e., bulletin boards, task cards) and received unacceptable ratings on the assessment rubric as a consequence.

Standard 6 (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10)- For all the outcomes addressed in this standard with the exception of *outcome 6.6*, 100% of teacher candidates rated as either Acceptable or Target in Fall 2008. *Outcome 6.6* also indicated that one teacher candidate was unacceptable in Spring 2009. The outcome dealt with the integration of knowledge and skills from multiple content areas. The specific teacher candidates were not able to integrate outside classroom experiences into physical education instruction, as they did not realize the potential impact this area had on the overall instructional process in physical education. In Spring 2009 two teacher candidates also utilized teaching resources and curriculum materials that might be considered inappropriate for the age of students that they were instructing. With these exceptions 98% of teacher candidates performed at Acceptable or Target levels for Standard 6 in Spring 2009.

Standard 7 (7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4)- For *outcomes 7.3* and *7.4* 100% of the teacher candidates were rated at the Acceptable or Target levels for both semesters (Fall 2008 & Spring 2009). For *outcome 7.1* (Fall 2008 & Spring 2009) 92% of the teacher candidates were rated as Acceptable or Target. Using a variety of appropriate authentic assessments (*outcome 7.2*) presented a problem for one teacher candidate in Fall 08. This could be due to the teacher candidate's lack of comfort with this type of assessment (requiring student assistance) or preference for a more traditional style of assessment.

Standard 9 (9.1, 9.2, 9.3)- In Fall 2008, 97% of the teacher candidates were rated at either the Acceptable or Target levels for all outcomes and 95% were rated similarly in Spring (2009). This indicated appropriate use of technology by the vast majority of teacher candidates. For Fall 2008, one teacher candidate had difficulty with outcome 9.2. and two others also had a similar problem in Spring 2009. This could be attributed to the specific host schools having limited technology resources and also the failure of the teacher candidates to pursue additional technological resources for use during instruction.

KA 5: Assessment of Candidate Effect on Student Learning

1. Brief description of the Assessment

The impact of the teacher candidate on student learning is assessed through the BGSU Teacher Work Sample Project (TWS). The TWS was developed in the Summer of 2006 and data collection continued through Spring 2009. The TWS is completed during the student teaching internship (KNS 492/KNS 497), the teacher candidate's last semester in the program. The TWS consists of five parts that address various components known to impact student learning.

- Part One- *Define the Learning Environment*
- Part Two- *Use Assessments to Influence Learning*
- Part Three- *Design for Instruction*
- Part Four- *Analysis of Student Learning*
- In Part Five- *Reflection and Self*

The five components of the TWS incorporate all of the skills, knowledge, and dispositions the teacher candidate gains throughout the BGSU PETE program. The TWS incorporates written work and technology assignments to complete this project.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

The following NASPE standards and outcomes are addressed in the TWS assignment. **Standard 2: Growth and Development (2.2)** is incorporated in Part One by collecting background information on the community, school, and highlighted class and in Part Two by the completion of a pre-assessment of student needs. This information is needed to develop appropriate instructional objectives for the unit, as well as for lesson plans.

Standard 6: Planning and Instruction (6.1, 6.4, 6.5, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10) is incorporated in Part Two and Part Three of the TWS. In Part Two, the development of the pre-assessment tool provides an assessment of student needs. These results are used to design appropriate learning outcomes for the unit and lessons. In Part Three, the development of appropriate unit and lesson plans are based upon information obtained in the pre-assessment. Actual instructional skills of the teacher candidate are documented in video samples of a highlighted lesson (iMovie).

Standard 7: Student Assessment (7.2, 7.3, 7.4) is incorporated in Part Two and Part Four of the TWS by the development and implementation of both pre-assessment and post-assessment tools which determine student needs for instruction and measure the amount of student learning taking place.

Standard 8 Reflection (8.1, 8.3) is incorporated in Part Five as the teacher candidate reflects upon the results of the post-assessment tools and also upon the impact of the TWS on student learning.

Standard 9: Technology (9.1, 9.2, 9.3) is incorporated in Part Three as the teacher candidate develops learning experiences that utilize technology. The documentation of the teacher candidate's instructional skills is highlighted in an iMovie (indicative of the teacher candidate's ability to use technology). Part Four also requires the teacher candidate to use technology to report pre-assessment data and post-assessment data graphically to determine the impact of instruction on student learning.

3. Analysis of Data for TWS

An analysis of data for both Spring 2009 (Table J2) and Fall 2008 (Table K2) provided the following results. **Part One** (*NASPE outcome 2.2*) 100% of teacher candidates received an Acceptable or greater rating (92% Target in Spring 2009%, 69% Target in Fall 2008). In **Part Two** (*outcomes 7.2 & 7.3 combined*), 96% of teacher candidates received an Acceptable or Target rating across the 2008-2009 academic year. For *outcome 6.1*, 100% of teacher candidates received an Acceptable or Target rating. In **Part Three** (*outcomes, 6.4 & 6.5*) 100% of teacher candidates were rated as either Acceptable or Target. In *outcomes 6.8, 6.9, and 6.10*, 85% of the teacher candidates received an Acceptable or Target rating in Fall 2008 and 100% of teacher candidates were rated as either Acceptable or Target in Spring 2009. In *outcomes 9.1 and 9.2*,

88% (85%, 92%) of teacher candidates were rated at either the Acceptable or Target levels across the academic year. **Part Four** (*outcomes 7.4 & 9.3* combined), 92% of teacher candidates were rated either Acceptable or Target. For **Part Five** (*outcomes 8.1 & 8.3*), 88% of teacher candidates were rated as acceptable or target in Spring 2009. In *Fall 2008* 100% were rated as acceptable or higher (92% target for outcome 8.1 and 77% target for outcome 8.3).

4. Interpretation of the Data

The data verified the goal of the TWS assignment. The majority of teacher candidates reported improved scores between the pre-assessment tool and the post-assessment tool. The results also indicated the NASPE standards and outcomes addressed were met in full by all teacher candidates except one who elected not to complete Part V of the Teacher Work Sample in Spring 2009. For **Standard 7- Outcomes 7.2 and 7.3**, the teacher candidates designed appropriate pre-assessment tools to assess the needs of the students. The teacher candidates designed game performance, psychomotor, and self-assessment tools. These outcomes, *7.2 and 7.3*, were met again as effective post-assessment tools were created that documented student learning. *Outcome 7.4* was met when results obtained in the pre-assessment tool were used in planning instructional experiences in the unit and as the teacher candidates reflected on results of the post-assessment to determine the impact instruction had on student learning.

Standard 6- Outcome 6.1 was met as all of the teacher candidates identified, developed, and implemented effective learning goals for their students. *Outcomes 6.4 and 6.5* were addressed as all the teacher candidates designed and implemented appropriate learning experiences that were safe, developmentally appropriate, and based upon principles of effective instruction, disciplinary, and pedagogical content knowledge. *Outcomes 6.8, 6.9, and 6.10* were met as the majority of teacher candidates (with two exceptions) integrated combinations of appropriate demonstrations, explanations, and various other instructional strategies into effective learning experiences. These were illustrated through the development of an iMovie created from a highlighted lesson.

Standard 8- Outcome 8.1, was addressed as the majority of teacher candidates reflected well upon the results of the post-assessment tools and critiqued their teaching performances, discussed the manner in which teaching goals were met, and explained the impact on student learning. *All the teacher candidates met outcome 8.3* during Fall 2008 as they discussed the use of the TWS experience on future teaching. However, 15% of teacher candidates in Spring 2009 failed to meet this requirement, as they did not document in detail the impact of the TWS on future instruction.

Standard 2- Outcome 2.2, the collection of relevant background data provided the teacher candidates with insights into the contexts of their students. All of the teacher candidates utilized this information appropriately in the development of learning goals and learning experiences based upon the information obtained.

Standard 9- Outcomes 9.1 and 9.2, Most teacher candidates utilized appropriate technology for physical education. However, some teacher candidates were placed in schools with limited technological resources. The digital video camera was the most common form of technology used. *Outcome 9.3* was met by all teacher candidates with one exception, as the TWS required them to use technology to report and compare the results of the pre-assessment and post-assessment tools to determine the impact the instructional experiences had on student learning.

KA6: Teaching Effectiveness Portfolio Electronic Version (E-Portfolio)

1. Description and Use

The purpose of the electronic portfolio is to document the progress of each teacher candidate as he/she completes Teaching-Learning Process in Middle Childhood-Young Adult Physical Education (KNS 472-Secondary Methods). The course is usually undertaken in the senior year during the semester prior to student teaching. The assignment was originally constructed in 2003 for teacher candidates to document their effectiveness as beginning teachers consistent with the criteria defined by the Praxis III Domains (ETS, 1994). PETE program faculty subsequently aligned NASPE standards and outcomes for initial PETE teacher candidates with the Praxis III sub-domains and created a scoring rubric to assess teacher candidate performance as Unacceptable (0-3.4), Acceptable (3.5-4.4) or Target (4.5-5.0) for each associated NASPE outcome. Each teacher candidate presents electronic evidence (including QuickTime Digital Video Clips in a PowerPoint presentation), collected over the course of a semester teaching physical education in a public school.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

The electronic portfolio assignment is an authentic learning experience where teacher candidates collect evidence aligned to NASPE Beginning Teacher Standards and Pathwise Domains. The electronic portfolio addresses outcomes across eight NASPE standards but primarily focuses on the following four standards.

Standard 4: Management and Motivation (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5). The ultimate goal of teaching is student learning and teacher candidates are required to submit evidence of their abilities to implement managerial routines (4.1), promote high levels of engagement by organizing resources equitably (4.2) and establish appropriate behavioral expectations (4.4). Teacher candidates must also document in their portfolios use of a variety of verbal and non-verbal techniques to maintain an effective and safe learning environment (4.3/4.5) and motivate students to participate in physical activity.

Standard 5: Communication (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4). Teacher candidates submit electronic evidence of their abilities to communicate tasks (5.1), which are clear, demonstrate respect/equity for all students, and deliver managerial and instructional content (5.2). Teacher candidates also document their abilities to communicate task intent in multiple ways so that all students have opportunities for success (5.3/5.4). NASPE Standards 4 and 5 are primarily addressed in Praxis Domain B of the electronic portfolio.

Standard 6: Planning and Instruction (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 6.10). The teacher candidate's ability to organize content knowledge for student learning is assessed in four main areas in Praxis Domain C of the electronic portfolio: (i) the ability to articulate clear and appropriate learning goals (6.1/6.2); (ii) the ability to select teaching strategies, which reflect student needs, safety, and facilitate learning (6.3/6.4/6.10); (iii) the ability to identify teaching resources and necessary curriculum material (6.7); and (iv) the ability to provide effective demonstrations and explanations of the content to students (6.8/6.9). Teacher candidates must be able to provide evidence of their abilities to articulate clear and appropriate learning goals. Each goal must contain a behavior, condition and criterion for success. All learning goals are related to the appropriate NASPE K-12 standard.

Standard 9: Technology (9.1, 9.3). The teacher candidate uses technology to provide high quality electronic evidence (QuickTime clips and digital documents in the PowerPoint presentation) of his/her teaching ability (9.1) and also utilizes technology in resource location to enhance professional development (9.3).

3. Brief Analysis of the Data

All data are included from two consecutive semesters (Spring 2009-Fall 2008). Aggregated data are presented in the Four Praxis III domains (Tables L2—Spring 2009, M2—Fall 2008) and translated into the NASPE standards for ease of SPA review for Spring 2009 (Table L3), Fall 2008 (Table M3). In reference to NASPE standards 4, 5, 6, & 9 (and their specific outcomes) the

aggregated data tables indicate that BGSU PETE teacher candidates are able to effectively manage and motivate students, communicate efficiently, plan appropriately, and effectively use technology to increase learning. **Standard 4 – Management and Motivation-** The results suggest the teacher candidates were able to motivate and manage students effectively with a pass rate of 98% over two semesters of data collection. **Standard 5 – Communication-** The results suggest the teacher candidates were consistently able to communicate with students effectively (100% of teacher candidates earned a rating of Acceptable or Target during Spring 2009 and Fall 2008). **Standard 6 – Planning and Instruction-** The data suggest the teacher candidates were able to effectively plan and select appropriate teaching strategies with 100% (52% Acceptable, 48% Target--Spring 2009, 40% Acceptable, 60% Target--Fall 2008) earning passing scores. Interestingly the Fall 2008 data replicate precisely the percentage data obtained in Fall 2007 for planning and instruction on this assessment rubric. **Standard 9 – Technology-** The results suggest that the teacher candidates were adequately skilled in terms of using technology to enhance learning and to grow professionally. In all, 100% of the 21 teacher candidates earned an Acceptable or Target rating over the 2008-2009 academic year. In Fall 2008 92% of teacher candidates scored at the target level and in Spring 2009 75% also performed in the same assessment category.

4. *Interpretation of the Data Findings*

Standard 4—Fall 2008 data indicated that 46% of the teacher candidates were rated as Acceptable and 54% as Target. During spring 2008 only 34% were rated as Target and 63% were rated as acceptable. The data are indicative of teacher candidates managing larger teaching groups during the spring 2009 semester than in Fall 2008. Typically novice teachers experience some initial difficulties when instructing larger numbers of students. One teacher candidate was also rated as unacceptable on one of the management criteria (4.2) due to an inability to organize and allocate learning resources effectively. Despite some remediation this problem persisted during the teacher candidate's internship in Spring 2009.

Standard 5—During Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 teacher candidates experienced little difficulty in communicating with students. They appeared to clearly understand the importance of stipulating high expectations (critical demandingness) when conveying managerial and instructional information to their charges.

Standard 6-- This percentage of success has been consistently high across both semesters of data collection (2008-2009). It appears that teacher candidates in each of the last two semesters have had little difficulty in showcasing effective teaching strategies (NASPE K-12 outcomes 6.1-6.10) in their electronic portfolios. During Fall 2008 60% of teacher candidates achieved a target level rating. Each of these teacher candidates provided pertinent examples of pedagogical content knowledge and was assessed accordingly in the sub-domains.

Standard 9-- There were no instances of teacher candidates receiving Unacceptable ratings for the technology component of the E-portfolio in either semester. In Fall 2008 92% achieved a target score on this part of the assessment while 75% also scored at the highest level in Spring 2009. Teacher candidates methodically review their teaching episodes on digital videotape and subsequently create QuickTime Digital Movies and other electronic artifacts to demonstrate their pre-lesson preparation, effective teaching practices, post-lesson reflection, and developing professionalism. The teacher candidates technological competencies have clearly improved based on this assessment over the past three years.

KA 7: Reflection and Collaboration

1. Brief Description of the Assessment

The *Reflection and Collaboration Project* is an additional assessment that addresses NASPE Standards 8 & 10. The project is undertaken during the student teaching internship. The five-assignment project enables the teacher candidate to demonstrate his/her ability to think critically, reflect and initiate collaborative relationships that support teaching/learning. The efforts of the teacher candidate are nurtured, reinforced and supported by the classroom mentor teacher and university mentor as the teacher candidate evolves into a beginning teacher at the culmination of the BGSU PETE program.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

Standard 8: Teacher Reflection (8.1, 8.2, 8.3) is assessed in the first three assignments. The *Daily Reflection Journal* specifically supports NASPE outcome 8.1 in that it requires the teacher candidate to reflect on instructional situations, critically evaluate the teaching scenario, and intimate his/her specific journal entry to one of the seven College of EDHD student teaching domains (see KA 4). The *Teacher Behaviors Assignment* encourages the teacher candidate to construct a plan for professional growth based on evidence derived from using selected self-assessment instruments. An instructional weakness is identified, a teaching goal established and a potential strategy selected. Teacher candidates' follow-up reflective reports focus on teaching progress until the goal is achieved (NASPE outcome 8.3). The *Resource Log* focuses on outcome 8.2, affording the teacher candidate opportunities to document his/her ability to locate professional physical education literature, helpful colleagues, and professional organizations to promote development as a reflective practitioner.

Standard 10: Collaboration (10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4) is assessed in project assignments three, four and five. The *Resource Log* corroborates Standard 10--Collaboration (outcome 10.3) by encouraging the teacher candidate to identify community resources to enhance activity opportunities. In addition, collaboration with parents/guardians and colleagues is documented in the *Resource Log* to fulfill outcome 10.4. The *Advocacy Assignment* (outcome 10.1) requires the teacher candidate to identify and select an advocacy role, (Sherrill, 1999) explain the associated project, and discuss its impact on the physical education program. Finally, the *Professional Development Initiative* addresses outcome 10.2 as the teacher candidate seeks a professional development activity within the broader field of education and discusses its impact on his/her instruction.

3. Analysis of the Data Findings

In examining the data associated with **NASPE Standard 8 Reflection** (8.1, 8.2, 8.3) PETE teacher candidates demonstrated pass rates of 92% (Spring, 2009) and 90% (Fall, 2008) in Tables O2 and P2 respectively. All teacher candidates, with one exception, were rated as Acceptable or Target on the *Daily Reflection Journal* (outcome 8.1) during spring 2009. The teacher candidate failed to complete the journal. Two teacher candidates also failed to complete the reflective journal on a regular basis in fall 2008. There was minimal variance in teacher candidates' abilities to document professional resources in the *Resource Log* (outcome 8.2) between semesters. In Fall 2008 the success rate was 100%, and in Spring 2009 the pass rate was 92%. For the *Teacher Behaviors Assignment* (outcome 8.3) the pass rate was 92% in Spring 2009 but only 85% in Fall 2008. For **Standard 10 Collaboration** (10.1, 10.2, 10.3, and 10.4) the results were fairly consistent across both semesters--92% of teacher candidates scored at Acceptable or Target levels on all assignments in Spring 2009 versus 90% in Fall 2008. During the Fall semester pass rates for specific assignments and outcomes were as follows: *Advocacy Assignment* (outcome 10.1) 85%; *Professional Development Initiative* (outcome 10.2) 100%; *Resource Log* documentation of community resources, (outcome 10.3) 77%; and pursuing productive relationships with parents/guardians and colleagues cited in the *Resource Log* (outcome 10.4) 100%.

4. Interpretation of the Data

Standard 8—The first assignment pertaining to reflective abilities, (*Daily Reflection Journal*--Outcome 8.1), was successfully completed by 88% of teacher candidates during the 2008-2009 academic year. This may be attributed to previous extensive reflection opportunities, like those involved in lesson planning and movement performance experiences, in the formative physical

education pedagogy classes, prior to student teaching. One teacher candidate failed to submit the reflective journal during Spring 2009 and this had a major impact on the candidates' performance during the teaching internship. Across the 2008-2009 academic year 25 of 26 teacher candidates successfully located and recorded the use of available resources, (*Resource Log*, outcome 8.2). This performance marked an improvement from the 2007-2008 academic year where there was a perception that the hectic school day schedule did not allow sufficient time for effective collaboration with colleagues regarding teaching resources. The *Teacher Behaviors Assignment* (outcome 8.3) again appeared to be the most problematic of the reflection assignments in both semesters. It required teacher candidates to record data over time on a selected area of professional growth. During Fall 2008 two teacher candidates failed to consistently file and summarize weekly follow-up reports on their selected teaching behavior as stipulated in the scoring rubric. The same candidate mentioned previously in Spring 2009 also failed to submit the *Teacher Behaviors Assignment* for assessment.

Standard 10—Teacher candidates' success in Collaborative assignments (Standard 10) was fairly evident for the 2008-2009 academic year. Indeed, the *Advocacy Assignment* (outcome 10.1—2008-2009) data revealed improvement from the previous academic year in terms of the number of teacher candidates scoring at the Target level—nearly 50% across both semesters. This might be due to the number of teacher candidates in placements where advocacy opportunities were encouraged and facilitated by schools (e.g., physical education open houses) rather than regarded as more of a nuisance by several site placements in previous years. (Specific advocacy role examples were added to the Advocacy assignment-scoring rubric last year to provide teacher candidates with more careful guidance on this assessment). The *Professional Development Initiative* (outcome 10.2) data indicated a slightly lower pass rate in Spring 2009. Most teacher candidates during Fall 2008 benefited from school districts offering in-service training for their educators at the beginning of the school year. These professional development opportunities were less common for teacher candidates during spring although many teacher candidates took initiative and attended alternative professional development activities. Achievement of Outcome 10.3 (seeking community resources, *Resource Log*) proved challenging for nearly a quarter of teacher candidates during the Fall 2008 semester. A number of them were placed in settings where obtaining local community resources to enhance physical activity opportunities was more difficult for student teachers than the PETE faculty initially anticipated. The faculty has now revised this assignment to more fairly accommodate teacher candidates in a variety of school settings. In general teacher candidates documented productive interactions with parents/guardians in their *Resource Logs*, (outcome 10.4) to promote student growth via various forms of communication (e.g., telephone, parent-teacher meetings) across the 2008-2009 academic year. The pass rate of 96% was indicative of their success in this mode of contact.

Key Assessment 8 (KA 8) Diverse Students:

1. Brief description of the Assessment and its use in the Program

NASPE Standard 3 (Diverse Students) is assessed as a requirement of KNS 433 *Adapted Physical Activity*, which is a core course for all teacher candidates in PETE. The NASPE assessment data for both Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 are derived from a section of a practicum logbook/ reflective journal. The specific section is entitled *Background or Epidemiological Information*. The assessment requires teacher candidates to complete the six steps or responsibilities of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) as a summative report of a 15-hour practicum based on their experiences in identifying, selecting and implementing appropriate instruction for an individual with a special educational need.

2. Alignment with NASPE Standards

In the *Background or Epidemiological Information* section of the logbook teacher candidates are required to complete all six responsibilities or steps of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) as expected by the IEP meeting participants' needs as mandated under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004).

Standard 3: Diverse Students (3.1, 3.2)

From the IEP responsibilities, three steps aligned with NASPE Outcome 3.1 *Identify, select and implement appropriate instruction that is sensitive to students' strengths/ weaknesses, multiple needs, learning styles, and prior experiences (e.g. cultural, personal, family, community)* and these steps are: Step 1: Discuss future planning, Step 2: Discuss Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance, and Step 4: Identify Measurable Goals, Including Objectives and Academic and Functional Goals, and Assessment Procedures. From the IEP responsibilities three steps aligned with NASPE Outcome 3.2 *Use appropriate services and resources to meet diverse learning needs* and these steps are: Step 3: Identify Your Child's Specialized Educational Needs for this IEP; Step 5: Identify Needed Services, Based on Peer-Reviewed Research to the Extent Practicable and Step 6: Determine Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

3. Analysis of the Data Findings

The data for the academic year 2008-2009 in which the Assessment was operational were reported on a semester-by-semester basis for both outcomes in the attached candidate data derived from the assessment (Tables Q2 & R2). The results of the assessments for Outcome 3.1 in Fall 2008 indicated that 80% of teacher candidates scored at or above the Acceptable level. In Spring 2009 100% scored at or above the Acceptable level. In general, the data indicated that teacher candidates when working one-to-one with an individual with a disability are able to identify, select, and implement appropriate instruction and effectively present this information as part of the six-step IEP sequence, which is a federally mandated format.

The results of the assessment for Outcome 3.2 indicated that 78% of teacher candidate performance was at or above the Acceptable level in Fall 2008. In Spring 2009 100% of teacher candidates scored at or above the Acceptable level. However, data for Outcome 3.2 in Fall 2008-Spring 2009 also provided evidence that not all teacher candidates completed their practicum at field-site placements that required completion of Steps 3, 5, and 6 of the IEP. There were three field sites with either adults and/or clients situated in non-educational settings where these three steps were not appropriate. As a consequence three teacher candidates did not complete this element of the assessment over the two semesters. However, the variety of field-sites available provided opportunities for most teacher candidates to use appropriate services and explore different resources to meet diverse learning needs.

For both Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 there were a higher proportion of Acceptable ratings reported than Target performance ratings in Fall 2008. Only 21% were at a Target level for both outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 in Fall 2008.

4. Interpretation of the Data

Currently the teacher candidates are effectively meeting the NASPE standard and associated outcomes for working with diverse students relative to the requirements determined by federal law with respect to an IEP. The various field sites and different disability populations provide opportunities to identify, select, and implement appropriate instruction that is sensitive to individuals' strengths/weaknesses, multiple needs, learning styles, and prior experiences (aligned with NASPE outcome 3.1). The data generated for Outcome 3.2 indicated that the majority of teacher candidates, when appropriate, were able to provide services and resources that meet the diverse needs of students. In the 2007-2008 academic year 12 teacher candidates were placed in settings where outcome 3.2 was not addressed because the field site placement was a community-based program with adults. For the 2008-2009 academic year only three teacher candidates were placed in similar settings where outcome 3.2 could not be addressed. Although this represents an improvement from the previous year the situation is not perfect. In the future, more extensive efforts will be made to ensure that all teacher candidates are consistently placed in educational settings in order that outcome 3.2 can be comprehensively addressed by PETE teacher candidates. This may require some creative scheduling arrangements by the teacher candidate (frequently a senior with limited scheduling flexibility) and the PETE program. The performance evidence for both Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 indicated that following completion of this practicum experience the vast majority of teacher candidates were able to provide evidenced-based support for individuals requiring an IEP with a specific emphasis on needs within physical education.

4. Actions Taken/Program Improvements

The SAAC review process has provided a vehicle for systematic assessment of the PETE program at BGSU with the ultimate goals of informing and improving the education and preparation of PETE candidates. The information collected from the eight key assessments represents only the “tip of the iceberg” and fails to effectively illustrate the meticulous efforts of program faculty to design and implement a comprehensive assessment system that provides performance-based data to indicate the effectiveness of the BGSU PETE program. The process has encouraged the program faculty to redesign a number of program assessment procedures and better incorporate specific NASPE standards and outcomes into individual teacher candidate assignments. Throughout the eight key assessments all 44 NASPE outcomes are addressed on at least two occasions. Simultaneously, due to the specificity of the assessment rubrics, associated with the key assessments, the process appears to have increased our teacher candidates’ awareness of what NASPE considers Acceptable and Target levels of performance for Beginning Physical Educators across all 10 NASPE Standards. The eight key assessments are founded on three major components that are integral to development of an effective beginning physical education teacher: 1) Content Knowledge; 2) Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions, and (3) Student Learning.

Content Knowledge

BGSU PETE candidates are passing the Praxis II content knowledge exam above the required 80% threshold for national program recognition, but just below the state average for PETE graduates. Over the past two years though the BGSU PETE scores indicate a marked increase (2006-2007, 91.7%; 2007-2008, 93.3%). These scores are now closely aligned with the state average. The program faculty believed that a portion of the problem was related to teacher candidates standardized test-taking skills. Tutorial efforts were undertaken during the PETE student teaching seminar to increase teacher candidate success rates. For the past three years a seminar class has been conducted to better acquaint teacher candidates with Praxis II test specifics for both the Physical Education Content Knowledge and the Principles of Learning and Teaching exams. The PETE program faculty has also attempted to provide teacher candidates with additional resource materials (including reference to the electronic test preparation resources available via the internet—i.e., PEPraxis.com). Data for the past two years suggest that these activities have led to an improvement in PETE teacher candidate content knowledge performance. BGSU teacher candidates have typically performed poorly in categories I (Fundamental Movements, Motor Development, and Motor Learning) and V (Biomechanics) on Praxis II. In order to facilitate improved performance in these two categories, beginning in Spring 2006 Kinesiology (KNS) Division courses in Motor Development for Physical Educators and Coaches (KNS 240), Principles of Motor Skill Acquisition (KNS 250), and Biomechanics for Teachers, Performers and Coaches (KNS 270) were eliminated. Instead, teacher candidates now undertake an additional three hours (one hour in each course) and take Motor Development across the Lifespan (KNS 340), Motor Learning (KNS 350) and Biomechanics of Human Movement (KNS 370). By having teacher candidates undertake 300 level classes the Kinesiology faculty is attempting to facilitate a higher level of performance on the Praxis II examination and improve potential teachers’ content knowledge to better inform their physical education instruction. Kinesiology faculty who teach these movement foundations courses have been provided with examples of resource materials during a Kinesiology Division seminar and promised to make a concerted effort to better address Praxis II preparation in their courses. The 2007-2008 Praxis II data (the most recent reported by ETS) support some improvement in teacher candidate scores in category I and especially category V--Biomechanics. Furthermore, the PETE program has recently been modified in response to student’s performances on the Praxis II test. On the 2008-2009 PETE program checklist teacher candidates entering the program are required to pass Praxis II prior to undertaking their student teaching internships. Currently, passing Praxis II

(Physical Education Content Knowledge) is not a requirement for graduation. The program faculty contends that this change places the Praxis II exam closer to the content knowledge (movement foundations) portion of the PETE program and also provides a stronger foundation for student teaching.

While Praxis II assesses a teacher candidate's content knowledge via a standardized test, the PETE faculty developed KA 2 as a comprehensive measure of movement performance content knowledge. KA 2 transgresses three movement content areas in physical education (Games, Dance, and Gymnastics—all three incorporate physical fitness) that are representative of the BGSU PETE program philosophy and also represent the unique subject matter that a beginning K-12 physical education teacher needs to know, understand and be able to perform. Because a similar movement performance assessment is threaded through each course, consistent performance expectations are established. Data indicated that while teacher candidates are skilled in invasion games, they could also acquire movement skill in dance and gymnastics fairly quickly. For the 2008-2009 year teacher candidates have improved in their abilities to document movement content in dance and to a lesser degree in gymnastics. Beginning in Fall 2007, program faculty provided more exemplar content documents for gymnastics and dance courses and presented a more detailed explanation of expectations for teacher candidate success. Also, additional learning experiences such as attending and critiquing university dance programs and gymnastics competitions are now encouraged to help teacher candidates develop a stronger movement content knowledge background in these two activity areas. These activities appear to have improved teacher candidate performance in these two movement forms. Improved performance in the Net/Wall games class will be targeted for next year. While knowledge of the subject matter and experiences as a performer is important neither is sufficient grounding for becoming an effective beginning teacher. The body of knowledge related to the act of teaching must be studied and practiced.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Teaching is a professional activity and it is recognized that the activity of teaching needs to be learned. The evidence from planning and teaching assessments shows that BGSU PETE candidates invoke a developmental teaching-learning process that is sensitive to individual differences among students. Teacher candidates include appropriate task accommodations in their plans and demonstrate effective skills in working with students having diverse needs by planning and implementing appropriate learning experiences in various educational environments. BGSU teacher candidates become better class managers and motivators over the duration of their field experiences, although they do encounter managerial issues, (i.e., the ability to time specific components of lessons and working with large numbers of pupils). While teacher candidates learn to organize and manage students and resources to provide equitable learning experiences, program faculty contend that there is a need for teacher candidates to work with larger numbers of students prior to student teaching. In future KNS 472 and KNS 432 (methods courses) will attempt to address this issue by providing teacher candidates more opportunities for whole class instruction. Over the past academic year, data obtained from observations of teaching and electronic portfolios provides evidence that teacher candidates are effective communicators, with rare exception. PETE candidates typically stipulate high learning expectations using various communication strategies (e.g., bulletin boards) to convey both managerial and instructional information. The vast majority plan and implement effective learning goals for their students. They design safe, developmentally appropriate learning experiences that are based upon principles of effective instruction, including disciplinary and pedagogical content knowledge. Teacher candidates also integrate combinations of cogent demonstrations, explanations, and various instructional strategies (e.g., Games for Understanding, Movement Approach, Sport Education) into effective learning experiences for their charges. Teaching is a reflective activity and the PETE program provides teacher candidates extensive opportunities to reflect on their instruction. Data indicate that teacher candidates critically analyze the success of their classes and identify areas for improvement in subsequent lessons. However, when teacher candidates were asked to record data over time on a selected area

of professional growth, several had difficulty with this assignment during Fall 2008 and Spring 2009. PETE candidates are also aware of the importance of collaboration in educational settings and most are able to pursue productive relationships with parents/guardians and colleagues. In 2008-2009, results suggested that several teacher candidates showed improvement in becoming advocates for physical activity in the community, but that locating community resources provided a challenge for 25% of teacher candidates in fall 2008 in comparison to teacher candidates' performances in the previous year. The Reflection and Collaboration assignment (KA 7) has strengthened the rigor of the student teaching internship (thanks to the NASPE/NCATE process) and it is a valuable activity designed to improve the professionalism of PETE graduates. BGSU teacher candidates are also becoming increasingly competent and confident in utilizing technological innovations. PETE candidates methodically review their teaching episodes on digital videotape and subsequently create QuickTime Digital Movies and other electronic artifacts to demonstrate their pre-lesson preparation, effective teaching practices, post-lesson reflection, and developing professionalism. The addition of the course, Introduction to Educational Technology (EDTL 230) on the 2007-2008 PETE program checklist will potentially assist teacher candidates in locating, evaluating, designing, preparing and efficiently using educational technology as an instructional resource in the classroom as they reach their capstone experiences in PETE. Evidence from KA 5 (Teacher Work Sample Project—TWS) also indicated that PETE candidates use technology to report and compare the results of pre-assessment and post-assessment tools to determine the impact of their instruction on student learning.

Effects on Student Learning

In the TWS, the majority of teacher candidates designed appropriate assessment tools that incorporated authentic assessments, peer and self-assessments, and traditional assessments in pre and post-assessment experiences. The teacher candidates utilized the results of the pre-assessments and developed appropriate learning objectives, instructional experiences, and subsequent assessments (formative and summative) to track student learning. As the teacher candidates reflected upon the results obtained from the post assessment tools, they were able to ascertain their impact on student learning. The majority of teacher candidates reported their instruction had positive impacts on student learning. Since the TWS is an evolving assignment several improvements have occurred including clarifications to the scoring rubric and a more exact timeline for the TWS project to help future teacher candidates. In general teacher candidates leave the BGSU PETE program as effective beginning teachers who can positively impact student learning.