



## Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

*Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

As specified in the Conceptual Framework, UNCG is committed to the preparation of competent professionals as demonstrated by their mastery of content, professional and pedagogical knowledge as well as their skill in facilitating student learning. All professional education programs at UNCG have developed a course of study that provides candidates with a well-rounded, rigorous background in their teaching area. Built on a foundation of liberal arts, our candidates develop a deep understanding of their fields, not in isolation, but in relation to other bodies of knowledge. Candidates not only study theory and facts, but they also develop an understanding and appreciation of their field through the opportunities to work in classrooms, research projects, and community agencies. These active, interdisciplinary experiences enrich candidates' ability to teach their own students. Candidates in all programs acquire the multiple knowledge bases outlined in the conceptual framework and participate in field experiences that help them synthesize and apply these knowledge bases in diverse settings.

### 1.1. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Data gathered for admission decisions are also used as preliminary assessments of candidates' content knowledge. Admission criteria vary somewhat by program, but all meet the basic requirements set forth by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. **Table 6** details admission criteria and program variations.

**Table 6: Admission Criteria by Level and by Program**

Program Level	Admission Criteria
Undergraduate	Passing scores on Praxis I (Reading = 176; Writing = 173; and Mathematics = 173) and an overall GPA of at least 2.5. Art, Education of the Deaf, and Birth-Kindergarten require 2.7 GPA; Elementary, Middle Grades, Social Studies, Special Education, English, French, German, and Spanish require a 2.75; and Latin requires a 3.0. Elementary Education, Middle Grades Education and Special

	Education require a “C” or better on an Introduction to Education course that students typically take in their sophomore year. Art, Dance, Music and Theatre have pre-admission auditions or personal statements that reflect students’ understandings of their content areas and their professional goals.
<b>License-only</b>	Hold a bachelor’s degree from a regionally accredited college or university and have graduated with an overall GPA of 2.5, or higher if required by the licensure program. (See above for GPA requirements.) Candidates must have in their licensure area a major or at least 24 semester hours of coursework or passing Praxis II scores. Candidates who do not meet the 24 hour minimum are required to take additional coursework.
<b>Graduate</b>	An undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or at least 9 hours of graduate work with a GPA of 3.0 plus satisfactory performance on a nationally standardized test of academic aptitude. Typically, candidates take the GRE although the Miller Analogies Test is also acceptable. For candidates entering programs requiring strong verbal skills, a Verbal GRE scores of 460 (48 <sup>th</sup> percentile) or higher is recommended. For candidates entering a quantitative program, a Quantitative GRE score of 600 (46 <sup>th</sup> percentile) or higher is recommended. A score of 400, the mean score on the recent test update, is recommended for candidates taking the Miller Analogies Test. The School of Music allows Praxis II to be submitted in lieu of GRE scores. Additionally, positive references and personal statements are required. Candidates for the M.Ed.-Classroom Practice Track (CPT) must have a major in a field other than education. For all CPT programs other than Elementary and Middle Grades Education, the prior degree should be in content related to the candidates’ teaching field. Candidates for M.Ed.-Teacher Leadership Track, as well as master’s degrees in Art, Dance, Music, Social Work, Special Education and Theatre, require that candidates hold an initial Standard Professional I license and teaching experience. Admission to the graduate program constitutes admission to the Teachers Academy.
<b>Graduate License-only</b>	3.0 undergraduate or graduate GPA. In addition, candidates in Reading must have a masters degree and candidates in Reading and English as a Second Language must hold a teaching license in another field.

Admission data for candidates admitted since 2001 indicate that the required admission standards for undergraduate and graduate programs were met, as reflected in the Tables 7, 8 and 9. **Table 7** shows Praxis 1 mean scores and the range of scores in Reading, Writing and Math as well as entering GPAs for candidates admitted in 2001 to the present. All admitted candidates earned at least the minimum passing score and the mean score in all three tests was several points higher.

**Table 7: Admission Data for Undergraduate UNCG Applicants**

Year	Mean and Range of Praxis I scores			Mean and Range Admitting GPA
	Reading	Writing	Math	
2001-2002	181.0 (176-186)	177.4 (173-186)	181.5 (173-190)	3.26 (2.5 – 4.0)
2002-2003	180.7 (176-187)	177.6 (173-187)	181.4 (173-190)	3.26 (2.5 – 4.0)
2003-2004	180.6 (176-187)	177.2 (173-186)	180.5 (173-190)	3.29 (2.51 – 4.0)
2004-2005	180.6 (176-187)	177.0 (173-189)	180.1 (173-190)	3.26 (2.51 – 4.0)
2005-2006	180.5 (176-188)	176.8 (173-189)	180.3 (173-190)	3.30 (2.51 – 4.0)

As reflected in **Table 8**, the mean score on the GRE for admitted candidates is slightly above the UNCG recommended score on the Verbal test; but the mean score for all admitted candidates is lower on the Math test than the UNCG recommended score. When the scores of candidates in the math areas (secondary math and educational research methodology) are considered separately, however, as depicted in **Table 9**, the mean score on the Math GRE Test is well above the recommended score. This pattern of scores indicates that many of the persons admitted to the graduate programs have strong verbal skills but not as strong mathematical skills when compared to a national sample of persons applying to graduate schools. That these candidates were admitted on the basis of their verbal scores also indicates that program faculty view most of the graduate programs as verbal intensive programs.

**Table 8: GRE Admission Data for Master's Degree and Graduate Licensure-only**

	2001-2002 Mean Score (n=163)	2002-2003 Mean Score (n=132)	2003-04 Mean Score (n = 137)	2004-05 Mean Score (n = 145 )	2005-06 Mean Score (n = 111)
GRE Verbal	473.9	476.8	473.1	475.7	480.0
GRE Math	506.3	515.8	541.7	532.2	530.5

**Table 9: GRE Admission Data for Graduate Candidates in Math Education and in Educational Research Methodology**

Number of Candidates	GRE Verbal	GRE Math
22	484.4	694.1

**Praxis II** scores are another measure of candidates' mastery of content knowledge. As seen in **Tables 10 and 11**, the percent of candidates earning passing scores on Praxis II is high. All undergraduate programs met the requirement of a pass rate of 80%. Most programs were at or higher than the average State pass rates. Secondary Math had a pass rate of 82.35% compared to the State's 84%. In both Art and Music, the pass rate of License Only candidates was slightly lower than the state average pass rate. At the graduate level, similar high pass rates exist. In math, only one student took Praxis II and that student did not pass. Otherwise, all programs had high pass rates.

**Table 10: Pass Rate on Praxis II for Undergraduate Candidates in the Initial  
Teacher Preparation Programs**  
(Admitted During the Period of Fall, 2001 – Spring, 2006)

Program	# of Test Takers		% Passing at State Cut Score		Overall Pass Rate for All Institutions in the State
	BA/BS	ULO	BA/BS	ULO	(2003-2004)
<b>Birth-Kindergarten*</b>					
<b>Elementary</b>	421		99.06%		96%
<b>Middle Grades</b>					
<b>Comp Science</b>	1	2	100%	100%	100%
<b>Comp Social Studies</b>	1	3	100%	100%	95%
<b>Language Arts</b>	25	9	100%	100%	98%
<b>Math</b>	18	6	100%	100%	99%
<b>Secondary English</b>	46	11	95.83%	91.67%	91%
<b>Second Language (K-12)</b>					
<b>French</b>	1	1	100%	100%	63%
<b>German</b>		1		100%	
<b>Spanish</b>	11	5	100%	100%	83%
<b>Secondary Mathematics</b>	14	9	82.35%	90%	84%
<b>Comprehensive Science</b>					
<b>Biology</b>					
<b>Chemistry</b>	6	3	100%	100%	100%
<b>Physics</b>	1	3	100%	100%	No data
<b>Comprehensive Social Studies</b>	41	6	97.62%	100%	96%
<b>Art</b>	29	13	93.55%	86.67%	88%
<b>Dance*</b>					
<b>Music</b>	106	8	97.25%	88.89%	94%
<b>Theater*</b>					
<b>Latin*</b>					
<b>Physical Education</b>	50	6	98.04%	100%	84%
<b>Special Education</b>					
<b>General Curr</b>	15	1	93.75	100	No data
<b>BD</b>	14		100		100%
<b>LD</b>	1		100		94%
<b>Deaf/Hard of Hearing</b>	1	2	100	100	

*\*not required or no test available*

**Table 11: Pass Rate on Praxis II for Graduate Candidates in the Initial Teacher Preparation Programs**  
(Admitted During the Period of Fall, 2001 – Spring, 2006)

Program	# of Test Takers		% Passing at State Cut Score		Overall Pass Rate for All Institutions in the State
	MEd	GLO	MEd	GLO	(2003-2004)
<b>Elementary</b>	119		99.17		96%
<b>Middle Grades</b>					
<b>Comp Science</b>	2		100		100%
<b>Comp Social Studies</b>	7		100		95%
<b>Language Arts</b>	16		100		98%
<b>Math</b>	6		100		99%
<b>Secondary English</b>	16		94.12		91%
<b>Second Language (K-12)</b>					
<b>French</b>					63%
<b>German</b>					
<b>Spanish</b>	9		100		83%
<b>Secondary Mathematics</b>	1		0		84%
<b>Comprehensive Science</b>	6		100		100%
<b>Chemistry</b>					No data
<b>Comprehensive Social Studies</b>	15		100		96%
<b>Music</b>	9	2	100	100	94%
<b>English as a Second Language</b>	8	64	100	98.46	
<b>Reading</b>	36		97.30		
<b>Physical Education</b>	2		100		84%
<b>Special Education</b>					
<b>General Curr</b>	38	11	100	91.67	No data
<b>BD</b>		3		100	100%
<b>LD</b>	1	32	100	100	94%

In addition to Praxis II, all programs assess content knowledge during final student teaching, using the Teacher Growth and Assessment for Profile (TGAP) measure, the UNCG Teaching Portfolio Rubric, and program-specific assignments and measures. (See Table 27 in the Assessment Plan under Standard 2 and individual program reports for the specific data.)

**1.2. Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel**

Programs in Instructional Technology, School Administration (Principal and Superintendent), Counseling, Media Coordinator and Supervisor, and Social Work adhere to state and university admission criteria. These data also serve as assessments of candidates’ entering content knowledge. At the undergraduate level, School Social Work candidates must have a 2.5 GPA. Applicants for graduate programs are expected to have a 3.0 GPA in their undergraduate coursework (or, for School Administration, a 3.5 GPA in a master’s degree program for Ed.S. and Ed.D. candidates), a combined Verbal and Quantitative score on the GRE of 1000 and acceptable letters of reference. Exceptions to these admission criteria have been made for applicants who are members of a cohort group recommended and supported by their school district. In such cases, we assume that admitted candidates’ content knowledge has been assessed by the cooperating school district.

Programs may require additional application materials. The undergraduate School Social Work program requires that candidates complete SWK 215: Introduction to Social Work (minimum grade of C), SWK 310: Social Policy and Social Services and SWK 311: Social Behavior and the Human Environment, and submit a personal statement about their career goals. Educational Leadership/School Administration requires a curriculum vitae or resume and a personal statement that addresses the candidate’s knowledge about and goals for school administration. Embedded in the course requirements and goal statements are knowledge and understandings about the professional fields. While personal statements are not assessed using a rubric, they are carefully reviewed for entry-level content knowledge.

As reflected in **Table 12**, the mean GRE scores for candidates in School Counseling and School Media were slightly above the recommended criteria on the Verbal test; and for Counseling students scores were at the recommended criteria on the Math test as well. The lower scores in School Administration are the result of the program admitting several cohorts of candidates in collaboration with local schools. In these programs, districts recommend and support candidates who they see as capable future leaders. Based on their recommendation, the program is more flexible with admission criteria, but the program maintains the same exit requirements. As reflected in the candidates’ performance on the ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium), they all met both program and standardized test exit requirements.

**Table 12: GRE Admission Data for Other Professional School Personnel**

<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Verbal</b>	<b>Quantitative</b>
	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>
<b>GRE scores for:</b>		
<b>School Counseling</b>	524.1	603.6
<b>School Media</b>	515.2	519.5
<b>School Administration</b>	450.1	479.9

**Praxis II or ISLLC data:** Among the assessments used to assess candidates' acquisition of content knowledge are scores on Praxis II or ISLLC, taken by candidates for the Master's of School Administration. As reflected in **Table 13**, 100% of the UNCG candidates passed these nationally standardized tests, indicating that all candidates met the required performance levels when exiting their program.

**Table 13: Unit Pass Rates on Praxis II and the ISLLC Tests  
for Other School Personnel  
For Students Admitted During the Period 2001-2006**

Program	# of Test Takers		% Passing at State Cut Score		Overall Pass Rate for All Institutions in the State
	Grad	GLO	Grad	GLO	
School Counseling	40	11	100%	100%	
School Media	201	36	99.5%	100%	
Instructional Technology Specialist	No test required				
School Administration Principal Superintendent	226 15			100% 100%	

### **1.3 Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates**

Candidates for initial licensure demonstrate their pedagogical content competence through course assignments and internship performances. Grades on their assignments, evaluations of artifacts and reflections in their Teaching or Advanced Competencies Portfolios, observations as recorded on the Pre-service Teacher Growth and Assessment Profile – TGAP and the Pedagogy subtest of the Praxis II all provide means of assessing candidates' pedagogical content knowledge. The elements and their corresponding rubrics for all the unit assessments are in Appendices A, B and C. Data gathered across undergraduate and ULO programs are presented in **Table 14**.

**Table 14 Evidence of Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Undergraduate and ULO\* Candidates**

<i>Percent of Candidates Earning Score on the Teaching Portfolio and the Pre-service Teachers Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP)</i>			
	Ratings		
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
Teaching Portfolio			
Element 12	0	33%	67%
TGAP			
Element 1	0	21%	79%

<b>Element 2</b>	0	14%	86%
<b>Element 4</b>	0	22%	78%
<b>Element 5</b>	0	29%	71%
<b>Element 6</b>	0	28%	72%
<b>Element 7</b>	0	33%	67%
<b>Element 8</b>	0	26%	74%
<b>Element 9</b>	0	22%	78%
<b>Element 10</b>	0	26%	74%
<b>Element 12</b>	0	18%	82%
<b>Element 16</b>	0	20%	80%

\*ULO = Undergraduate Licensure Only candidates

Prior to the implementation of the TGAP (Teacher Growth and Assessment Profile), programs administered the UNCG Exit Criteria which was based on the state adopted Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument. Individual programs reviewed these instruments each semester. Candidates were required to have acceptable ratings on the Exit Criteria in order to be cleared for licensure. These data are stored in candidates' records and have not been aggregated at the Unit level. Because an acceptable rating was required for graduation, we know that 100% of the candidates completing the program earned an acceptable or proficient rating.

**Table 15** provides comparable data for candidates in the Classroom Practice Tracks (i.e., candidates earning their initial professional teaching license at the graduate level). Most graduate programs use a mastery learning model in their classes, thus it would be predicted and it is the case that almost 100% of the candidates earn scores of 5 or 6. This was the first year that these measures were used. Experience with the measures across programs taught us some ways that we might modify the measure to be more useful. In future years, we will record the number of times a learning product is returned for additional work before it is accepted. We will also record the nature of the assignment that was returned. Such data will provide helpful information about areas that are most challenging to candidates as well as a better measure of candidates' initial proficiency.

**Table 15: Evidence of Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Graduate Licensure Candidates**

<i>Percent of Candidates Earning Score on the Teaching Portfolio and the Pre-service Teachers Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP)*</i>			
	<b>Ratings</b>		
	<b>1, 2</b>	<b>3, 4</b>	<b>5, 6</b>
<b>Teaching Portfolio</b>			
<b>Element 12</b>			100%
<b>TGAP</b>			
<b>Element 1</b>		3%	97%

<b>Element 2</b>			100%
<b>Element 4</b>			100%
<b>Element 5</b>			100%
<b>Element 6</b>			100%
<b>Element 7</b>			100%
<b>Element 8</b>			100%
<b>Element 9</b>			100%
<b>Element 10</b>			100%
<b>Element 12</b>			100%
<b>Element 16</b>			100%

Candidates for a M.Ed.-Teacher Leadership Track and Graduate Licensure-Only in Reading and ESOL enter their programs with a teaching license and experience in the classroom. They demonstrate their pedagogical content competencies through course assignments and grades, critical performance assignments, reflections and classroom-based action research projects.

#### **1.4. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates**

Candidates develop and demonstrate professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills through coursework, assignments, reflections, and multiple field placements. During field placements, candidates are observed and receive feedback and coaching regarding their performances. In early field placements, programs may use program-selected evaluation tools and/or sections of the Pre-service Teacher Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP). Candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are also assessed through six elements in the Teaching/Advanced Competencies Portfolios that reflect not only skilled, research-based instructional planning, learning strategies and assessment, but also only responsiveness to diversity among learners, interpersonal and collaborative skills, and engaging and effective relationships with families and communities.

Most undergraduate licensure-only and PAIL (graduate licensure-only in Special Education) candidates hold lateral entry teaching positions. Their teaching performance is monitored by a state-required mentor and the principal or her designee. The undergraduate licensure-only candidate's performance is also assessed by university faculty during assignments for methods courses and, in most programs, candidates are observed by a university mentor or field supervisor. All participants in NC TEACH statewide licensure program are supervised by university mentors and a field supervisor. Undergraduate licensure-only candidates who do not hold lateral entry teaching positions are required to student teach and, as such, meet the same requirements as other student teachers. As with degree candidates, the TGAP and Portfolio Rubrics are used to evaluate undergraduate licensure-only and PAIL candidates.

As reflected in **Table 16**, at graduation most of candidates' scores are in the 5 and 6 range, indicating proficiency in the element assessed. Both the university and school-

based supervisors rated candidates, and the two scores were averaged. The percentages reported in **Table 16** are based on the average scores earned by candidates.

**Table 16: Evidence of Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge for Undergraduate and Undergraduate Licensure-only Candidates**

<i>Percent of Candidates Earning Score on the Teaching Portfolio and Pre-service Teachers Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP)</i>			
	<b>Ratings</b>		
	<b>1, 2</b>	<b>3, 4</b>	<b>5, 6</b>
<b>Teaching Portfolio</b>			
<b>Element 1</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>Element 3</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>Element 5</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>Element 7</b>	0	20%	80%
<b>Element 9</b>	0	20%	80%
<b>Element 12</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>TGAP</b>			
<b>Element 1</b>	0	21%	79%
<b>Element 2</b>	0	14%	86%
<b>Element 3</b>		17%	83%
<b>Element 4</b>	0	22%	78%
<b>Element 5</b>	0	29%	71%
<b>Element 6</b>	0	28%	72%
<b>Element 7</b>	0	33%	67%
<b>Element 8</b>	0	26%	74%
<b>Element 9</b>	0	22%	78%
<b>Element 10</b>	0	26%	74%
<b>Element 11</b>	0	40%	60%
<b>Element 12</b>	0	18%	82%
<b>Element 16</b>	0	20%	80%
<b>Element 17</b>	0	16%	84%
<b>Element 18</b>	0	26%	74%
<b>Element 19</b>	0	26%	74%
<b>Element 20</b>	0	29%	71%
<b>Element 21</b>	0	23%	77%

**Table 17** shows the percent of scores earned by graduate students in each rating group on the TGAP. Again, because a mastery learning model is used in most graduate classes, ratings of 5 and 6 are more frequent because candidates' products are often not accepted until the instructor considers them to be of outstanding quality.

**Table 17: Evidence of Graduate and Graduate Licensure-only Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge Contained in the Teaching Portfolio and Pre-service Teachers Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP) Ratings**

	Percent of Ratings in each Group		
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
<b>TGAP (initial license only)</b>			
<b>Element 1</b>		3%	97%
<b>Element 2</b>			100%
<b>Element 3</b>			100%
<b>Element 4</b>			100%
<b>Element 5</b>			100%
<b>Element 6</b>			100%
<b>Element 7</b>			100%
<b>Element 8</b>			100%
<b>Element 9</b>			100%
<b>Element 10</b>			100%
<b>Element 11</b>			100%
<b>Element 12</b>			100%
<b>Element 16</b>			100%
<b>Element 17</b>		3%	97%
<b>Element 18</b>			100%
<b>Element 19</b>		3%	97%
<b>Element 20</b>		6%	94%
<b>Element 21</b>		3%	97%

Graduate programs are switching their graduate candidates in the Classroom Practice Tracks to the UNCG Portfolio rubric, but because most of these candidates are part-time students and midway through their program, it is taking longer to transition from one portfolio system to another. Programs were reluctant to change the portfolio system for candidates midway through their studies, thus program data about professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills derived from the UNCG Portfolio Rubric are not yet available. Data are only available from the rubrics that had been previously used. The rubric used by the Classroom Practice Tracks contained two items or dimensions relevant to candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. These dimensions were: Instructional Expertise and Knowledge of Learners. On each of these dimensions, faculty rated both the candidates' narratives about the dimension as well as the artifacts included that were illustrative of the dimension. Data from this instrument are displayed in **Table 18**.

**Table 18: Evidence Derived from the Portfolio Rubric formerly used by the Classroom Practice Track**

Dimension	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
Instructional Expertise Narrative Artifacts	0	0	72% 72%	28% 28%
Knowledge of Learners Narrative Artifacts	0	0	67% 66%	33% 34%

**1.5. Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel**

Knowledge and skills of Other School Personnel are documented through assessments of critical assignments, logs and journals, professional reflections, internship observations, capstone portfolios and hearings, comprehensive exams, exit surveys, and dispositions, many of which are collaboratively evaluated by field-based and university supervisors.

- Educational Leadership. Ed Leadership developed a “Hallmark Assignment” for each course. Rubrics for these assignments were based on the NCDPI standards and placed in TaskStream. All (100%) of Educational Leadership completers met the state standards, with ratings on all assignment-specific measures being acceptable or proficient. Additionally, during the Spring 2006 semester, Comprehensive Assessment and Portfolio (CAP) hearings (an oral exam) were conducted for 20 MSA students and 4 EdS students. All students passed, indicating that they have achieved acceptable or higher progress toward mastery of the Leadership Preparation Standards. The CAP process, along with the 100% pass rate on the School Leadership Licensure Assessment and an overall review of TaskStream data, indicate that ELC students are proficient in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions embedded in the Leadership Preparation Standards.
- All undergraduate School Social Work completers in the past three years have received at least minimum course grades or performance ratings on the six outcome criteria; standards were met at the level of proficiency by 95% of the candidates. Similarly, over 90% of all Joint Masters of Social Work (JMSW) candidates have passed their required social work courses by demonstrating that they have obtained the program’s required knowledge and skills as assessed with assignment-specific rubrics. In surveys, JMSW graduates reported, in almost all categories over a four year period, highest levels of satisfaction with their preparation.
- All School Counseling candidates have acceptable or proficient ratings on assessments of knowledge, skill and dispositions. Instructional Technology has only one completer at this time; that student received acceptable or proficient ratings in all areas.

- Library and Information Studies used the UNCG Portfolio Rubric with their graduates. **Table 19** shows the percent of scores awarded in each category for the LIS graduates.

**Table 19: Evidence that Other School Personnel Demonstrated Professional Knowledge and Skills**

Percent of Scores in Each Rating Category			
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
<b>Teaching Portfolio</b>			
<b>Element 1</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>Element 3</b>	0	13%	87%
<b>Element 5</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>Element 7</b>	0	20%	80%
<b>Element 9</b>	0	27%	73%
<b>Element 12</b>	0	27%	73%

### **1.6. Dispositions for All Candidates**

In 2004-05, the Teachers Academy Council of Program Coordinators adopted the newly developed UNCG Candidate Disposition Assessment Process (**CDAP**) for use with all candidates. The instrument measures ten dispositions that are aligned with the Teachers Academy’s Conceptual Framework: reflective, ethical, inclusive, engaged and committed to professional practice, lifelong learner, self-efficacious, receptive to feedback, affirming of diversity, responsible and collaborative. As with other unit-wide rubrics, a six-point scale is used and individual programs may include additional elements as appropriate for their professional disciplines. The CDAP is used to measure candidate dispositions at least three times: within the first year of the candidate’s admission to the education program, varies by the program; before the start of the final field placement; and by the end of the student teaching/final field internship. Program response to unacceptable ratings is delineated in the *Professional Behavior Policy*, which is explained in detail in this report as part of the Standard III discussion. Essentially, this policy outlines procedures by which programs provide candidates with explicit feedback about their performance and expectations regarding how to improve.

Programs use the disposition data to ensure their graduates consistently demonstrate professional dispositions. Additionally, programs use aggregated data about dispositions to identify areas in need of program-wide improvement. As reflected in **Table 20**, most undergraduates earned acceptable to higher ratings on the CDAP; however there were a few candidates who earned ratings of 1 or 2 on a few of the elements. Being engaged and committed to professional practice, being a life-long learner, being self-efficacious and collaborative were the areas in which a few candidates had difficulty.

**Table 20: Percent of Undergraduate and Undergraduate Licensure-only Candidates' Scores on the Candidate Disposition Assessment Process (CDAP)**

	Ratings		
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
<b>Dispositions</b>			
<b>Element 1 - Reflective</b>		33%	67%
<b>Element 2 - Ethical</b>		18%	82%
<b>Element 3 - Inclusive</b>			
<b>Element 4 - Engaged and committed to professional practice</b>	<1%	19%	81%
<b>Element 5 - Life-long learning</b>	<1%	28%	72%
<b>Element 6 - Self-efficacious</b>	1%	31%	68%
<b>Element 7 - Receptive to feedback</b>		21%	79%
<b>Element 8 - Affirming of diversity</b>		21%	79%
<b>Element 9 - Responsible</b>		23%	77%
<b>Element 10 - Collaborative</b>	1%	26%	73%

Most of the candidates in our advanced masters programs for teachers are employed and already have established successful teaching careers. We have had extensive discussions about how best to assess dispositions in these teachers. Currently, most programs consider dispositions during the admission process, examining recommendations and personal statements, and when possible, conducting interviews. Programs also share the Disposition Rubric with candidates during the orientation to the program, explaining that all graduates are expected to demonstrate these dispositions. Should a problem arise, the rubric will be used as a framework for discussing the problem. Ratings throughout the program are not done otherwise.

In other graduate programs where candidates are entering new roles, dispositions are reviewed systematically and in depth. The Library and Information Studies Program assesses dispositions four times during the program. Candidate self-assessment and faculty assessment are included. Faculty in the Counseling Program review candidates' dispositions each semester as part of their assessment of each candidate's progress. The Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations department have adapted the CDAP to reflect leadership dispositions. Called the Leadership Candidate Disposition Process, this measure is administered three times: candidates assess themselves and faculty assess candidates during their studies. Dispositions are also assessed in many of the required assignments. As reflected in **Table 21**, all candidates earned acceptable ratings.

**Table 21: Evidence that Graduate and Graduate Licensure-only Candidates Earned Acceptable Professional Dispositions Ratings**

	Ratings		
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
<b>Element 1 - Reflective</b>			100%
<b>Element 2 - Ethical</b>			100%
<b>Element 3 - Inclusive</b>			100%
<b>Element 4 - Engaged and committed to professional practice</b>			100%
<b>Element 5 - Life-long learning</b>		2%	98%
<b>Element 6 - Self-efficacious</b>		9%	91%
<b>Element 7 - Receptive to feedback</b>			100%
<b>Element 8 - Affirming of diversity</b>			100%
<b>Element 9 - Responsible</b>		4%	96%
<b>Element 10 - Collaborative</b>			100%

### **1.7 Student Learning for Teacher Candidates**

UNCG finds that effective teaching and learning are, in great part, the result of the teacher’s knowledge and skills related to appropriate and research-based use of assessment to inform instructional decisions. All teacher preparation programs teach and assess candidates’ ability to select, use and interpret appropriate assessment tools and to use the assessment findings to plan effective, appropriately paced, instructional strategies for all students.

In addition to program-specific course assignments and evaluations, all teaching programs use items on the Pre-service Teachers Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP) and the Teaching Competencies Portfolio rubric to assess undergraduate and undergraduate licensure-only candidates’ competencies in these areas, as displayed in **Table 22**. The artifacts and reflections that students submit in their Teaching Competencies Portfolios must demonstrate knowledge and skill in assessment of learning goals and objectives and knowledge about appropriate research findings that inform their instructional decisions. Candidates’ teaching must also reflect these competencies. Using the TGAP, school-based and university supervisors evaluate candidates’ ability to assess students’ learning, provide growth-oriented feedback to students, and modify instructional plans in accordance with assessment data. Applying their knowledge of child and adolescent development and the specific achievement, abilities and needs of individual students, candidates plan differentiated learning strategies that are engaging and meaningful and that encourage high achievement for their students.

**Table 22: Evidence that Candidates Assess, Adjust, Monitor, and Have a Positive Effect on Student Learning**

	Ratings		
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
<b>Teaching Portfolio</b>			
Element 6	0	27%	73%
Element 7	0	20%	80%
Element 8	0	20%	80%
Element 9	0	20%	80%
Element 12	0	27%	73%
<b>TGAP</b>			
Element 6	0	28%	72%
Element 8	0	26%	74%
Element 9	0	22%	78%
Element 11	0	40%	60%
Element 12	0	18%	82%
Element 13	0	19%	81%

While candidates' reports do not document student achievement, it is important to note that candidates overwhelmingly reported feeling prepared to assess and implement teaching approaches that ensure student learning, as reflected in their responses to the UNCG Exit Survey conducted after their student teaching. See **Table 23**. Data in Table 23 were obtained at the end of student teaching when candidates were ready to graduate. Data from a focus group discussion with graduates who had been teaching for several years (see discussion in Standard 2) are consistent with responses to this survey.

**Table 23: Items from the Institutional Research Exit Survey**

Question (# of missing responses)	Possible Responses	Frequency	Percent
1. How prepared are you to create learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students and link new information to prior learning?	Very prepared	142	66.36
	Adequately prepared	63	29.44
	Somewhat prepared	6	2.80
	Not prepared	3	1.40
2. How prepared are you to understand how children learn and develop and to provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development?	Very prepared	145	67.76
	Adequately prepared	57	26.64
	Somewhat prepared	9	4.21
	Not prepared	3	1.40
5. How prepared are you to use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' critical thinking and problem solving?	Very prepared	139	65.57
	Adequately prepared	61	28.77
	Somewhat prepared	6	2.83
	Not prepared	6	2.83

6. How prepared are you to effectively manage a classroom?	Very prepared	114	53.77
	Adequately prepared	77	36.32
	Somewhat prepared	15	7.08
	Not prepared	6	2.83
7. How prepared are you to integrate educational technology into instructional planning for student learning?	Very prepared	114	53.52
	Adequately prepared	76	35.68
	Somewhat prepared	18	8.45
	Not prepared	5	2.35
8. How prepared are you to develop instructional plans and differentiate instruction so that all students learn?	Very prepared	131	61.50
	Adequately prepared	71	33.33
	Somewhat prepared	9	4.23
	Not prepared	2	0.94
9. How prepared are you to use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate student needs and adjust instruction based on the assessments?	Very prepared	142	67.30
	Adequately prepared	59	27.96
	Somewhat prepared	8	3.79
	Not prepared	2	0.95

As previously noted, graduate programs are switching their graduate candidates in their Classroom Practice Tracks to the UNCG Portfolio rubric, but data are only available for the rubrics that were previously used. That rubric contained one item that assessed the connection between student learning and subject matter. On this dimension, the narrative and the artifacts included in the portfolio were both rated. In relation to the narrative, 70% of the candidates earned a rating of Proficient and 30% earned a rating of Exemplary. In relation to the artifacts, 31% of the candidates were rated as Exemplary and 69% earned ratings of Proficient. None were rated below Proficient.

### **1.8. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates Other Professional School Personnel**

School Media used the UNCG Portfolio rubric when evaluating their portfolios. **Table 24** shows the percent of scores earned in each category.

**Table 24: Evidence of Student Learning (Impact of Services) as Recorded in the UNCG Graduate Licensure Teaching Portfolio**

	Percent of Scores in Each Rating		
	1, 2	3, 4	5, 6
<b>Teaching Portfolio</b>			
<b>Element 6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>Element 7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>Element 8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>Element 9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>Element 12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>73%</b>

Three of the NC DPI standards used by the *Educational Leadership Program* when evaluating portfolios address candidates' ability to establish educational environments that support student learning and promote continuous improvement. They are:

**Standard 2.0:** promoting and maintaining a positive school culture for learning, by promoting effective instructional programs, by applying best practices to student learning, and by designing and implementing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

**Standard 3.0:** managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

**Standard 4.0:** collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

The Capstone Portfolio contained the *hallmark assignments* selected by the student as most meaningful to him or her. In the Capstone essay, candidates were required to elaborate on why the selected assignments were meaningful to the candidate, and how the assignment assisted the candidate in addressing various standards. Finally, in the Ed.S. and Ed.D. comprehensive examinations, one of the questions to which students must respond asked them to explicitly link their course experiences to the various standards. The Capstone Hearings were conducted by a panel of faculty, including the student's advisor and one other faculty member. In addition to the Capstone Portfolio, the ELC program also required candidates to prepare an Internship Portfolio that contained products from internship experiences referenced to the various standards. These portfolios were evaluated by a panel that included the university-based internship supervisor and the candidate's field-based supervisor/mentor. All (100%) of Educational Leadership completers met the state standards, with ratings on all measures being acceptable or proficient. Ratings ranged from 4 to 5.71 out of 6 (acceptable or proficient) on *hallmark* assignments and 4.61 to 5.34 on *internship* ratings.

All undergraduate School Social Work completers demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills related to working with clients, including the ability to communicate, problem solve, apply research and respond to diversity; 95% of the candidates met these standards at the level of proficiency. Over 90% Joint Masters of Social Work (JMSW) candidates have received at least passing ratings on their direct and indirect impact on clients. Instructional technology candidates and their supervisor analyze videos of candidate performance for impact on students; the only candidate to complete the program received passing scores on this measure.

Candidates in School Counseling are assessed on their ability to understand and respond to issues of student development, diversity, family and environment, as well as transitions and crises, in order to facilitate coping and maximize student learning. All Counseling completers received acceptable or proficient ratings in these areas.

<b>Previous: Conceptual Framework</b>	<b>Next: Standard 2</b>	<b>UNC-G NCATE / DPI Home Page</b>	<b>Program Reports</b>	<b>School of Education Home Page</b>	<b>Teachers Academy Home Page</b>
-----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

Copyright© 2005, 2006  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Teachers Academy, 318 Curry Building:  
Phone: (336) 334-3414;  
Fax: (336) 334-4120