Theses and Dissertations

2015-06-01

Does CAEP Have it Right? An Analysis of the Impact of the Diversity of Field Placements on Elementary Candidates' Teacher Performance Assessments Completed During Student Teaching

Jason Aaron Popham
Brigham Young University - Provo

Does CAEP Have it Right? An Analysis of the Impact of the Diversity of Field

Placements on Elementary Candidates' Teacher Performance

Assessments Completed During Student Teaching

Jason Aaron Popham

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Randall S. Davies, Chair
Peter J. Rich
Nancy Wentworth
Erin F. Whiting
Ross Larsen

Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology

Brigham Young University

June 2015

ABSTRACT

Does CAEP Have it Right? An Analysis of the Impact of the Diversity of Field
Placements on Elementary Candidates' Teacher Performance
Assessments Completed During Student Teaching

Jason Aaron Popham
Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology, BYU
Doctor of Philosophy

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) has replaced its predecessors, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) as the new sole accreditor for educator preparation in the United States. As the new accreditor, CAEP has established a new set of accreditation standards and cross-cutting themes by which it intends to measure educator preparation programs (EPPs) worthiness to received accredited status. These new standards and cross-cutting themes are untested and need to be researched in order to determine the degree to which they constitute valid and reliable measures of an EPP's potential to produce quality teachers. To evaluate one aspect of CAEP's new standards and cross-cutting themes (i.e., diversity), this study used hierarchical liner modeling to regress elementary candidates' student teaching performance assessment scores on school- and classroom-level diversity variables to evaluate the impact that being placed in a diverse field experience might have had on candidates' performance during student teaching. The analysis found that the levels of diversity in the student teaching placements had little to no impact on the elementary candidates' performance on diversity items on their teacher performance assessments completed by university supervisors and mentor teachers during student teaching. A confirmatory factor analysis also determined that the diversity related contextual factors of the schools used in the study could not be reduced to a single diversity score. Diversity is clearly a complex multidimensional construct comprised of a variety of interdependent yet distinct constructs. Developing competency in diversity and multiculturalism clearly requires more than simply being placed in a diverse student teaching placement. This does not discredit the practice of providing candidates a variety of field experiences; however the findings from this study call into question CAEP's assumptions regarding diversity and multicultural education embedded in its standards and cross-cutting themes.

Keywords: accreditation, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), diversity, student performance assessments, clinical experiences, hierarchical linear modeling (HLM)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the IP&T faculty for their support and instruction as I have pursued my graduate studies at Brigham Young University. I would especially like to thank my graduate committee for their patience and understanding throughout this process. Without their support and help, I know that this dissertation would not have been successful. I would like to particularly thank Dr. Randy Davies, my committee chair, for brainstorming the ideas for my dissertation and supporting me throughout my program. I've greatly appreciated our many discussions on accountability and accreditation, which have helped focus my thoughts and given me the confidence to pursue this undertaking and participate in national accreditation arenas.

I would like to say a special thank you to Drs. Lynnette Erickson and Stefinee Pinnegar for believing in me and helping me focus my dissertation topic. I would like to also thank Lynnette for being my trusted partner as we completed the 2014 TEAC accreditation for the BYU Educator Preparation Program. That experience provided valuable training and mentoring as I completed this journey. I also want to thank the data management team, particularly Bryn Sieverts, for preparing all the different datasets that I used in this study.

Finally, I want to express my love and thanks to my beautiful wife, Robyn, and five lovely children, Nathan, Kielle, Ada, Ryan, and Tessa, for their support and patience as I've pursued my graduate studies. Robyn has stood by me throughout this process and been my biggest cheerleader. Without her picking me up on those down days, I don't see myself finishing this study and my degree. I want to particularly thank my daughter Ada for praying for me every day that I would finish my graduate studies. It meant so much to me that she remembered me each day as she communed with her Heavenly Father. I also want to thank my parents for supporting me throughout my schooling and believing in me even when the system did not. I

particularly want to thank my mom for reading to me as a child. That foundation has seen me to

the end of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: Introduction

In 1983 *A Nation at Risk* launched a school reform effort that is still impacting both P-12 schools and educator preparation programs (EPPs) (Ravitch, 2014). A recent example of these school reform efforts is the formation of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). In 2009 the Executive Board of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Board of Directors of the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), CAEP's two predecessors, authorized the formation of a NCATE/TEAC design team to propose a "unified accrediting system that affords choice" (NCATE/TEAC Design Team, 2010, p. 17).

While the creation of this new accrediting body has been complicated by a clash of organizational cultures and systems of accreditation, CAEP put forward two goals that would direct its efforts: (a) "to raise the performance of candidates as practitioners in the nation's P-12 schools" and (b) "to raise the stature of the profession by raising standards for the evidence the field relies on to support its claims of quality" (Cibulka & Murray, 2011, p.3). These two goals represent a raising of the traditional accreditation bar, but begs a significant question: What impact will CAEP and its new form of accreditation have on EPPs? Another salient question is closely related: Will EPPs be able to provide the needed evidence to prove to CAEP that they are meeting its standards for this this new form of accreditation? These two overarching questions are too broad to answer as stated; they must be broken down into smaller questions to elucidate the possible effects of this new accreditation paradigm.

The formation of CAEP with its new paradigm on accreditation has and will continue to directly impact EPPs in the State of Utah. Utah EPPs are required to be accredited by CAEP or one of its predecessors (i.e., NCATE, TEAC) in order to be recognized by the Utah Board of

Education ("the Board") as an approved program (UAC R277-502, 2014; UAC R277-503, 2014) if their graduates are to be eligible for state teaching licensure. Since most candidates who enter into an EPP have the desire to receive a degree and a teaching license, the processes of accreditation and program approval are extremely important for colleges and universities that prepare prospective P-12 educator candidates.

A critical component of any EPP is the culminating field experience, commonly termed *student teaching*. Both CAEP and the Board require that approved preparation programs have a high quality student teaching experience (CAEP, 2013a; UAC R277-504, 2015). "Field experiences have long been identified by both teacher educators and prospective and experienced teachers as a major, if not the most important, part of preservice teacher preparation" (Hollins & Torres-Guzman, 2005, p. 493). In recent years policymakers and practitioners have echoed this sentiment and called for further study of the impact of field experiences on the learning of preservice teacher candidates (AACTE, 2010; Anderson & Stillman, 2013; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Levine, 2006; NCATE, 2010c; NCTQ, 2011).

According to CAEP, one major component of a high quality student teaching experience is the diversity of the student teaching placement (CAEP, 2013a). The more diverse the student teaching placement, the more opportunities candidates may have to apply the knowledge and skills they acquired in their course work and the more likely they are to gain practical experience working with diverse students (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Hollins & Torres-Guzman, 2005; Tabacbnick & Zeichner, 1984). In its 2013 *Accreditation Standards*, CAEP emphasizes the importance of diversity by making it a cross-cutting theme that should be embedded across all five of its accreditation standards. In its rationale explaining the

cross-cutting theme of diversity for EPPs, CAEP establishes its meaning for *diversity* by delineating eight major categories: (a) "race and ethnicity, (b) poverty, (c) language, (d) disability, (e) giftedness, (f) religion, (g) sexual orientation, and (h) gender" (CAEP, 2013a, p. 21).

As the new *de facto* national accreditor for educator preparation (CAEP, 2013b), CAEP has yet to accredit any EPPs using these new standards and cross-cutting themes. Still, CAEP's emphasis on diversity and high quality field experiences will require EPPs seeking accreditation to investigate the diversity of their student teaching placements in order to present evidence that they prepare candidates "to develop professional capabilities that will enable them to adjust and adapt instruction in appropriate ways for the diversity they are likely to encounter in their professional lives" (CAEP, 2013a, p. 20). To obtain this evidence, EPPs need to understand the characteristics and trends of diversity in the districts and schools partnering with them to prepare teacher candidates with the needed knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to impact P-12 student learning (CAEP, 2013a). Along with understanding the trends, EPPs need to investigate how the diversity in these placements impact candidate performance on the assignments and assessments completed during their culminating field experiences.

Statement of Purpose

This study was designed to explore the performance of a sample of Brigham Young University (BYU) elementary education candidates on the diversity items embedded in the three assessments used by the program during student teaching: (a) Teacher Work Sample (TWS), (b) Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS), and (c) Candidate Dispositional Scale (CDS). The three assessments measure the candidates' knowledge (e.g., TWS), skills (e.g., CPAS), and professional dispositions (e.g., CDS). The TWS is a capstone assignment developed by the

Renaissance Group (n.d.) in which candidates design, teach, and analyze the results of a unit during their field experience. The CPAS is the BYU elementary program's student teaching evaluation tool, aligned with the *Utah Effective Teaching Standards* (USOE, 2013), Utah's customization of the national Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards (2013). The CDS is a self-report instrument on which candidates evaluate their self-efficacy on their locus of control, aspirations, and diversity developed by the BYU Educator Preparation Program (BYU EPP; Popham, et al., 2014).

This study explored the degree to which the level of diversity, as defined by CAEP, found in the student teaching placements impacted the performance of BYU elementary education candidates on the diversity items found on the CPAS, TWS, and CDS. As the BYU EPP transitions to CAEP, the faculty needs to understand the impact more specifically to guide them in preparing the evidence required to meet CAEP Standards 1 and 2 (i.e., Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Partnerships and Practice) in relation to the cross-cutting theme of diversity.

Five of the eight CAEP categories of diversity were considered in this study: (a) race and ethnicity, (b) poverty, (c) language, (d) disability, and (e) gender. The mobility rate of schools, which is a subcomponent of poverty, was also included. These six variables of diversity were selected because they are readily available in the mandatory annual October 1 and end-of-year reports that districts must provide to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) for the schools involved with the BYU elementary education (BYU ELED) program. For the remaining three CAEP categories (i.e., giftedness, religion, sexual orientation) are not tracked in these reports and therefore cannot be included in this study. Additionally, it is not appropriate to inquire into and track P-12 students' religious beliefs and sexual orientation.

Research Question

This study addressed the following research question: To what degree does the diversity of a

student teaching placement affect the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions evident in

elementary education candidates' performance during student teaching as measured by the

CPAS, TWS, and CDS assessments used by the BYU elementary education program?

Chapter 2: Literature Review

To contextualize the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) requires understanding what accreditation is, part of its history, and how it has affected the field of educator preparation. It is also important to see how accreditation has been influenced by the school reform efforts in the United States.

Definition of Accreditation

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA; 2010), the private nonprofit organization that coordinates accreditation activities in the United States, including those of CAEP, defines accreditation as "both a process and a status." Their definition specifies, "It is the process of reviewing colleges, universities, institutions and programs to judge their educational quality—how well they serve students and society. The result of the process, if successful, is the award of 'accredited status'" (CHEA, 2010, p. 1).

CHEA (2011) further states, "accreditation in the United States is about quality assurance and quality improvement" (p. 9). The United States Department of Education (USDE) confirms that the "goal of accreditation is to ensure that education provided by institutions of higher education meets acceptable levels of quality" (2014, n.p.). The USDE continues by identifying several functions of accreditation:

1. Verifying that an institution or program meets established standards

2. Assisting prospective students in identifying acceptable institutions

3. Assisting institutions in determining the acceptability of transfer credits

4. Helping to identify institutions and programs for the investment of public and private funds

5. Protecting an institution against harmful internal and external pressure

6. Creating goals for self-improvement of weaker programs and stimulating a general raising of standards among educational institutions

7. Involving the faculty and staff comprehensively in institutional evaluation and planning

8. Establishing criteria for professional certification and licensure and for upgrading courses offering such preparation

9. Providing one of several considerations used as a basis for determining eligibility for Federal assistance (USDE, 2014, n.p.).

The accreditation process that leads to an "accredited" status is built on the acceptance of professional standards, including whether or not an institution or program can demonstrate it meets the minimal level of those standards as judged by a panel of peers. Those professional standards are the defensible criteria by which the worth or merit of a program may be judged (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). As part of the process, accreditation is meant to improve and strengthen programs while ensuring that the EPP's faculty has a knowledge base and skill set needed to prepare candidates with minimal knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to enable them to function in the work force (CAEP, n.d.; CHEA, 2010, 2011; NCATE, n.d.; TEAC, n.d.; USDE, 2014). As the new sole accreditor, CAEP is likely to have a major impact on educator preparation, particularly as new standards are implemented for judging a program's quality and worth.

History of Accreditation

The first examples of accreditation activity in the United States do not start on a federal level but a state level. In 1787 when the State of New York established the University of the State of New York (New York Regents), it was "required by law to yearly visit and review the

work of every college in the state, register each curriculum at each institution, and to report to the legislature" (Harcleroad, 1980, p. 2). The Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution leaves the responsibility of educating U. S. citizens to the states: "[T]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people" (U. S. Const. Amend. X). All but a handful of educational institutions in the United States are sponsored and/or regulated by state or local governments, as reflected in the United States accreditation system. Other than a few notable exceptions (e.g., United States military academies), the federal government does not accredit educational institutions but relies on states and nonprofit associations and councils to do the job (Harcleroad, 1980).

The United States accreditation system that we know today began over questions about the differences between high school and college and "the lack of commonly accepted standards for admission to college and for completing a college degree" (Harcleroad & Eaton 2011, p. 205). This origin was acknowledged by a statement by Sister Mary Andrew Matesich, president of Ohio Dominican University, at the Presidents Work Group on Accreditation Meeting in 1995:

> One hundred years ago, the question was, "What is the difference between a high school and a college?" That was the purpose of accreditation. Regional accreditation came about because institutions said, "We don't know the difference between a high school and a college." (as qtd by Bloland, 2001, p. 17)

Regional accreditation bodies. The end of the nineteenth century was a turbulent and confused time in higher education. Along with the expansion of secondary and postsecondary education, leading to the question of differences between high school and college and to recognition of the need for admission standards, three additional factors contributed to this

unsettled environment: (a) the final breakdown of the classical curriculum accompanied by the implementation of the elective system; (b) the expansion of new academic fields; and (c) the expansion of various types of institutions to meet emerging social needs (e.g., teacher colleges, junior colleges, land-grant colleges, research universities, specialized professional schools) (Harcleroad, 1980; Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011).

The University of Michigan was the first to address some of these issues by evaluating the differences between high schools and colleges. Starting in 1871, the university sent out faculty members to inspect and review high schools, including the curriculum they were using to help establish standards for the high school diplomas used by students seeking admission to the university (Harcleroad, 1980; Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011). In addition to accreditation work done by universities, like the University of Michigan and others, university presidents and other educational leaders came together to form regional accreditation bodies to establish standards, evaluate members, and publish lists of accredited institutions. In 1885, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the first of six regional accrediting bodies, was formed in New England by a group of secondary schoolmasters. The second regional accreditation body was the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools formed in 1887. Chancellor Kirkland and the faculty of Vanderbilt University led the formation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1895. In that same year the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges was formed. Nearly 20 years later, in 1917, the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges was formed; the last of the six regionals, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, was formed in 1923 (Harcleroad, 1980; Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011). These six regional accreditation bodies have played a pivotal role in shaping accreditation in the United States.

Specialized, professional accreditation bodies. The first of many voluntary specialized, professional accreditation bodies was the American Medical Association (AMA). The AMA was formed in 1847 and quickly thereafter formed the Committee on Medical Education to review medical education curriculum and practices (Harcleroad, 1980). The AMA did not take an active accreditation role until 1905, over 50 years after its inception, when the AMA was restructured and formally began to review medical schools (Harcleroad, 1980; Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011). During the restructure, the AMA established the Council on Medical Education, which led the first effort to rate medical schools. In 1907 the Council reviewed 160 medical schools in ten areas and published a list of those schools classifying them as Class A, "approved"; Class B, "probation"; or Class C, "unapproved" (Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011).

This first list was vigorously criticized, so in 1908 and again in 1915 the AMA joined with the recently established Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to complete a second study. This study led to a second list published by the Council on Medical Education classifying the then 95 medical schools as approved (66), probation (17), and unapproved (12). "This voluntary effort led to the ultimate in accountability: the merger and closing of 65 medical schools. In the process, medical education was changed drastically, and the remaining schools completely revised and changed their curricula, a process still continuing to this day" (Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011, p. 206).

The AMA set the foundation for specialized, professional accrediting bodies. Across the years there have been many of these accrediting bodies in such areas as teacher preparation, architecture, business, law, journalism, theology, music, engineering, pharmacy, optometry, and nursing—three of which were the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

(NCATE), the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), and Council for the

Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), presently recognized as the professional

accrediting bodies for educator preparation in the United States.

Accreditation of Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs)

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) is the blending of the

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher

Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). "Under *de facto* consolidation, NCATE and TEAC

are subsidiaries of CAEP, maintaining their recognition by the U.S. Department of Education

(USDE) and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) for the purpose of

maintaining the accreditation of educator preparation providers until such time as said providers

come up for accreditation under CAEP" (CAEP, 2010, para. 2). CAEP will eventually take over

as the sole educator preparation accrediting body.

Since CAEP is a new accreditor that has yet to accredit any educator preparation

programs, both of its predecessors, NCATE and TEAC, need to be considered to understand

CAEP. NCATE has been accrediting educator preparation programs since 1954 and TEAC since

1997. The concept of CAEP began in 2009 when the Executive Board of NCATE and the Board

of Directors of TEAC authorized the formation of a NCATE/TEAC design team to propose a

"unified accrediting system that affords choice" (NCATE/TEAC Design Team, 2010, p. 17),

blending the best of NCATE and TEAC. The formation of CAEP and development of a new

approach to accreditation has been complicated by a clash of the traditions, processes, cultures,

and values of NCATE and TEAC. To help guide the new accrediting body, CAEP selected two

goals that would guide its efforts: (1) "to raise the performance of candidates as practitioners in

the nation's P-12 schools" and (2) "to raise the stature of the profession by raising standards for the evidence the field relies on to support its claims of quality" (Cibulka & Murray, 2011, p.3).

NCATE. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has been accrediting educator preparation units since 1954 with the belief that "every student deserves a caring, competent and highly qualified teacher" (NCATE, 2010a, n.p.). Five major organizations with key interests in educator preparation were instrumental in creating NCATE. Those organizations were the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Education Association (NEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) (NCATE, 2008).

Prior to NCATE's formation, AACTE was the organization that accredited educator preparation programs. AACTE filled that role from its inception in 1948 to 1954 when it established NCATE and transferred those responsibilities to the newly formed accrediting body.

In 1954, after several years of wrestling with accreditation problems within the Association [AACTE], while at the same time trying to be a professional association home for institutions of widely varying size and quality, the Association [AACTE] gave up accrediting, and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education was created" (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1998, p. 32).

One of the key issues that AACTE wrestled with prior to the formation of NCATE and a driving force that lead to the separation of the professional organization from the accrediting organization was that to be a member of AACTE, an institution also had to be accredited by

AACTE. This was an obvious conflict of interest and roadblock to institutions with an interest in joining AACTE as a professional organization but had no desire or resources to pursue accreditation by AACTE (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1998).

Though AACTE played a key role, NCATE's legacy did not start with AACTE. Prior to AACTE, the American Association of Teacher Colleges (AATC), AACTE's predecessor, acted as the accrediting body for educator preparation. AATC started its work in 1917 when five presidents and deans of prominent degree granting teacher colleges came together to discuss teacher education and the state of teacher colleges and normal schools in the nation (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1998). AATC further solidified its role in the accreditation of educator preparation programs in 1922 when AATC merged with the National Council of Teacher Colleges (NCTC) and prepared a constitution and bylaws to organize and govern their work (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1998). The NCATE known today has its roots in the very foundation of the educator preparation field. It can trace its genealogy back to the normal school movement of the late 19th century and teacher colleges of the early 20th century.

In educator preparation accreditation's developmental phases from AATC to AACTE and finally to NCATE, a set of standards and an accreditation framework had been maintained to guide the work of judging a "professional education unit" (or unit) may be judged in order to grant accredited status.

> [The unit has] primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. A unit must include in its accreditation review all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs offered for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in preschool through twelfth grade settings" (NCATE, 2008, p. 5).

To guide a unit's day-to-day work, NCATE requires units seeking accreditation to establish a conceptual framework, a "shared vision of the unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools (NCATE, 2008, p. 14). NCATE's standards document specifies,

> [The shared vision] provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated. The conceptual framework provides the basis that describes the unit's intellectual philosophy and institutional standards, which distinguish graduates of one institution from those of another. (NCATE, 2008, p. 14)

Along with its framework for establishing a unit's conceptual framework, NCATE has six unit standards and many supporting critical elements that direct its accreditation process. "The six NCATE unit standards identify the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions expected of educational professionals" (NCATE, 2008, p. 10). Table 1 lays out NCATE's six standards and the number of critical elements associated with each major standard.

In addition to its six major standards with accompanying critical elements, NCATE coordinates with 24 specialized professional associations (SPAs), each maintaining its own set of standards (NCATE, 2008). Any unit completing an NCATE accreditation cycle must address each set of SPA standards that corresponds to programs offered by the unit or complete an approved state program review process. The SPA review results provide a primary source of evidence for Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions. See Appendix A for a list of the 24 NCATE SPAs.

Table 1

2008 NCATE Unit Standards

Standard number	Standard name	Number of critical elements
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	7
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	3
3	Field Experience and Clinical Practice	3
4	Diversity	4
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	6
6	Unit Governance and Resources	5

To evaluate a unit's success in meeting its six standards, NCATE uses a series of rubrics addressing the critical elements associated with each standard. The rubrics describe the critical elements using three proficiency levels: *unacceptable, acceptable,* and *target*. To be fully accredited, the unit must demonstrate it meets the acceptable level on all six of the NCATE standards while working toward the target level. During each accreditation cycle, the unit must select one of the six standards for which it will reach the target level. Each subsequent accreditation cycle, the unit will select another standard to reach at the target level until they have reached the target level on all six standards.

A unit prepares a self-study case called an Institutional Report (IR), with supporting evidence to demonstrate to NCATE that the unit meets the six standards. To evaluate this claim, NCATE sends a Board of Examiners (BOE) team to conduct a site visit to review the institutional report and supporting evidence. Following the site visit, the BOE prepares a team report that outlines its findings and makes an accreditation recommendation. The institution has the opportunity to review the BOE team report and write a rejoinder if it is concerned with any of

the findings presented in report. The chair of the BOE team has the responsibility to write a response to the institution's rejoinder.

The IR, BOE team report, institutional rejoinder, and BOE team chair's response to the rejoinder are the evidence that the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) relies on to make its accreditation decision. The UAB has the option of (a) granting or continuing accreditation for a defined length of time, (b) deferring the decision until the next meeting, or (c) denying or revoking accreditation (NCATE 2010b; NCATE, 2012). Table 2 outlines the seven accreditation decisions that the UAB may make regarding an institution's accreditation status. At present NCATE has 675 accredited units, with 33 units in candidacy for accreditation (D. Leon-Guerrero, personal communication, March 19, 2013).

TEAC. The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) has been accrediting educator preparation programs since 1997 with the belief that every student deserves a "competent, caring, and qualified educator" (TEAC, 2012, p.2). Although TEAC's history is much shorter than NCATE's, its development is directly related to NCATE; thus TEAC shares much of NCATE's history. TEAC was formed to provide an alternative to NCATE. In 1997, Frank B. Murray was approached by the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) to create a new accreditation system for educator preparation (Fallon, 2012). Allen P. Splete, President of CIC, stated that

> Currently, the only organization offering accreditation for teacher education is the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Many colleges and universities have found NCATE's standards lacking and the process too costly or time-consuming, so this new accrediting organization [TEAC] was formed" (Moncure, 1998, p. 1).

In addition to CIC's invitation, Murray responded to the 1996 call made by the

National Commission on Teaching for America's Future (NCTAF) for all teacher education

institutions to be accredited (NCTAF, 1996). In its 1996 report, NCTAF put forward two goals:

(1) to provide each pupil with a caring, competent, and qualified teacher, and (2) to insure that

Table 2

Unit Accreditation Board Accreditation Decisions

Accreditation Decision	Description
Accreditation for seven years	All standards are met and no serious problems exist across standards.
Accreditation for five years	All standards are met, no serious problems exist across standards, and the state retains a five-year cycle.
Accreditation for two years with a focused visit	When at least one standard is not met and problems are centered in the unmet standard, a focused visit within two years will be required. If the standard continues to be unmet after the focused visit, accreditation will be revoked.
Accreditation for two years with a full visit	When one or more standards are not met and serious problems exist across standards, a full visit will be requested. If the standard(s) continues to be unmet after the full visit, accreditation will be revoked.
Defer decision	The UAB will defer a decision if the Board of Examiners (BOE) team recommended that any standard was met for which the UAB did not accept the team's recommendation. A supplemental rejoinder related to the new unmet standard(s) will be submitted for review during the next UAB meeting. If the standard(s) continues to be unmet after the supplemental rejoinder, accreditation will be granted for 18 months with either a focused or full visit.
Deny accreditation	When one or more standards are not met and the preponderance of evidence indicates problems across multiple standards by an institution seeking accreditation for the first time.
Revoke accreditation	When one or more standards are not met and the preponderance of evidence indicates problems across multiple standards by an institution seeking to continue accreditation.

every teacher education program is accredited. Murray embraced these goals and placed them at the heart of TEAC. At the time of NCTAF's report over half of the approximately 1,300 schools of education were accredited under the NCATE system of accreditation. The fact that over 650 of the educator preparation programs in the U.S. were not accredited may not be troublesome if only weak and poor performing schools remained unaccredited however; "some of the nation's premier schools of education have also not bothered with the prevailing system of accreditation [NCATE]" (Murray, n.d., p. 2).

> In accepting this challenge to create a new system of accreditation,
> [Murray] designed a system that balances three sources of evidence in a single
> accreditation system: (a) that the program's graduates are qualified, competent,
> and caring beginning teachers; (b) that the program faculty investigates the factors
> that improve program quality; and (c) that the program has the capacity for
> continuous program improvement. (Murray, 2010, p. 7)

This new system of accreditation defined the entity being accredited differently than NCATE. In its statement that "TEAC accredits [single] programs that prepare professional educators who will teach and lead in the nation's schools, grades pre-K-12," TEAC specified that a single program can be made up of different licensure areas, majors, tracks, and/or levels "if they share a common logic, structure, quality control system, and similar and comparable categories of evidence" (TEAC, 2012, p. 7). Institutions with multiple programs seeking accreditation must decide which programs to "bundle" together in an *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal,* a research monograph, TEAC's program self-study report. When considering which programs to bundle into their *Inquiry Brief*, a program must consider three factors: (a) program structure, (b) quality control system, and (c) evidence. If programs with essentially the

same requirements, reasoning, logic, and faculty that share a common quality control system that produces comparable evidence that can be honestly aggregated, they may be bundled and presented in a single *Inquiry Brief* (TEAC, 2012).

The *Inquiry Brief* presents a program's argument that it prepares competent, caring, and qualified educators. To make its case, a program must demonstrate that it has satisfied TEAC's three quality principles:

- Quality Principle I: Evidence of candidate learning

- Quality Principle II: Evidence of faculty learning and inquiry

- Quality Principle III: Evidence of institutional commitment and program capacity for quality. (TEAC, 2012)

TEAC maintains a standard of quality requiring that a program demonstrate that the evidence that it relies upon to make its argument is "trustworthy, consistent with the program's claims and TEAC's requirements, and is of sufficient magnitude" (TEAC, 2012, p. 2).

A program meets the TEAC standard of quality when the evidence cited in the program's *Inquiry Brief* is consistent with the claims made about the graduates' accomplishments and when there is little or no credible evidence that is inconsistent with the claims. TEAC uses a system of heuristics to arrive at its accreditation decision and judgments about whether the program's evidence of the students' and graduates' accomplishments and other matters is *trustworthy* and *sufficient.* (TEAC, 2012, p. 2)

Guiding the preparation of an *Inquiry* Brief, TEAC relies on four process principles:

- Process Principle One: Continuous improvement to advance quality

- Process Principle Two: Inquiry-driven accreditation

- Process Principle Three: Audits to ensure quality

- Process Principle Four: Frugality. (TEAC, 2012)

Together, the three quality principles and four process principles make up the framework of the TEAC accreditation system.

To account for its definition of program, TEAC has developed two sets of quality principles, one for teacher education programs and one for educational leadership programs, represented with their associated components in Table 3. To evaluate a program's success at meeting the three quality principals, TEAC requires a program to make its case in the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal* that it prepares and submits.

To check the trustworthiness and sufficiency of the program's argument, TEAC uses a five-step evaluation process; each step is dependent on and informed by the step before it. The first step in the process is the formative evaluation of the *Inquiry Brief,* during which three questions about the Brief are asked: (a) "Is the program making a persuasive case for itself? (b) Does the Brief include all of the required elements? and (c) Is the language clear and precise?" (TEAC, 2012, p. 41). This phase is a formative review by TEAC staff that provides feedback to the program including ways to improve the Brief. The formative evaluation can cycle as many times as needed for the program to consider that they have prepared a quality *Inquiry Brief* to submit to TEAC for the next step in the process, the auditability decision.

During the auditability decision, TEAC asks, "Is the Brief complete and ready to be audited?" (TEAC, 2012, p. 41). The auditability check is for completeness; no judgment of the program's quality is made at this time. The third step in the process is the academic audit or site visit for which TEAC sends a team of two to four auditors to verify the trustworthiness of the *Inquiry Brief* and supporting evidence. The guiding question of this step is "Is the evidence in

the Brief trustworthy?" (TEAC, 2012, p. 41). While on site, the audit team works to verify the evidence presented in the case by reviewing artifacts, reconstructing the analysis conducted by the program, and interviewing administration, faculty, mentor teachers, and students.

Following the site visit, the audit team prepares the Audit Report, which summarizes the audit tasks performed and the trustworthiness of the evidence presented in the *Inquiry Brief*. The auditors also report one of four judgments or audit opinions: (a) clean opinion, (b) qualified opinion, (c) adverse opinion, and (d) disclaimer opinion (TEAC, 2012). The audit report represents the transition from the audit step to the summative evaluation step. During the summative evaluation step, TEAC seeks to answer two questions: (a) "Is the preponderance of the evidence in the Brief consistent with the program's claims that the program's graduates are competent, caring, and qualified? (b) Is the evidence reliable, valid, and of sufficient magnitude to support the program's claims?" (TEAC, 2012, p. 42) Once the audit team has completed their draft of the audit report, they share it with the program representatives for their acceptance. The program has the opportunity to "correct any factual errors and may formally respond in writing to the findings of the audit" (TEAC 2012, p. 88). Once the program has responded to the Audit Report, the lead auditor adds the program response and finalizes the report. The *Inquiry Brief* and Audit Report are then submitted to the Accreditation Panel for review.

Table 3

TEAC Quality Principles for Teacher Education and Educational Leadership Programs

Quality principle	Teacher education subindicators	Educational leadership subindicators
QP I: Evidence of candidate learning	1.1 subject matter knowledge	1.1 professional knowledge
	1.2 pedagogical knowledge	1.2 strategic decision-making
	1.3 caring and effective teaching skills	1.3 caring leadership skills
	1.4 Cross-cutting themes	
	1.4.1 learning how to learn	1.4.1 learning how to learn
	1.4.2 multicultural perspectives and accuracy	1.4.2 multicultural perspectives and accuracy
	1.4.3 technology	1.4.3 technology
	1.5 valid and reliable interpretation of the evidence	1.5 valid and reliable interpretation of the evidence
QP II: Evidence of faculty learning and inquiry	2.1 rationale for the assessments	2.1 rationale for the assessments
	2.2 program decisions and planning based on evidence	2.2 program decisions and planning based on evidence
	2.3 influential quality control system	2.3 influential quality control system
	2.3.1 curriculum	2.3.1 curriculum
	2.3.2 faculty	2.3.2 faculty
	2.3.3 candidates	2.3.3 candidates
	2.3.4 resources	2.3.4 resources
QP III: Evidence of institutional commitment and capacity for program quality	3.1 Commitment (program parity with the institution)	
	3.1.1 curriculum	3.1.1 curriculum
	3.1.2 faculty	3.1.2 faculty
	3.1.3 facilities	3.1.3 facilities
	3.1.4 fiscal and administrative	3.1.4 fiscal and administrative
	3.1.5 candidate support	3.1.5 candidate support
	3.1.6 candidate complaints	3.1.6 candidate complaints
	3.2 Sufficient capacity for quality	
	3.2.1 curriculum	3.2.1 curriculum
	3.2.2 faculty	3.2.2 faculty
	3.2.3 facilities	3.2.3 facilities
	3.2.4 fiscal and administrative	3.2.4 fiscal and administrative
	3.2.5 student support services	3.2.5 student support services
	3.2.6 policies and practices	3.2.6 policies and practices
	3.3 State standards	

The final step in the evaluation process is the accreditation decision, which is broken down into two parts: the Accreditation Panel review and recommendation and the Accreditation Committee's accreditation decision.

The Accreditation Panel reviews all of the materials related to the case and then determines if the evidence, as verified by the audit, is of sufficient magnitude to support the claims of the Brief. On the basis of its examination, the panel recommends an accreditation decision to the Accreditation Committee. (TEAC, 2012, p. 95)

The Accreditation Committee then considers the panel's recommendation and renders a final accreditation decision. During the fifth step of the evaluation process, TEAC is considering (a) "Should the Accreditation Panelists' recommendation be accepted? (b) "Was the TEAC process that ended in the panel's recommendation followed properly?" (TEAC, 2012, p. 42) The Accreditation Committee can make one of four decisions, as outlined in Table 4.

Following the Accreditation Committee's decision, the program has 30 days to accept or appeal the decision. If the decision is to accredit and the program accepts, TEAC announces the decision by posting the summary of the case on its website and adding the program to its list of accredited programs; informs stakeholders; and schedules the program's annual report. If the decision is not to accredit, the program may appeal, "if it has evidence to support its claim" (TEAC, 2012, p. 116). The program must present evidence of any or all of the following:

- "Evidence of errors or omissions in prescribed procedures

- Evidence that demonstrates bias, conflict of interest, or prejudice

- Evidence that TEAC's decision was not supported adequately or was contrary to the facts presented and known at the time of the decision" (TEAC, 2012, p. 116)

At present, TEAC has 165 accredited programs with 75 institutions of higher education in candidacy for accreditation (D. Rigden, personal communication, March 19, 2013).

Table 4

TEAC Accreditation Committee Decisions

Accreditation decision	Description
Accreditation for seven years	All three of the TEAC Quality Principles are met. The committee accredits for seven years, upon the recommendation of the panel, when it cannot find conclusive evidence that is contrary to the panel's recommendation.
Initial accreditation for five years	For programs seeking accreditation for the first time that do not yet have data to support Quality Principle I: Candidate Learning but have met Quality Principles II & III and provided a robust plan to obtain data to meet Quality Principle I by the next audit visit, the committee awards initial accreditation for five years, when the committee cannot find conclusive evidence that is contrary to the panel's recommendation.
Accreditation or initial accreditation for two years	One of the three TEAC Quality Principles is below standard and thus not met. The committee awards accreditation or initial accreditation for two years when conclusive evidence if found that any single element (Quality Principles I-III) was below standard.
Deny accreditation	Two or more of the TEAC Quality Principals are below standard and thus not met. The committee may deny accreditation upon the recommendation of the panel, if conclusive evidence was not found to support the programs faculty's claims. The committee may override the panel's recommendation for accreditation of a program if it can find conclusive evidence in the record showing that any two elements the panel considered above standard were actually below standard.

CAEP. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) is built on the legacies of NCATE and TEAC. In 2009, with encouragement from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), "the premier voice on educator

preparation" (AACTE, 2015, n.p.); the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), "a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states" (CCSSO, 2015, n.p.); and many leading education deans, the Executive Board of NCATE and the Board of Directors of TEAC authorized the formation of a NCATE/TEAC design team to propose a "unified accrediting system that affords choice" (NCATE/TEAC Design Team, 2010, p. 17). The design team was challenged to develop a new approach to educator preparation accreditation, blending the best of NCATE and TEAC. Across the following four years, led by the design team, many educator preparation professionals came together to develop a new approach to educator preparation accreditation and in 2013 that work culminated in CAEP becoming the single, *de facto* accreditor for educator preparation in the United States (CAEP, 2013b).

To guide CAEP's work, the designers established a mission statement: "CAEP advances excellent educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning" (CAEP, 2013c, n.p.). Along with the mission statement, CAEP set six goals to drive its strategic plan to become a premier accreditor: (a) "to raise the bar in educator preparation, (b) to promote continuous improvement, (c) to advance research and innovation, (d) to increase accreditation's value, (e) to be a model accrediting body, and (f) to be a model learning organization" (CAEP, 2013c, n.p.).

Armed with its new mission statement and set of goals to guide its work, CAEP has worked to develop a new model of accreditation. To provide the choice that was promised by the NCATE/TEAC design team, CAEP has developed three pathways for an educator preparation provider (EPP), (i.e., NCATE unit, TEAC program) to pursue accreditation: (a) inquiry brief pathway, (b) selective improvement pathway, and (c) transformation initiative

pathway (CAEP, 2013a). These three pathways have evolved from the NCATE and TEAC models of accreditation. The inquiry brief pathway is an adaptation of the TEAC approach, while the selective improvement and transformation initiative pathways follow NCATE. To scaffold each of the three CAEP pathways and bring about a unified approach to accrediting educator preparation, the CAEP Board of Directors formed the Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting and "charged it to develop accreditation standards for preparation programs" (CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting, 2013, p. 5). Table 5 displays the five standards, number of subcomponents, and cross-cutting themes developed and recommended by the Commission and adopted and approved by the CAEP Board of Directors.

Table 5

2013 CAEP Accreditation Standards and Cross-cutting Themes

Standard number	Standard name	Number of subcomponents
Standard 1:	Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	5
Standard 2:	Clinical Partnerships and Practice	3
Standard 3:	Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	6
Standard 4:	Program Impact	4
Standard 5:	Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	5
Cross-cutting theme 1:	Diversity	0
Cross-cutting theme 2:	Technology and Digital Learning	0

Diversity and Field Experiences Across Accreditation Models: NCATE, TEAC, CAEP

NCATE and TEAC both examine evidence of an educator preparation program's ability to prepare candidates to work with diverse populations of P-12 students as well as the quality of the field experiences candidates complete. However, they approach this evaluation in very different ways. CAEP provisions show influences of both.

NCATE. Of NCATE's six standards, Standard 3 is dedicated to field experiences and Standard 4 addresses diversity.

Standard 3: Field Experience and Clinical Practice. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. (NCATE, 2008, p. 29)

Standard 4: Diversity. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools. (NCATE, 2008, p. 34)

To evaluate a unit's performance on each standard, NCATE has developed a series of rubrics, which use a three-point scale ranging from *unacceptable*, *acceptable*, and *target*. A unit must reach the acceptable level or above on each standard to receive accreditation. In NCATE's rubric to evaluate Standard 3, the "acceptable" column states,

Field experiences and clinical practice provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn. All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practices that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. (NCATE, 2008, p. 31)

Thus NCATE requires that accredited institutions address diversity in their field experiences and student teaching placements. Greater detail is included on the necessary knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in Standard 4: Diversity. The "acceptable" column of Subsection 4a of the Standard 4 rubric states,

Curriculum and field experiences provide a well grounded framework for understanding diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates are aware of different learning styles and adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. (NCATE, 2008, p. 34)

The "acceptable" column of Subsection 4d of the rubric continues the specification:

Field experiences or clinical practice programs provide experiences with male and female P–12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups. Candidates also work with English language learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences and/or clinical practice to develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with all students. (NCATE, 2008, p. 36)

Together Standards 3 and 4 frame NCATE's expectation for working with diverse students in field experiences and emphasize the importance of diversity in the NCATE process. When pieced together NCATE requires candidates to have knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work with the following categories of diverse students: (a) race and ethnicity, (b) poverty, (c) language, (d) disability, (e) giftedness, and (f) gender.

TEAC. TEAC's approach to standards and evaluation criteria differs from that of NCATE's. TEAC does not judge according to *standards,* but expresses its expectations through its Quality Principles. It does not use rubrics, but establishes quality and process principles to frame its work. Through Quality Principle I: Evidence of candidate learning, TEAC focuses its evaluation of a program's ability to prepare competent, caring, and qualified candidates to work with diverse populations along with its statement that a program must present the evidence that candidates participate in high quality field experiences (TEAC, 2012).

TEAC breaks Quality Principle I down into five subcomponents, of which Subcomponents 1.2 (Pedagogical Knowledge), 1.3 (Caring and Effective Teaching Skills), and 1.4.2 (Multicultural Perspectives and Accuracy) focus on diversity, including diversity within the field experiences. Subcomponent 1.2 states, "TEAC requires evidence that the candidates learn how to convert their knowledge of a subject matter into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of students" (TEAC, 2012, p. 20). TEAC is less prescriptive than NCATE in its definitions, allowing programs to define and defend its criteria. TEAC introduces a different perspective on diversity with Subcomponent 1.3 (Caring and Effective Teaching Skills) with an emphasis on the concept of caring:

Above all, teachers are expected to act on their knowledge in a caring and

professional manner that would lead to appropriate levels of achievement for all

their pupils.

Caring is a particular kind of relationship between the teacher and the student that

is defined by the teacher's *unconditional acceptance of the student* [emphasis

added], the teacher's intention to address the student's education needs, the

teacher's competence to meet those needs, and the student's recognition that the

teacher cares.

Although it recognizes that the available measures of caring are not as well

developed as the measures of student learning, TEAC requires evidence that the

program's graduates are caring. (TEAC, 2012, p. 20)

TEAC does not leave programs without guidance on how it defines diverse students. In

Subcomponent 1.4.2 (Multicultural Perspectives and Accuracy), also classified as a cross-cutting

theme of Quality Principle I, TEAC delineates the categories of diversity it expects a program to

apply when considering field experiences and diversity instruction. Subcomponent 1.4.2 states,

Graduates who understand their teaching subject also know and understand—(2)

the qualification that limit generalization owing to different cultural perspectives.

TEAC requires evidence that candidates for the degree understand the

implications of confirmed scholarship on gender, race, individual differences, and

ethnic and cultural perspectives for educational practice. For all persons, but

especially for prospective teachers, the program must yield an accurate and sound

understanding of the educational significance of race, gender, individual

differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives. (TEAC, 2012, pp. 20-21)

As a whole, TEAC Quality Principle I requires candidates to be competent, caring, and qualified to work with the following categories of diverse students: (a) race and ethnicity, (b) poverty, (c) language, (d) disability, (e) giftedness, and (f) gender.

CAEP. Building on NCATE's standards and TEAC's quality principles and cross-cutting themes, CAEP has developed Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice, which focuses on the relationship between the educator preparation provider (EPP) and the P-12 schools and districts collaborating with it to prepare high quality candidates. Standard 2 also focuses on the clinical experience offered by the EPP and its P-12 partners to ensure that candidates are able to demonstrate that they are prepared to have a positive impact on all P-12 students. "The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development" (CAEP, 2013a, p. 6).

Subcomponent 2.3: Clinical Experiences further emphasizes the conditions that need to be provided by the EPP and its P-12 partners to ensure that candidates have high quality field experience when it states, "The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, *diversity* [emphasis added], coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development" (CAEP, 2013a, 6). Similar to NCATE's Standard 3, CAEP's Standard 2 emphasizes that providers must address the diversity found in the field placements

they use when preparing candidates; so that their candidates are able to work with all P-12 students they may encounter in the work place.

Similar to TEAC, CAEP has moved diversity out of the standards and made it a cross-cutting theme emphasizing the importance of diversity across all of an EPP's preparation efforts. Along with technology, the second cross-cutting theme, the commission stresses the significance of diversity by saying,

> Diversity and technology are, thus, two critical areas that will require new learning and substantial innovation by preparation providers; the significant demographic and technological changes that impact their programs also influence the skills their completers must master to be effective. Because these two challenges are imbedded in every aspect of educator preparation, the Commission chose to recognize them throughout the recommended standards. (CAEP, 2013a, p. 20)

Thus, CAEP and the Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting have elevated the emphasis on diversity to a higher level than CAEP's predecessors.

Diversity and Multiculturalism

In the professional literature *diversity* has been a difficult construct to define. Depending on the topic and perspective being discussed, diversity can mean many different things and be defined in many different ways. One way to enter the conversation on diversity is to look at the literature associated with multicultural education. Gorski (2009a) highlights the work of the field's leading and pioneering scholars (Banks, 2004; Grant & Sleeter, 1997; Nieto, 1995, 2004; Sleeter, 1996, 2003) and defines multicultural education as follows:

Multicultural education, at its heart, is social reconstructionist in nature, a movement to identify and eliminate the inequities and injustices that plague our schools, societies, and world. So although individual educational practices, programs, or resources may be consistent with or reflective of multicultural education philosophy, authentic multicultural education is achieved only through systemic and comprehensive school reform—through the identification and elimination of racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and other inequitable distributions of privilege and power. *In other words, multicultural education's chief concerns are equity and social justice.* (p. 348)

Gorski (2009b) summarizes these constructs of multicultural education into five defining principles:

1. "Multicultural education is a political movement and process that attempts to secure social justice for underserved and disenfranchised students;

2. Multicultural education recognizes that, while some individual classroom practices are philosophically consistent with multicultural education, social justice is an institutional matter, and as such can be secured only through comprehensive school reform;

3. Multicultural education insists that comprehensive school reform can be achieved only through a critical analysis of systems of power and privilege;

4. Multicultural education's underlying goal—the purpose of this critical analysis—is the elimination of education inequities; and

5. Multicultural education is good education for *all* students" (p. 310).

These five defining principles are intended as the theoretical and philosophical framework for multicultural education offered by EPPs—as a structure for conversations with their candidates around P-12 diversity, including the needs of diverse learners. These principles should represent the backbone of the multicultural education offered by EPPs. However research literature is questioning how these show up in educator preparation and accompanying discourse around issues of student diversity. Multicultural education tends to be more about the celebration of diversity and learning about culture and human relations than equity and social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Diaz-Rico, 1998; Gorski, 2009a, 2009b; Hidalgo, Chavez-Chavez, & Ramage, 1996; Jackson, 2003; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004; Nieto, 2004; Vavrus, 2002).

Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol (2001) created a typology to summarize the different approaches to multicultural education, grounded in the foundational work of Grant and Steeler (1997) and McLaren (1994). Jenks et al. (2001) identify three major frameworks in their typology: (a) conservative multiculturalism, (b) liberal multiculturalism, and (c) critical multiculturalism.

Conservative multiculturalism can be summarized as "assimilating students into the mainstream culture" (p. 90) in favor of cultural homogeneity. To support this paradigm, conservative multiculturalism endeavors to Americanize minorities, with the goal of having a standardized curriculum so that all learners have equal opportunities for learning and are prepared for a competitive economy. Ideologically, conservative multiculturalism is rooted in a market logic and sidesteps the complex issues of diversity and culture.

Jenks et al. (2001) continue by describing *liberal multiculturalism* as an approach that "accents the need for diversity and cultural pluralism and the acceptance and celebration of differences" (p. 92). In contrast to conservative multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism embraces and appreciates differences instead of forcing conformity and adoption of the

mainstream culture. Though valuing difference, liberal multiculturalists do not give enough

attention to power, privilege, and control. Jenks et al. (2001) build on Grant and Sleeter's (1997)

work when they further point out that the "liberal approach unfortunately includes a limited

analysis of why inequities exist in the first place, as well as simplistic conceptions of culture and

identity" (p. 93). This acceptance of cultural pluralism and celebration of differences "sidesteps,

or is ignorant of, the root causes of racism and inequity" (p. 93).

The third approach that Jenks et al. (2001) identify is *critical multiculturalism,* which

emphasizes that the issues of educational equity can only be obtained through examining deeper

questions:

> Under what conditions and by whom are concepts of equity and excellence
>
> constructed? What do they look like for different groups and in different
>
> circumstances? . . . How can equity and excellence be achieved in a society in
>
> which historically the dominant culture has determined the meaning? The critical
>
> approach seeks justice by focusing on the relationships between equity and
>
> excellence, on one hand, and race, ethnic, and class configurations, on the other
>
> hand. (p. 93)

Jenks et al. (2001) further build on Grant and Sleeter's (1997) social reconstructionist

work when they point out that critical multiculturalists "believe that schools impose standards on

children that reinforce the power relationships and social stratification of American society" (p.

94), forcing educators to recognize that they work within a larger sociopolitical context. Grant

and Sleeter's social reconstructivist model "directly challenges students to become social

reformers and commit to the reconstruction of society through the redistribution of power and

resources" (Jenks et al., 2001, p. 95). Critical multiculturalism builds on liberal

multiculturalism's accentuation of diversity and cultural pluralism while celebrating differences by moving this acceptance and celebration to deeper questions forcing candidates to examine more of the reasons "why" and calls for action to bring about social reconstruction by better understanding the roles of power, privilege, and control.

Jenks et al.'s (2001) typology of conservative multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism, and critical multiculturalism provides a way to categorize and organize current thinking about multiculturalism and provides a sociopolitical philosophy to discuss the purposes of multiculturalism. However, none of the three completely connects to and builds on the five defining principles of multicultural education (Gorski, 2009b).

In his 2009 analysis of multicultural teacher education syllabi, Gorski used Jenks et al.'s (2001) work to critique approaches to preparing teachers in multicultural education. He described five different approaches nested within Jenks et al.'s (2001) three original approaches. Gorski (2009b) relabeled conservative multiculturalism *Teaching the "Other,"* indicating that the objectives of this approach would be to "prepare teachers to work effectively with a diverse student population by studying the cultures, values, lifestyles, and worldviews of individual identity groups and how to assimilate them into the education system" (p. 312). However, he subdivided the remaining two approaches—liberal and critical multiculturalism—to provide more nuance across these types.

Gorski (2009b) divided liberal multiculturalism into *Teaching with Cultural Sensitivity and Tolerance* and *Teaching with Multicultural Competence* (p. 312). The objectives associated with *Teaching with Cultural Sensitivity and Tolerance* were to "prepare teachers to tolerate difference and to be aware of and sensitive to diversity, particularly through an examination of personal biases and prejudices," while *Teaching with Multicultural Competence* was intended to

"equip teachers with the knowledge and practical skills necessary to implement multicultural curricular and pedagogical strategies, enabling them to meet the diverse learning needs of students" (p. 312). These approaches differ in that the first is focused more on self-reflection for personal awareness, while the second focuses on skill development; however both of these approaches lack attention to educational inequities.

Gorski (2009b) also divided critical multiculturalism into two new approaches: *Teaching in Sociopolitical Context* and *Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice*. The objectives for *Teaching in Sociopolitical Context* are to "engage teachers in critical examination of the systemic influence of power, oppression, dominance, inequity, and injustice on schooling, from their own practice to institutional and federal education policy" (p. 313). The objectives of the *Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic* approach were to "prepare teachers to be change agents through the sort of critical examination described under 'Teaching in Sociopolitical Context' and through studying strategies for, and engaging in, counter-hegemonic teaching and social activism" (p. 313). Three significant characteristics are shared by these two approaches: (a) "a focus on critical analysis of educational policy and practice at an institutional level, (b) consideration of this analysis in a larger sociopolitical context, and (3) the engagement of critical theories" (p. 315). The difference between these two approaches is that the second approach "prepares teachers to resist, and to prepare their students to resist, oppression" and to "imagine themselves as change agents within and outside schools—and to nurture this spirit in their students" (p. 316). Gorski (2009b) indicates that the elements of the *Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice* approach "most fully encompass the key principles of multicultural education," and EPP's grounded in this approach are best suited to "prepare teachers to be what might be called *authentic* multicultural educators" (p. 316).

In the conclusion of this multicultural syllabus study, Gorski (2009b) points out many influences and challenges that affect moving the multicultural courses offered by EPPs towards a more authentic multicultural education grounded in the five defining principles. One of these challenges is accreditation. Gorski (2009b) points out that an analysis of NCATE's Diversity standard exposes patterns consistent with the *Teaching with Multicultural Competence* approach:

> The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools. (NCATE, 2008, p. 34)

Gorski's (2009b) findings show that the "syllabi did not appear to be designed to prepare teachers to practice authentic multicultural education, they did appear designed to meet this NCATE standard" (p. 317). This finding raises the same question for CAEP's possible impact on the multicultural education offered by EPPs that are CAEP accredited, particularly since CAEP's standards and cross-cutting themes are partially rooted in NCATE's Diversity standard.

As pointed out previously, it can be difficult to operationalize *diversity*. The discrepancy between the theories and ideals of multicultural education (Banks, 2004; Grant & Sleeter, 1997; Nieto, 1995, 2004; Sleeter, 1996, 2003) and the actual curriculum and practices advocated by Jenks et al. (2001) and Gorski (2009b) for multicultural courses offered by EPPs only highlights this difficulty. In the field of educator preparation accreditation, this struggle continues. To help focus the discussion around diversity and to provide guidance to EPPs, CAEP and the

Commission on Standards put forward the eight categories of diversity cited earlier in this chapter: (a) "race and ethnicity, (b) poverty, (c) language, (d) disability, (e) giftedness, (f) religion, (g) sexual orientation, and (h) gender" (CAEP, 2013a, p. 21). CAEP has chosen these eight categories of diversity that EPPs need to focus on in their preparation and field experiences.

To further help EPPs understand the commission's perceptions of the importance of diversity, CAEP's accreditation document cites a contrast: "The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that 48 percent of P-12 public school students are students of color" while "the education workforce is far less diverse, with fewer than 20 percent of teachers being teachers of color" (CAEP, 2013a, p. 20). This disparity between teachers and the P-12 students is predicted to only increase as immigration and birthrates of minorities continue to rise. The document continues,

> Diversity must be a pervasive characteristic of any quality preparation program. The Commission expects responsible providers to ensure that candidates develop proficiencies in specific aspects of diversity and to embed diversity issues throughout all aspects of preparation courses and experiences. Examples of proficiencies that candidates who complete an educator preparation program should develop include:
>
> - Incorporation of multiple perspectives to the discussion of content, including attention to learners' personal, family, and community experiences and cultural norms.
> - A commitment to deepening awareness and understanding the strengths and needs of diverse learners when planning and adjusting instruction that

incorporates the histories, experiences and representations of students and families from diverse populations.

- Verbal and nonverbal communication skills that demonstrate respect for and responsiveness to the cultural backgrounds and differing perspectives learners and their families bring to the learning environment.

- Ability to interpret and share student assessment data with families to support student learning in all learning environments.

- An understanding of their own frames of reference (e.g., culture, gender, language, abilities, ways of knowing), the potential biases in these frames, the relationship of privilege and power in schools, and the impact of these frames on educators' expectations for and relationships with learners and their families. (CAEP, 2013a, p. 21)

A cursory comparison with Gorski's (2009b) approaches to multicultural education seems to place CAEP's focus on and explanation of diversity in the category of *Teaching with Multicultural Competence*, similar to NCATE's Diversity standard. CAEP appears to have taken a small step further along this path. There is some evidence of the *Teaching in Sociopolitical Context* approach when CAEP mentions candidates having an understanding of the relationship between privilege and power (CAEP, 2013a), but the statements still fall very short of the ideal approach of *Teaching as Resistance and Counter-Hegemonic Practice*.

Though its statements appear to fall short of the ideals presented by Gorski (2009b), CAEP is issuing higher diversity expectations for the EPPs it will accredit than its predecessors, encouraging, that where possible, they utilize the most diverse field experiences available to them. To rise to CAEP's challenge to provide diverse field experiences, EPPs must understand

the diversity within the contexts where they work. They must investigate and understand the diversity trends within the P-12 schools and districts in which they conduct research and place candidates to complete field experiences. Along with understanding the trends, EPPs need to investigate how the diversity in these placements can impact candidate performance on the assignments and assessments completed during their culminating field experiences. Data collected from these inquiries should enable EPPs to present evidence to CAEP that they are preparing candidates with the requisite knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to positively impact all P-12 students' learning and development (CAEP, 2013a).

Chapter 3: Method

The Brigham Young University elementary education (BYU ELED) program must be accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) to be eligible to recommend their candidates for Utah licensure (UAC R277-502, 2014; UAC R277-503, 2014). As part of the accreditation process, CAEP requires that educator preparation programs (EPPs) present evidence that they provide high quality clinical experiences in diverse settings to ensure that candidates are prepared to work with all P-12 students once they enter the work force (CAEP, 2013a). This chapter describes the research design and analysis used to investigate the degree to which the diversity in the clinical placements used by the BYU ELED program impacts candidate performance on three performance assessments (Teacher Work Sample, Clinical Practice Assessment System, Candidate Dispositional Scale) completed during student teaching to evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Research Design

This study employed a correlational research approach in which the independent variables (i.e., the degree of diversity found in schools) were regressed on the dependent variables (i.e., candidate mean scores on performance assessments items related to diversity). Correlational research is used to explore the impact of relationships between or among two or more variables and is often evaluated with regression analysis (Salkind, 2010). The specific dependent variables used in this study were the elementary education candidates' mean performance scores on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS), and Candidate Dispositional Scale (CDS). The specific independent variables used were the diversity conditions (i.e., race and ethnicity, poverty, language, disability, gender,

mobility) found in the classroom and schools used by the BYU ELED program for student teaching placements.

Sample and Data Collection

This study relied on two existing datasets: (a) the candidate performance dataset and (b) the school diversity dataset. The school diversity dataset provided the independent or diversity variables while the candidate performance dataset was the source of the dependent or candidate performance variables.

Candidate performance dataset. The candidate performance dataset was comprised of the performance assessment data for 814 BYU ELED candidates who graduated with an elementary education teaching degree during academic years 2009 to 2013. The dataset included 793 (97%) female and 21 (3%) male candidates; 737 (91%) of the candidates were white, and 77 (9%) were from a racial minority. The mean major GPA of the candidates was 3.71 (SD = .224), with a range from 2.61 to 4.00.

The candidate performance dataset was collected by the Brigham Young University Educator Preparation Program (BYU EPP) in preparation for its 2014 TEAC accreditation site visit to renew its TEAC accreditation (Popham et al., 2014). The candidate performance dataset was prepared by the BYU EPP Data Management Team, as directed by the BYU EPP TEAC Accreditation Team, from the performance assessment data collected from fall semester 2009 to summer term 2013 on the candidates in the 27 teaching majors and 23 teaching minors offered at BYU. One of the 27 teaching majors represented in the dataset was the elementary education major. The three performance assessment instruments: (Teacher Work Sample [TWS], Clinical Practice Assessment System [CPAS], and Candidate Dispositional Scales [CDS]) represented in the candidate performance dataset are described in more detail later in this chapter.

School diversity dataset. The school diversity dataset is made up of the demographic and diversity information for the elementary classrooms and schools used by the BYU ELED program for student teaching placements for academic years 2009 to 2013, found in the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP). The BYU-PSP is comprised of the university and five Utah school district partners: Alpine School District, Jordan School District, Nebo School District, Provo City School District, and Wasatch School District (MSE, 2014). The BYU-PSP has operated for the last 30 years on the foundational principle that "improving public education requires teacher training institutions and public schools to collaborate to simultaneously improve teacher education and K-12 student learning" (MSE, 2014, para. 2). BYU-PSP school districts educate approximately a third of the students in Utah, with 25% of the teachers and administrators in the state (MSE, 2014). Table 6 presents the number of elementary schools used from 2009 to 2013 by the BYU ELED program for student teaching placements; Table 7 presents the average diversity categories of those schools by academic year (Popham, 2015).

The school diversity dataset blended two sources: information from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and data generated by the BYU EPP's Field Experience Demographic (FED) instrument completed by the candidates during field experiences. The first half of the dataset was secured from the data quality manager at USOE to complete a diversity trend analysis of the schools in the BYU-PSP and the student teaching placement schools used by the BYU ELED program (Popham, 2015). These data were taken from the October 1 and end-of-year annual reports for academic years 2004 to 2014 prepared by the five BYU-PSP districts (i.e., Alpine, Jordan, Nebo, Provo City, Wasatch) and reported to USOE. The USOE data quality manager extracted the data from state-level data systems and emailed them to the McKay

School of Education assessment and accreditation director in a Microsoft *Excel* file that included the following data columns: district_id, school_id, school_number, district_name, school_name, school_year, school_type, lowest_grade_served, highest_grade_served, virtual_school, title_1_school, enrollment, male, female, racial_minority, low_income, limited_English, special_ed, and mobile. The FED half of the data came from candidates' self-reports on the demographics of the classrooms in which they student taught and the race/ethnicity of their mentor teachers.

Table 6

Elementary Schools by BYU-PSP District Used by the BYU ELED Program for Student Teaching Placements by Year

Year	Alpine	Jordan	Nebo	Provo City	Wasatch	BYU-PSP
2009	19	6	15	7	4	51
2010	19	10	17	7	4	57
2011*	14	9	15	7	4	49
2012	16	8	14	7	4	49
2013	13	7	13	7	4	44

Note. * = The Jordan District split into the Jordan District and the Canyons District between academic years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, reducing the number of elementary schools in the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership.

At the outset of the study, the intent was to use the FED as the sole source of diversity data on the student teaching placements. However after reviewing the data and finding that the candidate self-report data at the school-level were not adequately valid or reliable, a better data source was sought. In most cases, candidates reported the demographic information for their student teaching placement school at least one, if not multiple, academic years prior to their

Table 7

Average Diversity by Category for the BYU ELED Student Teaching Placement Schools by District and Year

		Alpine School District												
		% Male		% Racial minority		% Low income		% Limited English		% Special ed		% Mobile	
Year	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2009	19	51%	2.1	23%	15.1	37%	20.1	15%	13.3	13%	3.3	7%	2.5
2010	19	51%	1.7	19%	14.9	39%	19.7	12%	12.9	13%	3.3	6%	3.0
2011*	14	51%	2.1	24%	16.4	43%	21.7	16%	14.5	14%	4.0	6%	3.5
2012	16	52%	3.0	24%	17.1	46%	22.2	16%	15.0	15%	4.8	6%	3.1
2013	13	51%	2.3	23%	17.5	42%	22.8	14%	14.5	14%	3.3	7%	2.0
		Jordan School District												
		% Male		% Racial minority		% Low income		% Limited English		% Special ed		% Mobile	
Year	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2009	6	50%	1.4	16%	15.3	24%	17.4	9%	10.2	15%	3.1	7%	3.0
2010	10	51%	1.9	16%	14.3	25%	15.5	9%	9.2	13%	3.1	7%	2.9
2011*	9	51%	1.5	21%	13.5	27%	16.7	8%	8.3	13%	2.5	6%	2.8
2012	8	51%	1.5	20%	13.9	30%	17.7	9%	9.1	13%	3.0	6%	2.7
2013	7	51%	1.3	25%	14.3	29%	18.8	9%	9.9	12%	2.3	7%	3.6
		Nebo School District												
		% Male		% Racial minority		% Low income		% Limited English		% Special ed		% Mobile	
Year	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2009	15	51%	2.3	12%	6.7	30%	11.5	7%	5.4	16%	2.3	6%	2.4
2010	17	52%	2.2	12%	5.9	40%	13.4	7%	4.8	16%	2.5	5%	1.9
2011*	15	51%	1.8	13%	6.7	38%	14.0	5%	4.7	16%	1.9	4%	1.9
2012	14	51%	2.5	12%	5.8	35%	11.2	3%	2.7	15%	2.4	4%	1.7
2013	13	52%	3.3	12%	6.0	39%	12.5	4%	4.1	15%	2.4	4%	1.7

		Provo City District												
		% Male		% Racial minority		% Low income		% Limited English		% Special ed		% Mobile	
Year	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2009	7	50%	2.2	42%	17.1	56%	21.1	31%	14.5	16%	3.2	10%	2.3
2010	7	50%	2.3	41%	16.3	55%	20.2	28%	15.0	16%	3.9	9%	3.0
2011*	7	51%	2.1	44%	17.9	63%	21.0	31%	17.2	18%	3.7	9%	3.8
2012	7	51%	1.8	44%	17.4	62%	21.2	28%	14.9	19%	6.6	10%	4.1
2013	7	53%	3.8	44%	16.8	65%	20.4	27%	14.8	19%	7.5	9%	3.9

		Wasatch District												
		% Male		% Racial minority		% Low income		% Limited English		% Special ed		% Mobile	
Year	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
2009	4	53%	2.3	20%	6.6	35%	11.2	19%	7.7	15%	1.6	6%	2.5
2010	4	52%	2.0	20%	7.7	40%	10.6	18%	8.6	15%	2.8	6%	1.0
2011*	4	51%	0.5	19%	6.7	40%	10.4	17%	8.5	17%	1.7	5%	2.8
2012	4	53%	1.4	18%	8.5	40%	11.0	15%	9.4	16%	1.2	6%	2.3
2013	4	54%	3.8	19%	9.7	41%	11.5	15%	8.8	16%	1.4	5%	1.8

Note. * = The Jordan District split into the Jordan District and the Canyons District between academic years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 reducing the number of schools in the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

student teaching year. This meant that the FED school-level data did not accurately represent the demographics of the student body the candidates actually worked with during student teaching. Since the candidates had first hand knowledge of their classroom and mentor teacher, data reported on those levels on the FED were deemed more reliable and valid for the study.

Instruments. The BYU ELED program uses three instruments to evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions at the end of their capstone student teaching experiences: Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS), and Candidate Dispositional Scales (CDS). Data from the candidates' performance on these three instruments were used to evaluate the impact of the diversity of candidates' student teaching placement. In addition, the BYU ELED program has candidates report the contextual factors of their student teaching placement using the field experience demographic (FED) instrument.

TWS. The BYU ELED program uses a modified Teacher Work Sample that was developed by the Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality (n.d.) as a capstone assessment. Candidates must develop, teach, and assess a unit of instruction and report their results to demonstrate their skills related to planning and implementing lessons. The TWS consists of seven sections: (a) contextual factors, (b) learning goals, (c) assessment plan, (d) design for instruction, (e) instructional decision-making, (f) report of student learning, and (g) reflection and self-evaluation (See Appendix B). The assessment is scored with an eight-part rubric: one part for each of the seven sections and one to score the overall quality of the TWS. The BYU ELED TWS uses a three-level Likert-type scale: 0 (*deficient*), 1 (*basic competence*), and 2 (*advanced competence*) (Popham et al., 2014).

CPAS. The CPAS was developed by the Brigham Young University Educator Preparation Program (BYU EPP) as a holistic systems approach to provide candidates with

formative and summative feedback on their classroom practice during field experiences. All BYU EPP programs, including the BYU ELED program, utilize the CPAS to rate candidates' student teaching performance and skills during student teaching. The CPAS is a 10-item instrument based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (USOE, 2013), Utah's adaptation of the Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards (2013), employing a five-level Likert-type scale: 1 (*deficient*), 2 (*emerging competence*), 3 (*basic competence*), 4 (*advanced competence*), and 5 (*distinguished competence*) (See Appendix C). In addition to completing the 10 scaled items, evaluators write a qualitative summary statement of the candidates' areas of strength and weakness (Popham et al., 2014).

CDS. The CDS is a pre/post instrument developed by the BYU EPP to assess candidates' perceptions of their own professional dispositions and self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments. Self-efficacy reflects confidence in the ability to exert control over one's own motivation, behavior, and social environment (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). The CDS is administered by the BYU ELED program at admission to the program and again at the end of student teaching to examine candidate dispositions. This instrument includes 46 items on three scales: (a) locus of control, (b) aspirations, and (c) diversity. Locus of control (14 items) and aspiration (16 items) both employ a four-level Likert-type scale: 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) and 1 (*never*) to 4 (*always*), respectively. Diversity (16 items) employs a five-level Likert-type scale: 1 (*not competent*) to 5 (*very competent*) (See Appendix D) (Popham et al., 2014).

FED. The BYU EPP developed the FED to track the demographics of the candidates' field experiences each time they are in a P-12 classroom. Thus they complete the FED at the end

of each of their field experiences, including their student teaching experience. The FED is broken down into three major sections: (a) contextual factors of the school, (b) the race/ethnicity of the mentor teacher, and (c) contextual factors of the classroom or classrooms the candidate teaches in (see Appendix E). In the School section candidates are asked to report the enrollment of the school; the number of students in seven different categories of race/ethnicity (i.e., African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, Undeclared); the number of English language learners; the number of students on free/reduced lunch (i.e., socio-economic status); the number of students with disabilities; average daily attendance of the school; school mobility rate; and whether the school qualifies as a Title I school. In the Classroom section candidates report on the contextual factors of the specific classroom in which they work, including the number of students in the seven race/ethnicity categories reported in the School section; the number of English language learners; the number of students in the classroom with disabilities; and the number of students involved in accelerated programs (e.g., gifted and talented).

Evaluators

Candidates' performance during their student teaching experience is evaluated using the TWS and CPAS by university and P-6 evaluators.

TWS raters. Candidates prepare their TWS during their student teaching experience and submit this assignment to the BYU ELED program for evaluation. The program distributes the TWSs to tenure track faculty, clinical faculty, and P-6 master teachers who have been trained to evaluate the assignment. TWS evaluators have a wide range of content area foci and experiences in both higher education and P-12 schooling. The clinical faculty and master

teachers have worked in elementary schools for five or more years and most have mentored elementary education candidates for three or more years.

During fall semester 2013, the BYU EPP conducted a TWS inter-rater agreement study on all BYU EPP programs with two or more TWS raters. Results were inconsistent. The BYU EPP randomly selected two TWSs, one from the top 10% of those submitted during academic years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 and one from the bottom 10%, then asked all recognized TWS raters to evaluate both samples. The BYU EPP established a 75% agreement level across all program raters. The 24 BYU ELED program raters that participate in the study had 75% agreement on one of the TWS samples and 56% agreement on the second, thus meeting the established agreement level on one of the two TWSs evaluated, but not on the other (Popham et al., 2014).

CPAS raters. The CPAS is completed by two different sets of raters. Elementary candidates receive a CPAS evaluation from a clinical faculty associate (CFA) and a second from their mentor teacher (MT). A CFA is a master teacher who has five or more years of P-6 classroom experience, has obtained a level two or higher license, and has demonstrated an ability to mentor other P-6 teachers or has served as a mentor teacher for the BYU ELED program on multiple occasions. CFAs leave their elementary school classroom for two to three years and teach course work on the BYU campus, with the primary responsibility to mentor and assess elementary education candidates during their field experiences. At the end of their two-year rotation at BYU, CFAs return to their P-6 classroom or other duties as assigned by their principal or district. A MT is a successful classroom teacher with three or more years of P-6 classroom experience who has obtained a level two or higher license. The BYU ELED program provides

CFAs and MTs with CPAS training at the beginning of each semester. CFAs receive additional training so they can support the MTs and candidates on the skills represented on the CPAS.

Across academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the BYU EPP conducted three inter-rater agreement studies on CPAS raters. The first CPAS study was intended to set a baseline for all programs that had two or more university raters. A student teacher from each program was filmed at the beginning, middle, and end of his or her student teaching experience, and lesson plans used during those teaching episodes were collected. With the goal of an 80% agreement level, the BYU EPP asked all university raters to view each of the three videos and accompanying lesson plans. Once the university raters had viewed the videos and lesson plans, they were asked to complete a CPAS evaluation on the filmed student teacher using their current approach to completing the CPAS. Rater agreement was calculated from those evaluations. The eight BYU ELED program raters who participate in the study had an inter-rater agreement level of 68%, which was below the 80% agreement level established by the BYU EPP (Popham et al., 2014). As a whole, only one of the BYU EPP programs scored the CPAS with a rater agreement of 80% or higher.

All programs that did not reach the 80% agreement level in the first study were asked to participate in the second study. They were instructed to bring together all of their university raters and use the videos and lesson plans from the first study to participate in a calibration experience. University raters were invited to watch and discuss the previously videoed student teacher's performance and work to find agreement on the knowledge and skills demonstrated in the video and lesson plans as evaluated by the CPAS. Along with the videos and lesson plans, raters were instructed to use the CPAS to guide the discussion during the calibration experience.

Once the programs had completed the calibration experience, university raters were asked to repeat the steps of the first study with a new set of videos and lesson plans. Five out of nine programs that participated in the second study reached or exceeded the 80% agreement level required by the BYU EPP. The intent of the calibration experience was to raise the agreement level among each program's CPAS raters. The nine BYU ELED program raters who participated in the second study had an inter-rater agreement level of 66%; again their performance fell below the 80% agreement level established by the BYU EPP (Popham et al., 2014).

The third inter-rater agreement study that the BYU EPP conducted was a between-rater study comparing the results of the university evaluators with those of the mentor teachers. The EPP collected the CPAS evaluations for all student teachers during academic years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. Any student who did not receive a complete set of university and mentor teacher evaluations was eliminated from the study. The BYU EPP established an agreement level of 80% and then evaluated the agreement between raters. The results of the study found that not a single BYU EPP program had an agreement level greater than 80%; results ranged between 36% and 70%. The BYU ELED programs results showed an agreement level of 58% (Popham et al., 2014).

Data Analysis

This study used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) in the Mplus statistical package to analyze candidate performance data against the diversity conditions in the student teaching placements. HLM, a statistical modeling technique that accounts for variation at multiple levels, is particularly useful to account for nested data. HLM is a complex form of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression (Niehaus, Campbell, & Inkelas, 2013; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002;

Woltman, Feldstain, MacKay, & Rocchi, 2012). To study the impact of school- and classroom-level diversity on elementary candidate performance during student teaching, the below HLM regression model was used:

$$PA_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_1 SD_{ij} + \beta_2 MTD_{ij} + \beta_3 CD_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}.$$

In this model PA_{ij} represents a candidate's (*j*) performance on one of the three performance assessments (TWS, CPAS, CDS) in a given elementary school or placement (*i*); β_{0j} represents the intercept for candidate *j*; β_1 is the effect of the school-level diversity conditions (SD_{ij}); β_2 is the effect of the race/ethnicity of the mentor teacher (MTD_{ij}); β_3 is the effect of the classroom-level diversity conditions (CD_{ij}); and ε_{ij} is the error term (Niehaus, Campbell, & Inkelas, 2013; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Woltman et al., 2012). This HLM regression model was used with the candidates' performance mean scores from the TWS, CPAS-UE, CPAS-MT, and CDS-D. To test the significance of the results, an alpha level of .05 was used.

The performance assessment scores used in the HLM regression model were the means of the items on the TWS, CPAS, and CDS that measure candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of diversity when working with diverse P-6 students. Candidates in the sample had two CPAS scores; one from the university evaluator and one from the mentor teacher. There was a single TWS and CDS score for each candidate. Thus four different HLM regression models were used: (a) one for the TWS, (b) one for the university evaluator CPAS, (c) one for the mentor teacher CPAS, and (d) one for the CDS. Table 8 provides the diversity items taken from the TWS, CPAS, and CDS to calculate performance scores for each BYU ELED candidate in the sample.

The school-level, mentor teacher, and classroom-level diversity variables were the composite of multiple diversity categories taken from the USOE and FED data. Table 9 presents

the diversity categories for each diversity variable at the school- and classroom-levels. To create a single school-level and classroom-level diversity variable (i.e., $\beta_1 SD_{ij}$, $\beta_3 CD_{ij}$) a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to determine to what level each of the diversity variables contributed to the overall construct of diversity. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis were intended to be used to develop a weighted formula to produce a single school-level and single classroom-level diversity score for each placement that could be plugged into the HLM regression formula to evaluate the impact of the school-level, mentor teacher, and classroom-level diversity on candidate performance.

Table 8

Items From the TWS, CPAS, and CDS that Comprise the Performance Scores Used in the Regression Model

Instrument	Item #	Item name
	CF.A	Contextual Factors: Community, School & Classroom Factors
	CF.B	Contextual Factors: Student Characteristics
	CF.C	Contextual Factors: Instructional Implications
TWS	LG.D	Learning Goals: Appropriateness
	AP.D	Assessment Plan: Appropriateness
	D4I.A	Design for Instruction: Contextual Information
	D4I.E	Design for Instruction: Adaptions
	CPAS 1	Learner Development
CPAS	CPAS 2	Learning Differences
	CPAS 3	Learning Environments
CDS	CDS 3 Post	Diversity

To confirm that the assumptions associated with the HLM regression model were met, the SPSS statistical package was used to check the performance and diversity data to see that they were normally distributed, had a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables, had internal reliability, and had homoscedasticity (Niehaus, Campbell, & Inkelas, 2013; Osborne & Waters, 2002; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Woltman et al., 2012). To prepare these data for analysis, all of the data were cleaned and coded using Microsoft *Excel* and SPSS to ensure it was in a valid format. All variables were given a numeric code so that Mplus and SPSS could properly analyze the data using descriptive and inferential statistical methods. All missing data were coded to 999, thus indicating to Mplus and SPSS that a candidate has a missing data point. To account for the missing data, full information maximum likelihood (FIML) was used.

The FIML approach computes a casewise likelihood function using only those variables that are for case i. Assuming multivariate normality, the casewise likelihood of the observed data is obtained by maximizing the function

$$\log L_i = K_i - \frac{1}{2} \log \left| \sum_i \right| - \frac{1}{2} (x_1 - \mu_1)' \sum_i{}^{-1} (x_1 - \mu_1)$$

where K_i is a constant that depends on the number of complete data points for case i, x_i is the observed data for case i, μ_i and Σ_i contain the parameter estimate of the mean vector and covariance matrix, respectively, for the variables that are complete for case *i*. The casewise likelihood functions are accumulated across the entire sample and maximized as follows.

$$\log L(\mu, \sum) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log L_i$$

(Enders & Bandalos, 2001, p. 434)

To evaluate whether the data were normally distributed, had a linear relationship, and homoscedasticity, SPSS was used to graph histograms and scatter plots of the data as well as

calculated the skewness and kurtosis of the data. To check for internal reliability, a

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was calculated for each of the performance measures

(TWS, CPAS, CDS).

Table 9

School-level, Mentor Teacher, and Classroom-level Diversity Variables

Condition	Diversity category	Source
School-level	Is Title I school	USOE
	Percent male	USOE
	Percent racial minority	USOE
	Percent low income	USOE
	Percent English language learners	USOE
	Percent disability	USOE
	School mobility rate	USOE
Mentor teacher	Is racial minority (Yes/No)	FED
Classroom-level	Percent racial minority	FED
	Percent English language learners	FED
	Percent disability	FED

Note. USOE = Utah State Office of Education; FED = Field Experience Demographics
Instrument

Chapter 4: Findings

Accreditation plays a significant role in the accountability and program approval for educator preparation programs (EPPs). Many states have embraced accreditation as one, if not the only, form of program approval. By successfully obtaining accredited status EPPs may recommend their candidates to the state for certification and licensure, one of the EPP's primary goals. Thus accreditation is a high stakes process that must be valid and trustworthy.

In 2013 the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was formed to become the new EPP accreditation agency, with the goal of raising the bar in educator preparation (CAEP, 2013c). As accreditation is a high stakes activity for many EPPs, CAEP's standards and processes should be examined to determine if they are valid and trustworthy. This endeavor cannot be completed all at once; therefore this study has examined CAEP's standards and crosscutting themes pertaining to two areas: clinical or field experiences and diversity.

This chapter will present the findings of the inquiry and analysis performed to answer the following research question: To what degree does the diversity of a student teaching placement affect the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions evident in elementary education candidates' performance during student teaching as measured by the CPAS, TWS, and CDS assessments used by the BYU elementary education program?

Descriptive Statistics

This study relied on two existing datasets: (a) the candidate performance dataset and (b) the school diversity dataset. Descriptive statistics in the form of means, standard deviations, range, skewness, and kurtosis for each of the variables were computed for both the candidate performance and school diversity datasets. Tables 10 and 11 present the descriptive statistics for

the performance measures and diversity variables at the school- and classroom-levels, found in the candidate performance and school diversity datasets.

Candidate performance. The 814 elementary candidates in the sample were evaluated on three performance measures: Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS), and Candidate Dispositional Scale (CDS) during their student teaching experience. The mean scores reported in Table 10 for the performance measures are the diversity items taken from each instrument functioning as a single diversity subscale.

To evaluate the internal consistency or reliability of these items as a single subscale, a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was calculated for each performance measure. Cronbach's alpha is an indication of the internal consistency between the items of an assessment in term of how reliably they measure the construct of interest (Gronlund & Linn, 1990). Of the performance measures, the TWS had the lowest alpha coefficient of .640, which is considered an *acceptable* finding (George & Mallery, 2003; Kline, 2000). The mentor teacher and university evaluator CPAS alphas were a good bit higher; $\alpha = .845$ and $\alpha = .867$ respectively. These alpha coefficients are considered to be *good*, indicating that there was internal consistency and the items could be considered to be a single *diversity* scale (George & Mallery, 2003; Kline, 2000). The CDS had the highest alpha coefficient: .922, which is considered to be *excellent* (George & Mallery, 2003; Kline, 2000). Gronlund and Linn (1990) suggest that reliability coefficients between .60 and .85 are *acceptable* (pp. 100-101), which would indicate that the reliability coefficients for all of the different performance measures were a*cceptable* and that the items are working together as a diversity subscale with internally consistency. This indicates that the mean scores are a reliable expression of the elementary candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions while working with diverse students.

Candidates (*N* = 699) had a mean score of 1.75 (*SD* = .255) on the diversity related items on the TWS, which was in the *basic competence* to *advanced competence* range. This finding indicates that evaluators believed that candidates exhibited a strong competence level when planning for, assessing, and teaching diverse students.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Candidate Performance Dataset

Assessment	*N*	Missing	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	Skew	*SE*	Kurt	*SE*	α
TWS	699	115	1.75	0.255	0.57	2.00	-1.233	0.092	1.686	0.185	0.640
CPAS-UE	778	36	4.09	0.568	2.50	5.00	-0.325	0.088	-0.509	0.175	0.867
CPAS-MT	774	40	4.25	0.540	2.00	5.00	-0.609	0.088	0.014	0.176	0.845
CDS-D	813	1	4.24	0.472	2.31	5.00	-0.497	0.086	0.070	0.171	0.922

Note. TWS = Teacher Work Sample; CPAS-UE = Clinical Practice Assessment System-university evaluator; CPAS-MT = Clinical Practice Assessment System-mentor teacher; CDS-D = Candidate Dispositional Scales-Diversity Scale; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; skew = Skewness; Kurt = kurtosis; *SE* = standard error; α = *Cronbach's* alpha

As both a mentor teacher and a university evaluator rated candidates on the CPAS diversity items, elementary candidates had two performance scores on this instrument. Mentor teachers gave the elementary candidates (*N* = 774) a mean score of 4.25 (*SD* = .540), while university evaluators rated the candidates (*N* = 778) with a mean score of 4.09 (*SD* = .568). These mentor teachers and university evaluators perceived that the elementary candidates in the sample had *advanced competence* to *distinguished competence* when working with diverse students as measured by the CPAS. This suggests that raters felt that candidates on average demonstrated a high level of competency when working with diverse populations in their classrooms during student teaching.

The CDS is a self-efficacy measure on which the candidates report how competent they felt with a series of different education and teaching constructs, one of which is working with diverse students. On the CDS, the elementary candidates (N = 813) reported a mean score of 4.24 (SD = .472), which placed them in the range of *competent* to *very competent*. This shows that candidates had high self-efficacy when working with diverse students at the end of their student teaching experience.

School- and classroom-level diversity. The 814 elementary candidates' student teaching placements were considered in three areas: (a) school-level, (b) mentor teacher, and (c) classroom-level. Table 11 reports the mean percentage of each diversity variable, taken from the USOE data or the candidates self-report on the FED.

At the school-level, six diversity variables were analyzed. The mean percentage of male students in the student teaching placement schools was 51% (SD = 2.1), which was expected since the male and female population proportion is approximately 50/50 (CIA, 2015). Of these students, 25% (SD = 21.7) were identified as being from a racial minority; 39% (SD = 21.8) lived in low-income households and qualified for free or reduced-price lunch; 14% (SD = 4.1) were classified as having a disability and were receiving accommodations; and 14% (SD = 16.1) were classified as English language learners. The populations in the student teaching placement schools were fairly stable, with a mean mobility rate of 8% (SD = 8.4).

The classroom-level data varies from the school-level data. At the classroom-level, the percentage of students identified as being from a racial minority was comparable to the school-level data; 26% (SD = 24.4) as compared to 25% respectively. However, the percentage of students identified as having a disability or being an English language learner were lower in the

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for School Diversity Dataset

Diversity category	N	Missing	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	Skew	*SE*	Kurt	*SE*
				School-level						
% Male	724	90	51%	2.1	0.46	0.56	-0.124	0.091	0.037	0.181
% Racial minority	810	4	25%	21.7	0.02	1	1.415	0.086	0.172	0.982
% Low income	810	4	39%	21.8	0	1	0.595	0.086	-0.585	0.172
% Limited English	810	4	14%	16.1	0	1	1.992	0.086	5.376	0.172
% Disability	810	4	14%	4.1	0	0.32	-0.528	0.086	2.874	0.172
% Mobile	786	28	8%	8.4	0	0.96	6.446	0.087	53.492	0.174
				Mentor teacher						
Is racial minority	809	5	29%	45.4						
				Classroom-level						
% Racial minority	757	57	26%	24.4	0	1	1.256	0.089	0.874	0.177
% Limited English	757	57	12%	17.2	0	1	2.267	0.089	6.3	0.177
% Disability	757	57	10%	7.5	0	1	0.932	0.089	1.099	0.177

Note. M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; skew = Skewness; Kurt = kurtosis; *SE* = standard error

student teaching placement classrooms than in the general population of the school. The

percentage of students identified as having a disability was 10% (*SD* = 7.5) as compared to 14%,

while the percentage of English language learners was 12% (*SD* = 17.2) as compared to 14%.

This indicates that the classrooms selected for elementary education student teaching experiences

could have been recorded as having a larger number of special education students and English

language learners than they actually did. In addition to the classroom contextual factors, each elementary candidate worked with a mentor teacher during his or her field experience; 29% (*SD* = 45.4) of those mentor teachers were identified as being from a racial minority.

School- and Classroom-level Diversity Scores

To investigate whether the school-level diversity variables (i.e., % male, % racial minority, % low income, % limited English, % disability, % mobile) and the classroom-level diversity variables (i.e., % racial minority, % limited English, % disability) could be considered as a single construct, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed. After several different models had been run, the model fit statistics were never acceptable and would not converge, indicating that diversity was likely not a unidimensional construct comprised of the diversity variables used in this study. As a multidimensional construct, diversity must be investigated in its unique sub-constructs; a single diversity score for the school- and classroom-levels could not be plugged into the regression model as originally planned. Thus, it was necessary to use each of the school-level diversity variables (i.e., % male, % racial minority, % low income, % limited English, % disability, % mobile) and classroom-level variables (i.e., % racial minority, % limited English, % disability) in the HLM regression model.

Estimating the Effects of School- and Classroom-level Diversity on Candidate Performance

This study used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to develop a nested regression model (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002) to evaluate if the diversity in the student teaching placements of elementary candidates impacted their performance on the diversity items on three performance assessments. The mean scores on the TWS, CPAS-UE, CPAS-MT, and CDS-D were regressed on the school-level diversity variables (i.e., % male, % racial minority, % low income, % limited English, % disability, % mobile), the dichotomous variable of whether the mentor teacher was

from a racial minority, and the classroom-level diversity variables (i.e., % racial minority, % limited English, % disability). Group mean centering was used to account for the nesting effect of the classroom-level variables within the school-level variables. To provide Mplus with proper data, a deviance statistic as calculated between the school- and classroom-level diversity variables (i.e., % racial minority, % limited English, % disability) (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). The assumptions associated with HLM regression models of data being normally distributed, showing a linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables, having internal reliability, and having homoscedasticity (Niehaus, Campbell, & Inkelas, 2013; Osborne & Waters, 2002; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Woltman et al., 2012) were checked using the SPSS statistical package and were found to be met.

The results from each of the four models showed that neither the classroom-level nor the school-level variables impacted elementary candidates' performance on the TWS, CPAS-UE, CPAS-MT, or CDS-D. Tables 12-15 show the results for each model. Examining the coefficient of determination or R^2 statistic enabled evaluation of the goodness-of-fit and predictability for each of the four models. R^2 is "a nondimensional measure of how well a regression model describes a set of data. People say that R^2 is the fraction of the variance in the dependent variable that the regression model explains" (Glantz & Slinker, 2001, p. 248). The R^2 statistic describes how closely the data are to the regression line. An $R^2 = 0$ indicates that the independent variables do not predict the dependent variable at all, while an $R^2 = 1$ indicates that it is possible to perfectly predict the dependent variable from the information in the independent variables (Glantz & Slinker, 2001). All four of the performance assessment models had a R^2 less than 0.05. The CPAS-UE model had the highest coefficient of determination, $R^2 = 0.046$, followed by the TWS model, $R^2 = 0.029$. The CPAS-MT model was the next highest with $R^2 =$

0.025, and the CDS-D was the lowest at $R^2 = 0.012$. It was surprising that the CDS-D model was the lowest, since the CDS-D is intended to measure a candidate's self-efficacy in with working with diverse students, and thus would be expected to be the highest predictor of the impact of a diverse placement on a candidates' ability to work with diverse students.

Examination of each of the independent variables showed that the CPAS-UE and CDS-D models had diversity variables with statistically significant effects on the performance measures. Percentage of limited English students ($\beta = -0.582$, $p = 0.016$) was the only variable at the classroom-level affected the CPAS-UE score. Two diversity variables at the school-level, percentage of racial minority students ($\beta = 0.714$, $p = 0.012$) and percentage of limited English students ($\beta = -0.726$, $p = 0.029$), affected the CPAS-UE score as well. It is worrisome to see that the limited English variable at both the school- and classroom-level were negative. This implies that as the percentage of limited English students increases in the classrooms and schools where elementary candidates student teach, their scores on the CPAS-UE will fall. This is contrary to the expectation established in the CAEP standards and cross-cutting theme of diversity, as well as the assumptions inherent in this study's research question.

Two school-level diversity variables on the CDS-D had statistically significant effects on elementary candidates' self-efficacy when working with diverse learners: percentage of male students ($\beta = -1.701$, $p = 0.046$) and percentage of students from low-income households ($\beta = -0.275$, $p = 0.03$). The CDS-D model did not show that any classroom-level diversity variables significantly affected elementary candidates' self-efficacy. The two significant diversity variables were also negative, indicating that as the male population and the percentage of low-income households increased in the schools, the BYU elementary candidates felt less prepared to work with these populations.

As indicated above, even though the CPAS-UE and CDS-D models showed some diversity variables at the school- and classroom-level that were statistically significant, indicating that they affected on elementary candidates' performance, the R^2 statistics indicated that these models had little to no predictive power. These findings have little bearing on the overall research question of the degree to which the diversity found in the student teaching placements affect elementary education candidates' performance during student teaching on the TWS, CPAS, and CDS, since no measureable impact was found. Thus from these findings there is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 12

HLM Results for the Teacher Work Sample Model

Diversity category	Estimate	SE	Standardized β	P-Value
School-level				
Is Title I school	-0.001	0.045	-0.004	0.978
% Male	0.425	0.584	0.000	0.466
% Racial minority	-0.214	0.182	-0.182	0.239
% Low income	0.134	0.093	0.115	0.148
% Limited English	0.154	0.186	0.097	0.409
% Disability	0.112	0.366	0.020	0.759
% Mobile	-0.057	0.189	-0.010	0.764
Mentor teacher				
Is racial minority	-0.008	0.043	-0.031	0.857
Classroom-level				
% Racial minority	-0.221	0.133	-0.078	0.099
% Limited English	-0.044	0.133	-0.016	0.743
% Disability	-0.021	0.152	-0.006	0.891

Note. $R^2 = 0.029$

Table 13

HLM Results for the Clinical Practice Assessment System: University Evaluator Model

Diversity category	Estimate	SE	Standardized β	P-Value
School-level				
Is Title I school	-0.005	0.126	-0.009	0.968
% Male	-0.723	1.453	0.000	0.619
% Racial minority	0.714	0.285	0.273	**0.012**
% Low income	0.136	0.31	0.053	0.662
% Limited English	-0.726	0.332	-0.206	0.029
% Disability	-0.138	0.891	-0.011	0.877
% Mobile	-0.406	0.44	-0.032	0.357
Mentor teacher				
Is racial minority	0.132	0.069	0.233	0.055
Classroom-level				
% Racial Minority	-0.016	0.277	-0.003	0.953
% Limited English	-0.582	0.241	-0.097	**0.016**
% Disability	-0.020	0.246	-0.003	0.934

Note. $R^2 = 0.046$

Table 14

HLM Results for the Clinical Practice Assessment System: Mentor Teacher Model

Diversity category	Estimate	SE	Standardized β	P-Value
School-level				
Is Title I school	0.106	0.105	0.196	0.313
% Male	-0.460	1.382	0.000	0.739
% Racial minority	0.216	0.309	0.087	0.484
% Low income	0.285	0.276	0.116	0.302
% Limited English	-0.538	0.371	-0.161	0.147
% Disability	-0.575	0.747	-0.048	0.441
% Mobile	-0.466	0.431	-0.039	0.279
Mentor teacher				
Is racial minority	0.03	0.089	0.056	0.733
Classroom-level				
% Racial minority	0.192	0.283	0.032	0.498
% Limited English	-0.440	0.299	-0.077	0.141
% Disability	-0.095	0.304	-0.014	0.756

Note. $R^2 = 0.025$

Table 15

HLM Results for the Candidate Dispositional Scale Model

Diversity category	Estimate	SE	Standardized β	P-Value
School-level				
Is Title I school	-0.019	0.055	-0.040	0.735
% Male	-1.701	0.851	0.000	**0.046**
% Racial minority	-0.109	0.187	-0.050	0.559
% Low income	-0.275	0.127	-0.128	**0.030**
% Limited English	0.253	0.176	0.087	0.151
% Disability	0.453	0.504	0.043	0.368
% Mobile	0.337	0.304	0.032	0.268
Mentor teacher				
Is racial minority	0.035	0.067	0.074	0.602
Classroom-level				
% Racial minority	-0.147	0.198	-0.028	0.458
% Limited English	0.009	0.163	0.002	0.954
% Disability	0.21	0.239	0.035	0.379

Note. $R^2 = 0.012$

Chapter 5: Discussion

High quality field placements are considered to be a critical part of any educator preparation program (EPP; CAEP, 2013a; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hollins & Torres-Guzman, 2005; UAC R277-504, 2015). Many components contribute to the definition of a high quality field placement. According to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), a major component that EPPs must attend to when considering the quality and outcomes of their field experiences is the diversity of the P-12 students in the schools and classrooms where candidates are placed to complete field experiences (CAEP, 2013a). The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of the diversity in the elementary schools and classrooms used for student teaching placements by the Brigham Young University (BYU) elementary education program had on those elementary candidates' performance on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS), and Candidate Dispositional Scale (CDS). This chapter will discuss the findings in relation to the literature, also exploring some of the implications and insights gained, limitations of the study, suggestions for future research, and conclusions.

Summary of Findings in the Context of Existing Literature

Cochran-Smith (2004) and Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) argue that the more diverse the candidates' student teaching experience, the more likely the candidates will gain the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to work with diverse students. CAEP (2013a) echoes this position in its standards and cross-cutting themes, requiring that EPPs provide diverse field experiences as part of their curriculum and preparation programs. Findings of this study indicate that the diversity within the field placements had no effect on candidate performance. When the performance assessments of BYU elementary candidates were analyzed

in the context of the diversity of their student teaching placements, no statistically significant effects were seen at the school- or classroom-level. Instead, these findings are more in line with Deering's and Stanutz's (1995) findings, that placing candidates in a diverse field setting had minimal, if any impact on the candidates' knowledge, skills, and attitudes relevant to working with diverse learners in P-12 schools.

Two of the performance assessments, the CPAS-UE and the CDS-D, showed two variables each with a significant effect on performance; however the majority of the variables reflected no impact. In addition to the diversity not having statistically significant effects on performance, the coefficient of determination (R^2) for each of the four models ($R^2 = 0.012$ to 0.046) indicated very little if any predictive value for elementary candidate performance when regressed on school- and classroom-level diversity variables (Glantz & Slinker, 2001; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002).

Finally, though not statistically significant, 59% (26/44) of the diversity variables showed a negative effect. This means that as the diversity increases at the school- and classroom-levels, candidate performance decreases (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). This finding is opposite from the hypothesis assumed within the research question for this study and the argument made by CAEP (2013a) that as the opportunity to work with more diverse P-12 students increases, the candidate's learning and performance should increase as well (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Tabacbnick & Zeichner, 1984). This also is contrary to the prevailing literature and CAEP standards and cross-cutting themes.

Implications and Insights Gained

This section will review some of the implications and insights gained from this study regarding the impact of the diversity in student teaching placements on the performance of elementary candidates. The findings will be compared to the results of existing literature.

Performance assessments and evaluators. The mean scores for the performance assessments are troubling. Mean scores for the candidates on the TWS, CPAS, and CDS were all at the top end of the scales. This indicates that the evaluators' scores on the TWS and CPAS and the candidates' feelings of self-efficacy shown on the CDS imply that the elementary candidates had demonstrated high levels of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to work with diverse P-6 students during their student teaching experience. This raises questions of whether the evaluators using the instruments understand and are attuned to the multicultural education and diversity constructs that the instruments are designed to measure. These findings also suggest that there may be a disconnect between the evaluators' perceptions of the diversity in the elementary schools and classrooms where the BYU elementary candidates completed their student teaching experience and the actual number of K-6 students from the different diversity categories, particularly as defined by CAEP (2013a).

Another concerning aspect of the findings is that the items taken from the TWS, CPAS, and CDS were designed to measure candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working with diverse populations of P-12 students (Popham et al., 2014). These instruments were developed to align with the *Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium Standards* (InTASC, 2013) and *Utah Effective Teaching Standards* (UETS; USOE, 2013), including those dealing with diversity. Considering the diversity items for each of the performance measures, one can question if the instruments actually measure candidates' ability to work with diverse

populations as defined by CAEP (2013a). This is particularly concerning with the CDS diversity scale since it was specifically designed to measure a candidate's feelings of self-efficacy when working with diverse populations (Popham et al., 2014).

As an example of the possible disconnect between the items on the BYU performance assessments and CAEP's definition of diversity as well as the raters' understanding of diversity and multiculturalism, the three diversity items from the CPAS can be considered. Those items are (a) STANDARD 1: Learner Development—The teacher candidate understands cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas of student development; (b) STANDARD 2: Learning Differences—The candidate understands individual learner differences and cultural and linguistic diversity; and (c) STANDARD 3: Learning Environments—The candidate works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. On the surface these items seem tangentially related to diversity and multiculturalism and do not seem to align with CAEP's definition of diversity. These items seem to be more about the diversity within learning styles and student development than the diversity associated with the multiculturalism literature. When looking deeper at the UETS and InTASC standards, the sub-components of the standards use language that describes the diversity the standard is meant to represent and aligns more with the literature related to multiculturalism. Such as, UETS sub-component 2.c which states, "the teacher allows students different ways to demonstrate learning sensitive to multiple experiences and diversity" (USOE, 2013, p. 9). Or InTASC sub-component 2.h which states, "the teacher understands students with exceptional needs, including those associated with disabilities and giftedness, and knows how to use strategies and resources to address these needs" (InTASC, 2013, p. 17). If the CPAS raters are only using the items found on the CPAS as they are written,

they may miss the nuances found in the sub-components of the standards that should guide their evaluations.

These findings may be challenging to the BYU EPP as it moves towards CAEP accreditation. In its 2014 *Inquiry* Brief, the BYU EPP claimed that the diversity items from the TWS, CPAS, and CDS provided evidence that program completers had the needed competencies to work with diverse P-12 students (Popham et al., 2014). If the instruments and the performance scores generated by evaluators that the BYU EPP depends on for evidence are not aligned with CAEP's standards and cross-cutting themes, the program may struggle to meet CAEP's higher bar of accreditation (CAEP, 2013c).

Diversity and multiculturalism. In Jennings's (2007) study on the topics prioritized by EPPs for multicultural instruction, findings showed that EPPs emphasize issues related to race and ethnic minorities first and foremost in their curricula. Second in order of emphasis are issues related to students with disabilities, English language learners, poverty or low-income households, gender issues, and finally sexual orientation. Gorski (2010) affirmed Jennings's (2007) findings with his study of multicultural teacher education scholarship, finding that the most emphasized topic in the multicultural teacher education literature used to inform EPPs' practice was centered on issues related to race and racial minorities. In order of importance, the four diversity variables in this study that were found to have a statistically significant impact on elementary candidate performance were percentage of students of racial minority ($p = 0.012$), percentage with limited English ($p = 0.016$), percentage from low income households ($p = 0.030$), and percentage of male students ($p = 0.046$). These findings parallel Jennings's (2007) findings, indicating that the BYU elementary education program seems to be emphasizing the same priorities as the rest of the nation. Gorski (2010) and Jennings (2007) argued that this

emphasis on racial and ethnic minorities has brought an imbalance to the multicultural education offered by EPPs and should be further examined to bring greater balance. Thus the BYU EPP should also reexamine its multicultural education curriculum to ensure greater balance.

These findings lead to two different discussions. The literature chapter demonstrated that a majority of the multicultural education curricula used in the United States and emphasized by CAEP, focuses on celebrating diversity and learning about culture and human relations (Gorski, 2009a, 2009b; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Diaz-Rico, 1998; Hidalgo, Chavez-Chavez, & Ramage, 1996; Jackson, 2003; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004; Nieto, 2004; Vavrus, 2002) rather than on the fundamental core of what leading and pioneering scholars have felt multicultural education should be about; equity and social justice driven by school reform facilitated by critical analysis of power and privilege (Banks, 2004; Grant & Sleeter, 1997; Nieto, 1995, 2004; Sleeter, 1996, 2003).

The findings of this study call for a deeper conversation around the influences of accreditation on multicultural education and on the standards that will be applied to EPPs. Gorski (2009b) indicated that accreditation is one of the major influencers on EPPs' decisions of what multicultural education curriculum to follow. But CAEP's understanding of multiculturalism and diversity may fall short of the critical multiculturalism approach (Jenks et al. 2001; Grant & Steeler, 1997; McLaren, 1994):

> [This approach] believes that issues of equity and excellence cannot be effectively addressed without posing difficult but essential questions: Under what conditions and by whom are concepts of equity and excellence constructed? What do they look like for different groups and in different circumstances? ... How can equity

and excellence be achieved in a society in which historically the dominate culture
has determined the meaning? The critical approach seeks justice by focusing on
the relationships between equity and excellence, on one hand, and race, ethnic,
and class configurations, on the other hand. (Jenks et a., 2001, p. 93)

Without this accord, CAEP has not gone far enough with its standards and cross-cutting themes,
and its strong influence on the field will perpetuate the idea that multicultural education is
limited to the celebration of diversity and learning about culture and human relations rather than
equity and social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Diaz-Rico, 1998; Gorski, 2009a, 2009b;
Hidalgo, Chavez-Chavez, & Ramage, 1996; Jackson, 2003; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004;
Nieto, 2004; Vavrus, 2002).

The second needed discussion should focus on the findings of the confirmatory factor
analysis (CFA) that diversity is not a unidimensional construct. CAEP (2013a) has established
diversity as one of its cross-cutting themes and represents diversity as a single, stand-alone
construct. It does put forward eight categories of diversity for EPPs to consider; however it
lumps those categories together as a single concept called *diversity*. The CFA results question
the soundness of this approach. In the process of better aligning its standards and cross-cutting
themes with the concepts of critical multiculturalism, CAEP must also seek to address the
underlying constructs of diversity and avoid treating them as a single idea. It needs to provide
EPPs with more guidance and insight so that they are not limited by CAEP's influence and
narrow definition.

Limitations

When considering the findings of this study, one must consider three limitations. The
first limitation focuses on the classroom-level and mentor teacher diversity data. The school-

level data were taken from the October 1 and end-of-year reports prepared by the districts and reported to the Utah State Office of Education; therefore these data were consistent across schools. The classroom-level and mentor teacher data came from the Field Experience Demographic instrument data on which candidates self-report the diversity characteristics of the K-6 students in their student teaching classroom and their mentor teacher. This self-report relies on the candidates investigating and truly knowing their students. A candidate who does not take the time needed to know his or her students may misrepresent the students' racial ethnicity. Candidates could also assume incorrectly that a student or group of students is classified as a limited English learner or as having disabilities. In addition to the concerns related to candidates' self-reporting of the data, the classroom-level data do not include data to account for students who come from low-income households. Low-income data are known at the school-level and would strengthen the classroom-level analysis; making it parallel with the school-level analysis.

The second limitation deals with concerns with the reliability and validity of the TWS, CPAS, and CDS instruments themselves. The CPAS-UE and CPAS-MT had Cronbach's alpha coefficients that are considered good, and the alpha coefficient for the CDS-D was excellent; however the alpha coefficient for the TWS was just barely in the acceptable range (George & Mallery, 2003; Gronlund & Linn, 1990; Kline, 2000). In general, the three instruments had internal consistency; however evidence showed concerns with construct and content validity, particularly when considering CAEP's categories of diversity. The performances assessments in this study were designed to measure candidates' grasp and use of the UETS (USOE, 2013) and InTASC standards (2013), including those dealing with diverse learners, but the study brings into

question their construct validity. One could ask if the TWS, CPAS, and CDS are actually measuring the diversity as defined by CAEP (2013a).

Rater agreement on the TWS and CPAS was the third limitation to the study. Popham et al. (2014) rater agreement studies showed that the elementary education raters struggled to find agreement on how to evaluate their candidates, with discrepancies on how they understood the constructs measured by the instruments. This lack of agreement draws attention to reliability and validity of the data used in the study. If the raters could not agree on the constructs being measured, then they may not have been looking at diversity in the same way. The discrepancies also call into question the evaluators' ability to judge how well the candidates performed when working with these diverse K-12 students.

Future Research

As CAEP continues to mature and begins to accredit EPPs, it becomes increasingly important to challenge their standards and cross-cutting themes by investigating CAEP's impact on EPPs and their practices. Very little research was done on the impacts of NCATE and TEAC, and with CAEP's ambitious agenda this trend should not continue, particularly since accreditation is critical to the field of educator preparation. CAEP put forward six goals to direct its work to become a premier accreditor, one of which is to raise the bar for educator preparation (CAEP, 2013c). If CAEP is truly raising the bar, the field needs to know if the standards and cross-cutting themes that CAEP will use to the measure the quality of EPPs are valid and reliable. Each standard and cross-cutting theme needs to be evaluated against the literature and best practice of the field.

One such area for further investigation is to continue the dialogue started here on diversity and multicultural education. This study found that the dialogue around diversity needs

to continue and that the field of educator preparation struggles to define what diversity is and its impact on EPPs. The field struggles to agree on what diversity is and how it should be taught. One problem that educator preparation has is that CAEP requires EPPs to present evidence that they prepare candidates to work with diverse students, however if the field of educator preparation cannot agree upon the definition of diversity, how can it even be measured? Gorski (2009b) put forward a typology of multicultural education approaches that could be used to further investigate CAEP's definition of diversity and multiculturalism. In his 2009b study, Gorski pointed out that accreditation is one of the challenges for moving multicultural education courses offered by EPPs towards the five defining principles of multicultural education. He pointed out that NCATE's Diversity standard falls short of the five defining principles and has been classified as *Teaching with Multicultural Competence* (Gorski, 2009b), which is a further refinement of critical multiculturalism (Jenks et al. 2001; Grant & Steeler, 1997; McLaren, 1994). As a blending of the approaches and philosophies of NCATE and TEAC's, CAEP uses NCATE's approach to diversity as part of its foundation for the cross-cutting theme of diversity. Thus research should be done to see if CAEP, like NCATE, is grounded in the constructs of liberal multiculturalism, with emphasis on the celebration of diversity and learning about culture and human relations, rather than equity and social justice; critical multiculturalism (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Diaz-Rico, 1998; Gorski, 2009a, 2009b; Hidalgo, Chavez-Chavez, & Ramage, 1996; Jackson, 2003; McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004; Nieto, 2004; Vavrus, 2002).

The confirmatory factor analysis conducted for this study found that diversity is not a unidimentional construct, but a complex of multiple constructs. Another possible line of research is to conduct an exploratory factor analysis to see which diversity categories cluster together. This is particularly important when considering Jennings (2007) and Gorski's (2010)

findings that the most emphasized construct in multicultural education is themes related to racial and ethnic minorities. Does race and ethnicity stand alone as a single construct, or is it clustered with one or more of the other constructs of diversity? This may help bring about a greater balance in the multicultural teacher education curriculum used by EPPs.

With better understanding of the clustering of diversity categories, the research question of this study can be revisited to see how these clusters of diversity categories impact candidate performance. EPPs struggle to balance all of the different topics in their curricula and knowing which diversity categories or clusters of categories seem to have the greatest impact on candidate learning and performance would allow EPPs to more effectively focus instruction and field experiences.

Finally, this study could stand as a type to create other studies to evaluate the CAEP standards and cross-cutting themes. For example, multiple factors go into a high quality field placement. Some of those factors are the quality of the mentor teacher assigned to work with the candidate during the field experience, whether the school is considered a high or low performance school, and whether the principal can be considered an effective instructional leader. Each of these aspects of a high quality field placement could be used to evaluate candidate performance during field experiences. As the field of educator preparation studies CAEP's standards and cross-cutting themes, many different studies should be conducted to see if CAEP is impacting EPPs and their practices positively or negatively.

Conclusion

Does CAEP have it right where multicultural aspects of candidates' field experiences are concerned? It appears that CAEP may be moving in the right direction; however findings of this study do questions whether CAEP's definition of diversity is comprehensive enough to show

impact on candidates' performance during their student teaching experience, particularly when the instruments used to measure performance are theoretically based on national standards intended to measure candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions when working with diverse students. Also there is evidence that CAEP's definition of diversity is not sufficiently grounded in the multicultural education literature. Considering Gorski's (2009b) typology of multicultural education, CAEP still appears to have to room to grow before its standards and cross-cutting themes align with the work of the leading and pioneering research scholars of the multicultural education field (Banks, 2004; Grant & Sleeter, 1997; Nieto, 1995, 2004; Sleeter, 1996, 2003).

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2015). *About AACTE.*

    Retrieved from http://aacte.org/about-aacte

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2010). *Reforming teacher*

    education: The critical clinical component. Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, L. M., & Stillman, J. A. (2013). Student teaching's contribution to preservice teacher

    development: A review of research focused on the preparation of teachers for urban and

    high-needs contexts. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(1), 3-69. doi:

    10.3102/0034654312468619

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.

    Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*.

    Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Banks, J. (2004). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. Banks & C. Banks

    (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3-30). San Francisco, CA:

    Jossey-Bass.

Bloland, H.G. (2001). *Creating the council for higher education accreditation (CHEA)*. Phoenix,

    AZ: The American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.

Causey, V. E., Thomas, C. D., & Armento, B. J. (2000). Cultural diversity is basically a foreign

    term to me: The challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education. *Teaching and*

    Teacher Education, 16, 33-45.

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). (2015). *The world fact book.* Retrieved from

https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html

Cibulka, J.G., & Murray, F.B. (2011). *CAEP: The council for the accreditation of educator*

preparation. Presentation at the 63rd annual conference of the American Association of

Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher*

education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the*

AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). (2010). *The value of accreditation*.

Washington, DC: Author.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). (2011). *An overview of U.S. accreditation*.

Washington, DC: Author.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), Commission on Standards and

Performance Reporting. (2013). *Draft accreditation standards.* Washington, DC: Author.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013a). *CAEP accreditation*

standards. Washington, DC: Author.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013b). *CAEP: History*.

Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/about/history/

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013c). *Vision, mission, and*

goals. Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/about/vision-mission-goals

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2010). *CAEP: A new*

accrediting body for educator preparation. Retrieved from http://www.caepsite.org

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (n.d.). *Mission and strategic plan.* Retrieved from: http://caepnet.org/about/strategicplan/

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2015). *CCSSO: Who we are.* Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Who_We_Are.html

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

David O. McKay School of Education (MSE). (2014). *BYU-Public School Partnership.* Retrieved from http://education.byu.edu/deans/psp.html

Deering, T. E., & Stanutz, A. (1995). Preservice field experience as a multicultural component of a teacher education program. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(5), 390-394. doi: 10.1177/0022487195046005010

Diaz-Rico, L. T. (1998). Toward a just society: Recalibrating multicultural teachers. In R. Chavez-Chavez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non) engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 69-86). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ducharme, E.R., & Ducharme, M. K. (1998). *The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education: A history.* Washington, DC: AACTE Publication.

Educator Licensing and Data Retention Administrative Rule, Utah Administrative Code § R277-502 (2014).

Educator Licensing and Data Retention Administrative Rule, Utah Administrative Code § R277-503 (2014).

Educator Licensing and Data Retention Administrative Rule, Utah Administrative Code § R277-504 (2015).

Enders, C. K., & Bandalos, D. L. (2001). The relative performance of full information maximum likelihood estimation for missing data in structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling, 8*(3), 430-457.

Fallon, D. (2012). Knowing by asking: Frank B. Murray's life of inquiry. In M. LaCelle-Peterson & D. Ridgen (Eds.), *Inquiry, evidence, and excellence: The promise and practice of quality assurance, a festschrift in honor of Frank B. Murray* (pp.1-12). Washington, DC: TEAC Publication.

Fitzpatrick, J.L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004) *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Pearson Education, Inc.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glantz, S. A., & Slinker, B. K. (2001). *Primer of applied regression and analysis of variance,* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Gorski, P. C. (2010). The scholarship informing the practice: Multicultural teacher education philosophy and practice in the United States. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 12*(2), 1-22.

Gorski, P. C. (2009a). Insisting on digital equity: Reframing the dominant discourse on multicultural education and technology. *Urban Education, 44*(3), 348-364. doi: 10.1177/0042085908318712

Gorski, P. C. (2009b). What we're teaching teachers: An analysis of multicultural teacher education coursework syllabi. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25,* 309-318. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2008.07.008

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1997). *Turning on learning: Five approaches to multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gronlund, N. E., & Linn, R. L. (1990). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching* (6th ed.). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Harcleroad, F.R. (1980). *Accreditation: History, process, and problems.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Harcleroad, F.R., & Eaton, J.S. (2011). The hidden hand: External constituencies and their impact. In P.G. Altbach, P.J. Gumport, & R.O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd ed.). (pp. 195-224). Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Hidalgo, F., Chavez-Chavez, R., & Ramage, J. (1996). Multicultural education: Landscape for reform in the twenty-first century. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.) *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 761-778). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Hollins, E., & Torres-Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC). (2013). *InTASC model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers 1.0.* Retrieved from

http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards _and_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers_10.html

Jackson, C. W. (2003). Crystallizing my multicultural education core. In G. Gay (Ed.), *Becoming multicultural educators: Personal journey toward professional agency* (pp. 42-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jenks, C., Lee, J. O., & Kanpol, B. (2001). Approaches of multicultural education in preservice teacher education: Philosophical frameworks and models for teaching. *The Urban Review, 33*(2), 87-105.

Jennings, T. (2007). Addressing diversity in US teacher preparation programs: A survey of elementary and secondary programs' priorities and challenges from across the United States of America. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 1258-1271. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.004

Kline, P. (2000). *The handbook of psychological testing (2nd ed.)*. London, ENG: Routledge.

Leon-Guerrero, D. (personal communication, March 19, 2013)

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers.* Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/ Educating _Teachers_Report.pdf

McKenzie, K. B., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(5), 601-632.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Moncure, S. S. (1998). Murray heads national accreditation group. *University of Delaware Update: A university community newspaper, 17*(37). Retrieved from http://www.udel.edu/PR/UpDate/98/37/murray.html

Murray, F. B. (2010). Lessons from ten years of TEAC's accrediting activity. *Issues in Teacher Education, 19*(1), Spring 2010, 7-19. Retrieved from ERIC database (EJ887292).

Murray, F. B. (n.d.). *On some differences between TEAC and NCATE.* Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6160002/Teacher_Education_Accreditation_Council_TEAC

National Commission of Teaching & America's Future (NCTAF). (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York, NY: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk. The imperative for education reform.* U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation institutions*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2010a). *About NCATE.* Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/Public/AboutNCATE/tabid/179/Default.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2010b). *Accreditation action by the UAB.* Retrieved from http://ncate.org/Accreditation/AftertheVisit/Accreditation ActionbytheUAB/tabid/659/Default.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2010c). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers* Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket =zzeiB1OoqPk%3D&tabid=7

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2012). *Accreditation decisions.* Retrieved from http://ncate.org/Accreditation/AccreditationDecisions/ tabid/646/Default.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (n.d.). *NCATE accreditation.* Retrieved from: http://ncate.org/Accreditation/tabid/100/Default.aspx

National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ). (2011). *Student teaching in the United States.* Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Student_Teaching_United_States_ NCTQ_Report

NCATE/TEAC Design Team. (2010). *Report and recommendation of the NCATE/TEAC design team to our respective boards of directors.* Retrieved from: http://www.caepsite.org/ documents/designteamreport.pdf

Niehaus, E., Campbell, C., & Inkelas, K. (2013). HLM behind the curtain: Unveiling decisions behind the use and interpretation of HLM in higher education research. *Research in Higher Education,* (n.p.). doi: 10.1007/s111162-013-9306-7

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* New York, NY: Longman.

Nieto, S. (1995). From brown heroes and holidays to assimilationist agendas. In C. Sleeter & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference.* (pp. 191-220). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Osborne, J., & Waters, E. (2002). Four assumptions of multiple regression that researchers should always test. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation, 8*(2). Retrieved from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?n=2&v=8

Popham, J. A. (2015). *An analysis of the diversity trends within the Brigham Young University elementary education program field placement schools.* Unpublished manuscript, Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Popham, J. A., Erickson, L. B., Graham, C., Black, S., Shumway, S., Marchant, M., & Bateman, B. (September 2014). *The Brigham Young University Educator Preparation Program inquiry brief.* Prepared for the Teacher Education Accreditation Council to reaccredit the teacher preparation programs at Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Ravitch, D. (2014). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger of America's public schools.* New York, NY: Random House, LLC.

Renaissance Teacher Work Sample Group. (n.d.). *Teacher work sample.* Retrieved from the Western Kentucky University website: http://www.wku.edu/rtwsc/

Rigden, D. (personal communication, March 19, 2013)

Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. (2003). Teaching globalization. *Multicultural Education, 5*(2), 3-9.

Tabacbnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(6), 28-36, doi: 10.1177/002248718403500608

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). (2012). *TEAC guide to accreditation.* Washington, DC: Author.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). (n.d.). *TEAC accreditation.* Retrieved from: http://www.teac.org/accreditation/

U.S. Const. amend. X.

U.S. Department of Education (USDE). (2014). *Accreditation in the United States*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/print/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation.html

Utah State Office of Education (USOE). (2013). *Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS).* Retrieved from http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/educatoreffectiveness/Standards/ Teaching/TeachingStandards.aspx

Vavrus, M. (2002). *Transforming the multicultural education of teachers: Theory, research, and practice.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Woltman, H., Feldstain, A., MacKay, J. C., & Rocchi, M. (2012). An introduction to hierarchical linear modeling. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods of Psychology, 8*(1), 52-69.

APPENDIX A:

List of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs)

1. Computer Science: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)
   a. Initial Secondary Computer Science Education
2. Early Childhood Education: National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
   a. Initial Early Childhood Education
   b. Advanced Early Childhood Education
3. Educational Leadership: Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC)
   a. Advanced Educational Leaders at the Building Level
   b. Advanced Educational Leaders at the District Level
4. Educational Technology Facilitation: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)
   a. Advanced Educational Technology Facilitation
5. Educational Technology Leadership: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)
   a. Advanced Educational Technology Leadership
6. Elementary Education: Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)
   a. Initial Elementary Education
7. English Language Arts (Secondary): National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
   a. Initial Secondary English Language Arts
8. Environmental Education: North American Association for Environmental Education (NAAEE)
   a. Initial Environmental Education
9. Foreign Language: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
   a. Initial Foreign Language
10. Gifted and Talented Education: National Association for Gifted Children--Council for Exceptional Children (NAGCCEC)
    a. Initial Gifted Education
11. Health Education: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD)/American Association for Health Education (AAHE)
    a. Initial Health Education
12. Mathematics Education: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
    a. Initial Elementary Mathematics
    b. Initial Middle Level Mathematics
    c. Initial Secondary Mathematics
13. Middle School: National Middle School Association (NMSA)
    a. Initial Middle Level
    b. Middle Level Masters
    c. Middle Level Doctoral
14. Physical Education: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance
15. (AAHPERD)/National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE)

      a.   Initial Physical Education
      b.   Advanced Physical Education

16. Reading Professional: International Reading Association (IRA)
      a.   Advanced Reading and/or Literacy
17. School Library Media Specialist: American Library Association (ALA)
      a.   Advanced School Library Media Specialist
18. School Media and Educational Technology: Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)
      a.   Advanced ECIT
19. School Psychologist: National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)
      a.   Advanced School Psychology
20. Science Education: National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)
      a.   Initial Middle School License
      b.   Initial Secondary Science
21. Social Studies: National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)
      a.   Initial Social Studies
22. Special Education: Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
      a.   Initial Special Education
      b.   Advanced Special Education Role (e.g., administrator, educational diagnostician, transition specialist, etc.)
23. Teaching English as a Second Language: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
      a.   Initial English as a Second Language
24. Technology Education: International Technology Education Association/Council on Technology Teacher Education (ITEA/CTTE)
      a.   Initial Technology Education

APPENDIX B:

Teacher Work Sample (TWS)

Brigham Young University

Educator Preparation Program

Teacher Work Sample
Guidelines
(TWS)

Academic Year 2014-2015

The Renaissance Partnership

For Improving Teacher Quality

The June 2002 Teacher Work Sample, prompt and scoring rubric was revised by representatives from the eleven Renaissance Partnership Project sites:

California State University at Fresno, Eastern Michigan University, Emporia State University, Idaho State University, Kentucky State University, Longwood College, Middle Tennessee State University, Millersville University, Southeast Missouri State University, University of Northern Iowa, Western Kentucky University.

Notice: The materials in this document were developed by representatives of the Renaissance Partnership Institutions and may not be used or reproduced without citing The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project *http://fp.uni.edu/itq*

The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality is a Title II federally funded project with offices at Western Kentucky University. Director: Roger Pankratz   roger.pankratz@wku.edu

In September 2003, The Department of Teacher Education at Brigham Young University made some modifications to the original Renaissance Teacher Work Sample document to reflect the specific outcomes relative to the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) at BYU. In addition, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Coalition (InTASC, 1992) Principles/Standards have been incorporated in the Teacher Work Sample. Permission to modify was granted by Roger Pankratz, August 2003, in a verbal conversation and via email. In August 2006 the prompts and rubrics were further refined and the evaluation scale was broadened to 0-5. It is anticipated that revisions will continue to be made periodically to continue to reflect the EPP at Brigham Young University.

Overview of Teacher Work Sample (TWS)

1. Identify a topic/unit that aligns with what you are expected to teach during student teaching or internship.
2. Prepare a work sample:

    *   describing the **contextual factors** that may influence student learning,

    *   identifying **learning goal(s)** based on state and/or district content standards,

    *   creating an **assessment plan** designed to measure student performance before (pre-assessment), during (formative assessment) and after (post-assessment) the sample lessons, and

    *   **design instruction (**lessons) based on your overall learning goal.

3. Teach the lessons you have prepared.
4. Report results:

    *   **describe** your instructional decision-making,

    *   **report** student learning using the results from the post-assessments,

    *   **reflect** upon and evaluate your teaching and **analyze** what caused students to learn.

5.   Finalize the preparation of your TWS using the format guidelines below.
    *   *Cover Page*. Include (a) your name and BYU ID# (b) grade level and subject taught, (c) major, (d) date (e) your university
    *   *Table of Contents.* List the sections and attachments in your TWS document with page numbers.
    *   *Charts, Graphs and Attachments*. Charts, graphs and assessment instruments are required as part of the TWS document. A <u>few</u> samples of student work may also be included. Be selective and make sure your attachments provide clear evidence of your performance or student learning.
    *   *Length.* A suggested page length is given at the end of each section. The total length of your document (excluding items in the Appendix A) typically will be 18-20 pages, double-spaced, 12-point font, 1" margins.
    *   *References and Credits*. If you referred to another person's ideas or material in your narrative, you should cite these in a separate section at the end of your narrative under *References and Credits*. You may use any standard form for references; however, the American Psychological Association (APA) style is a recommended format (explained in the manual entitled "Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association").
    *   *Anonymity*. To ensure the privacy of students in your class, do not include any student names in any part of your TWS.
    *   *Comprehensiveness of the TWS*. All TWS must be submitted in complete form including required appendices, charts, graphs, student work samples, etc. Incomplete TWSs will be returned to the candidate ungraded.
6.   Submit an e-copy of the TWS, titled "Teacher Work Sample," **on mYlink** by the due date.
7.   Scoring will be done using the following scale

    0 = **Missing-** not there

    1 = **Deficient** - Requires Intervention

    2 = **Basic Competence** - Meets Requirement

    3 = **Advanced Competence** - Above Basic Requirement

Seven Teaching Processes Assessed by the Renaissance Teacher Work Sample

Teaching Processes, TWS Standards, and Indicators

A summary of the requirements is listed in the rubric of each component

Contextual Factors
The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences in setting learning goal(s) and planning instruction and assessment.
• Knowledge of community, school, and classroom factors
• Knowledge of characteristics of students
• Implications for instructional planning and assessment

Learning Goals
The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goal(s) based on state/district content standards.
• Clarity of learning goals
• Alignment with national, state or local standards (Common Core State Standards)
• Complexity of thinking (i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy)
• Appropriateness of objectives for students

Assessment Plan
The teacher uses multiple assessment modes aligned with learning goal(s) to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.
• Multiple modes
• Clarity of criteria and standards for performance
• Adaptations based on the individual needs of students
• Quality of Assessments

Design for Instruction
The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goal(s) that address characteristics and needs of students, and the learning context.
• Use of contextual information
• Quality of the instructional strategies
• Use of technology
• Adaptations based on the individual needs of students
• Unit Outline

TEACH YOUR UNIT

Instructional Decision-Making
The teacher uses ongoing analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.
• Modifications based on analysis of student learning from pre-assessments
• Sound professional practice

Report of Student Learning
The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.
• Clarity and accuracy of profile
• Summary of the tables/charts
• Evidence of impact on student learning

Reflection and Self-Evaluation
The teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.
• Interpretation of student learning
• Insights on effective instruction and assessment
• Implications for future teaching
• Implications for professional development

TWS 1

Contextual Factors

UETS Standard 2: Learning Differences
InTASC Standard 2: Learning Differences

PURPOSE: To help you identify contextual factors in your classroom that will influence your instruction.
- Use the Utah State Office of Education website to identify relevant data on the racial/ethnic breakdown of your school.
- Use city websites, documents, etc. to identify your community's history and relevant data for the community. You need to know information about your school's larger community.
- Interview your cooperating teacher to identify relevant contextual factors that affect the classroom and possibly your instruction. Also peruse your school's website to glean additional information on the school contextual factors.
- Submit your Field Experience Demographic (FED) report on mYlink.
- Write the Contextual Factors narrative. Submit the narrative on mYlink.

COMPLETE THE FED FORM
Complete the FED Form and submit it on mYlink

INTERVIEW YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER, FACILITATOR, OR MENTOR
Arrange to have an interview with your cooperating teacher. This interview will help you to get more information regarding student demographics, needs, and characteristics.

Cooperating Teacher: Name _____

Fill out this chart using information from your cooperating teacher:

Classroom Breakdown	Your Individual Classroom Data
Total Number of Students in Your Class	
Number of African American Students in Your Class	
Number of American Indian Students in Your Class	
Number of Asian Students in Your Class	
Number of Hispanic Students in Your Class	
Number of Pacific Islander Students in Your Class	
Number of White Students in Your Class	
Number of English Language Learners in Your Class	
Number of Students with Disabilities in Your Class *(Students with active IEPs, Students with physical/mental/emotional handicaps with 504 status)*	
Number of Students in Accelerated Programs in Your Class *(Gifted and Talented, Honors, Advanced Placement)*	

Discuss the following questions with your cooperating teacher:

How do the location of the school, the community and school populations, the socio-economic profile, and the racial/ethnic demographic influence the classroom environment?

What types of support does the school receive from parents and from the community?

What specific help does your school have from the district or Federal Government to help with special populations in your school?

How do the following factors affect the instructional process? How do they enhance or detract from the effectiveness of the

instruction?

- Physical features of the school or classroom
- Access to technology and equipment
- School and class rules, schedules, and routines
- Student characteristics *(levels of development, achievement, and prior knowledge)*
- Exceptional students
- Students' varying learning modalities

How is curriculum developed because of the above factors?
- In what areas of the class curriculum do the students excel?
- In what areas of the class curriculum do the students struggle?
- On which areas of the class curriculum should I focus my attention when deciding upon a possible teaching unit for my teacher work sample?
- Which areas of the class curriculum should I avoid when deciding upon a possible teaching unit for my teacher work sample?

NARRATIVE
Using the information compiled thus far about the classroom, school, and community you are student teaching or completing your internship in, write up a 1-2 page detailed narrative explaining the data gathered on the contextual factors. Describe how the data gathered affects your instructional choices.

1. Contextual Factors Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
1.A Community, School, & Classroom Factors	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Candidate displays relevant knowledge of the characteristics of the community, school, and classroom that may affect learning.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
1.B Student Characteristics	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Candidate displays an understanding of student differences (e.g. development, interests, culture, abilities/disabilities) that may affect learning.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
1.C Instructional Implications	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Candidate provides implications for instruction and assessment based on student individual differences and community, school, and classroom characteristics.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Summary:					

TWS 2
Learning Goals

UETS Standards 1: Learner Development; 2: Learning Differences; and 6: Instructional Strategies

InTASC Standards 1: Learner Development; 2: Learning Differences; and 7: Planning for Instruction

PURPOSE: To help you create a framework for your teaching unit informed by the contextual factors and student needs that you have previously identified.

- Decide on a unit of study to teach. Name the unit.
- Craft overall educational learning goals for your unit.
- Align the unit goals with the National Standards for your content area.
- Label and briefly describe the learning levels (e. g., Bloom's Taxonomy, see Appendix A) represented in the unit goals.
- Write the learning goals narrative.

_____

LEARNING GOALS

List the learning goals (not the activities) that will guide the planning, delivery, and assessment of your unit. The goals should reflect the big ideas or structure of the discipline. Number each learning goal so you can reference them later.

ALIGNMENT

Show how the goals are aligned with local, state, or national standards. Identify the source of the standards.

LEVEL OF THINKING OF EACH GOAL

Describe the level (e. g., Bloom's Taxonomy, see Appendix A) of each learning goal.

APPROPRIATE

Discuss how your learning goals are appropriate in terms of developmental level of students and their cultural backgrounds. Include the unit title and how the unit goals align with national or state standard(s). Discuss the levels of learning (e. g., Bloom's Taxonomy, see Appendix A) of your learning goals.

NARRATIVE

For each learning goal describe how it reflects a big idea of the discipline, and how it aligns with local, state, or national standards. Discuss the variety of levels of learning that are addressed by the goals. Discuss how your defined goals are appropriate for the expected developmental levels of the students and their cultural backgrounds.

2. Learning Goals Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
2.A **Unit Goals**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	The goals reflect a "big idea" in the discipline.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
2.B **Alignment**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	The goals align with identified local, state, or national standards	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
2.C **Levels of Learning**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Goals reflect a variety of levels of learning (e.g. Bloom's Taxonomy).	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
2.D **Appropriateness**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Goals are appropriate for the expected development and cultural background of students.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	

Summary:

TWS 3

Assessment Plan

UETS Standards 1: Learner Development; 4: Content Knowledge; and 5: Assessment
InTASC Standards 1: Learner Development; 4: Content Knowledge; and 6: Assessment

PURPOSE: To help you develop a variety of methods for assessing the learning goals for your teaching unit and align the assessments with the level of learning of each goal.

- Identify how you will assess students' learning and growth as it relates to each learning goal.
- Align the assessment with the level of learning of each goal.
- Identify appropriate performance criterion for the assessment method.
- Discuss potential adaptations you will need to consider for each assessment based on contextual factors and student needs.
- Defend the quality of your assessments in narrative.

ASSESSING THE LEARNING GOALS
Structure a pre-assessment, formative, and a post- (or final) assessment for each unit goal to adequately measure student growth. Include a discussion of how will you learn what prior knowledge students have and how will you determine whether or not the students have mastered the learning goal?

ALIGNMENT
The assessment method aligns with the level of learning of the identified learning goal.

PERFORMANCE CRITERION
Identify the performance criterion for the assessment method which should include how you will evaluate students' performance on the assessments and the indicator of proficiency.

> For example:
>> *(Specific to Department)*

POTENTIAL ADAPTATIONS
For each individual assessment goal you have listed above, brainstorm the possible adaptations you will need to make based on contextual factors and specific student needs. Consider the range of factors throughout the unit. You can add this to the information already created for the individual goals in this document.

> For example:
>> *(Specific to Department)*

NARRATIVE
Write a 1-2 page narrative explaining your assessment plan. Why did you choose the particular method of assessment? Does it assess what you want your students to learn? Does it help you see where your students are at the beginning of the unit (pre-assessment, screening for prior knowledge, or discovering misconceptions)? How will the assessment show growth in the students?

3. Assessment Plan Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
3.A **Pre-, Formative, and Post- Assessments**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	The plan includes a pre-, formative, and post- assessment that measures student growth for each learning goal.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
3.B **Alignment with Level of Learning**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	The assessment method aligns with the level of learning (e.g. Bloom's Taxonomy) of the identified learning goal.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
3.C **Performance Criterion**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	For each assessment method there is a performance criterion which includes how you will evaluate students' performance on the assessments and the indicator of proficiency.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
3.D **Appropriateness**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	A variety of adaptations are identified that are appropriate to meet the individual needs to students.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Summary:					

TWS 4
Design for Instruction

UETS Standards 2: Learning Differences; 3: Learning Environments; and Standard 6: Instructional Planning; and 7: Instructional Strategies

InTASC Standards 2: Learner Differences; 3: Learning Environments; 7: Planning for Instruction; and 8: Instructional Strategies

PURPOSE: To help you design your unit instruction related to learning goals, students' characteristics and needs, and the specific learning context.

- Design lessons that address contextual factors and student needs.
- Select a variety of appropriate instructional strategies that focus on student learning.
- Include technology that will enhance the instruction and that students can use as part of the learning process.
- Describe how your instruction will integrate with a variety of content areas (e. g., literacy, art, music, mathematics, science).
- Identify adaptations to customize your instruction for specific special needs and exceptional students in your classroom.
- Write your lesson plans for the entire unit. Include supplements and assessments with the lesson plans.

PREPARE LESSON PLANS

Create each lesson and lesson materials that will support the unit goals already developed. Use a variety of appropriate instructional strategies. Include technology that will enhance the instruction and that students can use as part of the learning process. Describe how your instruction will integrate with a variety of content areas (e. g., literacy, art, music, mathematics, science). Reminder---Your complete lessons will include detailed plans, lecture notes, supplements, handouts, etc.

REVIEW FOR INTEGRATION AND ADAPTATIONS

After designing your lessons, examine the sequence of events or steps in your lesson plan and determine where integration with other content areas might occur, technology might enhance student learning, literacy strategies are used (how students access, analyze, evaluate, and create), and adaptations in instruction for special needs are needed.

NARRATIVE

Write a 1-2 page narrative analyzing your lessons based on how they support unit goals, integrate with other content areas if possible, utilize technology, and include literacy strategies where appropriate. Discuss the ways in which your instruction is designed to meet the needs of all learners including student with disabilities and English Language Learners.

4. Design for Instruction Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
4.A **Contextual Information**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Lessons address contextual factors and student needs.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
4.B **Instructional Strategies**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	A variety of instructional strategies that focus on student learning are used throughout the unit.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
4.C **Technology**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Students use technology that will enhance the instruction and that students can use as part of the learning process.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
4.D **Integration**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Instruction integrates with a variety of content areas (e.g., literacy, art, music, mathematics, science).	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
4.E **Adaptions**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	A variety of appropriate adaptations are identified to meet the individual needs of students.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
4.F **Overall Unit Plan**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Lessons are logically sequenced, student interest/engagement would be high. Lesson plans are included in Appendix B.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Summary:					

TWS 5

Instructional Decision-Making

Based on Analysis of Screening for

Prior Knowledge or Misconceptions of Students, or Pre-requisite Skills

and Formative Assessments

UETS Standards 4: Content Knowledge; and 7: Instructional Strategies

InTASC Standards 5: Application of Content; and 8: Instructional Strategies

PURPOSE: To describe the ways you modified your original design for instruction based on formative assessment. Be specific in what caused you to modify your teaching "midstream."

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

How did formative assessment help you identify which students were "getting the concept," and which students needed intensified instruction?

CHANGES TO INSTRUCTION

How did you modify instruction or use supplemental instruction to improve the learning of all students?

NARRATIVE

Incident #1

Screening for Prior Knowledge or Misconceptions of Students

a. In a narrative, describe how you modified your instruction based on analysis of screening for prior knowledge or misconceptions of students, or pre-requisite skills of one student.

b. **Sound Professional Practice—**Continue your narrative and explain why your modification should have improved student progress based on your understanding of sound professional practice. Describe the outcome. Did you get the result you anticipated from making the modification?

Incident #2

Formative Assessment of Students

c. **Modifications Based on Analysis of Formative Assessment —** In a narrative, describe how you modified your instruction based on formative assessment of one student.

d. **Sound Professional Practice—** Continue your narrative and explain why your modification should have improved student progress based on your understanding of sound professional practice. Describe the outcome. Did you get the result you anticipated from making the modification?

5. Instructional Decision-Making Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
5.A **Modifications Based on Analysis of Pre-assessment**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Appropriate modifications of the instructional plan are made to address pre-assessment data.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
5.B **Modifications Based on Formative Assessment**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Instructional decisions reported are appropriate based on formative assessment.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Summary:					

TWS 6

Summative Report of Student Learning

UETS Standard 5: Assessment

InTASC Standard 6: Assessment

PURPOSE: To analyze student assessment data, including screening and formative assessments to determine students' progress related to the unit learning goals. Use graphic representations and narrative to communicate the performance of the whole class and two individual students. Conclusions drawn from this analysis should be provided in the "Reflection and Self-Evaluation" section.

COLLECT AND ANALYZE DATA OF STUDENT LEARNING

- **Whole class—** To analyze the progress of your whole class, create a graphic summary that shows the extent to which your students made progress (from initial instruction to final instruction) toward the performance criterion that you identified for each learning goal identified in your Assessment Plan section.

- **Supplemental Instruction:** Select a student that required supplemental instruction based on the assessment data. Create a spreadsheet, graph, or table that shows the performance of the student on the assessments **on one unit learning goal**.

- **Individual Accommodation:** Select a student who required individual accommodation (either high or low performing). Create a spreadsheet, graph, or table that shows the performance of the student on the assessments **on one unit learning goal**.

NARRATIVE

Write a 1-2 page summary of the students' learning during your unit of instruction. Summarize what the graph tells you about students' learning in this unit for the whole class (e.g., the number of students who met the criterion). Explain why you selected the student who received supplemental instruction based on the student data and summarize his/her learning in this unit. Do the same thing for the student who received an individual accommodation.

6. Report of Student Learning Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓		3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
6.A Whole Class	**Data Summary**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Summary is meaningful and appropriate conclusions are drawn from the data.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
	Impact on Student Learning	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Adequate evidence is provided on who achieved and made progress toward the learning goal and/or each objective.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
6.B Student needing supplemental Instruction	**Data Summary**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Summary is meaningful and some appropriate conclusions are supported by data.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
	Impact on Student Learning	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Adequate evidence is provided that showed why the selected student data helped the teacher provide supplemental instruction.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
6.C Student needing individual accommodation	**Data Summary**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Summary is meaningful and some appropriate conclusions are supported by data.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
	Impact on Student Learning	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Adequate evidence is provided that showed why the selected student data helped the teacher provide individual accommodations.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Summary:						

TWS 7
Reflection and Self-Evaluation

UETS Standard 8: Reflection and Continuous Growth; 9: Leadership and Collaboration; and 10: Professional and Ethical Behavior
InTASC Standards 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; and 10: Leadership and Collaboration

PURPOSE: To evaluate your performance as a teacher and link your performance to student learning results.

NARRATIVE
Write a 3-4 page narrative that will reflect on your performance in teaching the unit and identify future action that could for improve your teaching and professional growth. You can use the following prompts to help you construct your narrative:

- **Select the learning goal where your students were most successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control.**

- Select the learning goal where your students were least successful. Provide two or more possible reasons for this lack of success. Consider your goals, instruction, and assessment along with student characteristics and other contextual factors under your control. Discuss what you could do differently or better in the future to improve your students' performance.

- Reflection on possibilities for professional development. Describe at least two professional learning goals that emerged from your insights and experiences with the TWS. Identify two specific steps you will take to improve your performance in the critical area(s) you identified.

7. Reflection and Self-Evaluation Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
7.A **Interpretation of** **Student Learning**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Provides adequate reasons for why students met or did not meet the learning goal and objectives.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
7.B **Insights on Effective** **Instruction and** **Assessment**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Identifies the most and the least successful activities and assessments and explores plausible reasons for their success or failure.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
7.C **Implications for** **Personal Professional** **Improvement**	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Identifies two areas for improvement and lists and describes specific professional activities to improve those areas.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Summary:					

8. Overall Quality Rubric

Rating→ Indicator↓	3 Advanced Competence	2 Basic Competence	1 Deficient	0 Missing	Score
Mechanics of Writing	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Spelling, grammar, capitalization, punctuation, sentence structure, and all other mechanics of writing are 90% correct.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Organization and Clarity	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	Sections are well organized and required information is clearly presented and easy to find.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	
Overall TWS Quality	Significantly Exceeds Basic Competence	TWS reflects the typical professional thought and effort expected in a culminating teacher education assignment.	Does not meet Basic Competence	Candidate did not include any of the evidence for the subsection	

Summary:

Total Score

Sum of scores: [ ]   **÷31 = Average Score:** [ ]

Overall Summary:

APPENDIX A

Bloom's Taxonomy

Competence	Skills Demonstrated	Question Cues	Teaching Uses
Remembering (*knowledge from long-term memory*)	• observation and recall of information • knowledge of dates, events, places • knowledge of major ideas • mastery of subject matter	list, define, tell, describe, identify, show, label, collect, examine, tabulate, quote, name, who, when, where, repeat, specify, relate, recognize, recall, state	CD's, films, videos, models, events, media, diagrams, books, written records, etc.
Understanding (*determining meaning*)	• understanding information • grasp meaning • translate knowledge into new context • interpret facts, compare, contrast • order, group, infer causes • predict consequences	summarize, describe, interpret, contrast, predict, associate, distinguish, estimate, differentiate, discuss, extend, explain, put in your own words, express, retell, compare, paraphrase, demonstrate, outline	Trends, consequences, tables, cartoons, etc.
Applying (*making use of the knowledge*)	• use information • use methods, concepts, theories in new situations • solve problems using required skills or knowledge	apply, demonstrate, calculate, complete, illustrate, show, solve, examine, modify, relate, change, classify, experiment, discover, use, dramatize	Collection of items, diary, photographs, sculpture, illustration, etc.
Analyzing (*taking apart the known*)	• seeing patterns • organization of parts • recognition of hidden meanings • identification of components	analyze, separate, order, explain, connect, classify, arrange, divide, compare, select, explain, infer, choose, organize, investigate	Graph, survey, diagram, chart, questionnaire, report, etc.
Evaluating (*judging outcomes*)	• compare and discriminate between ideas • assess value of theories, presentations • make choices based on reasoned argument • verify value of evidence • recognize subjectivity	assess, decide, rank, grade, test, measure, recommend, convince, select, judge, explain, discriminate, support, conclude, compare, summarize	Letters, discussion panel, court trial, survey, self-evaluation, value, allusions, etc.
Creating (*putting things together in another way*)	• use old ideas to create new ones • generalize from given facts • relate knowledge from several areas • predict, draw conclusions	synthesize, combine, integrate, modify, rearrange, substitute, plan, create, design, invent, what if?, compose, formulate, prepare, generalize, rewrite	Article, radio show, video, puppet show, inventions, poetry, short story, etc.

Benjamin S. Bloom, *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*.
Published by Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA. Copyright (c) 1984 by Pearson Education

A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives
Edited by Lorin W. Anderson, David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin Samuel Bloom
Published by Longman Publishing Group (December 2000)

APPENDIX C:

Clinical Practice Assessment System (CPAS)

Brigham Young University
Education Preparation Program

Clinical Practice Assessment System
(CPAS)
Summative Evaluation

Academic Year 2014-2015

Clinical Practice Assessment System

Summative Evaluation

4.00

Student Information

Full Name:_____

BYU ID: _____

Program/Emphasis: _____

Semester/Term: _____

Field Experience

School: _____

District: _____

Grade Levels: _____
(For multiple grades, separate by commas; e.g., 2, 3, 4)

Field Duration: _____
(Full Semester, Semester 1st Half, Semester 2nd Half, or Year Long)

Experience Type: _____
(Practicum, Student Teaching, or Internship)

Evaluator Information

Full Name: _____

Role: _____
(Mentor Teacher or University Supervisor)

Evidence for Evaluation (check all that apply):

☐ CPAS from BYU supervisor

☐ CPAS from school facilitator/mentor teacher

☐ Conferencing with candidate or other school personnel

☐ Professional Disposition Instrument (PDI)

☐ Lesson plans/TWS/candidate portfolio

☐ Other: _____

Total # Formative Observations: _____

Total # Formative Observation Minutes: _____

4. Advanced Competence	3. Basic Competence	2. Emerging Competence	1. Deficient
Above Basic Requirement	Meets requirement	Requires Feedback	Requires Intervention

The Learner and Learning

Teaching begins with the learner. To ensure that each student learns new knowledge and skills, teachers must understand that learning and developmental patterns vary among individuals, that learners bring unique individual differences to the learning process, and that learners need supportive and safe learning environments to thrive.

STANDARD 1: Learner Development—The teacher candidate understands cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional and physical areas of student development. ☐

STANDARD 2: Learning Differences—The candidate understands individual learner differences and cultural and linguistic diversity. ☐

STANDARD 3: Learning Environments—The candidate works with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. ☐

www.manaraa.com

Student Name:_____ BYU ID:_____ Evaluator Name:_____

Instructional Practice

Effective instructional practice requires that teachers have a deep and flexible understanding of their content areas and be able to draw upon content knowledge as they work with learners to access information, apply knowledge in real-world settings, and address meaningful issues. They must also understand and integrate assessment, planning, and instructional strategies in coordinated and engaging ways to assure learner mastery of the content.

STANDARD 4: Content Knowledge—The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline. ☐

STANDARD 5: Assessment—The candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, monitor learner progress, guide planning and instruction, and determine whether the outcomes described in content standards have been met. ☐

STANDARD 6: Instructional Planning—The candidate plans instruction to support students in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, Utah Core Standards, instructional best practices, and the community context. ☐

STANDARD 7: Instructional Strategies—The candidate uses various instructional strategies to ensure that all learners develop a deep understanding of content areas and their connections and build skills to apply and extend knowledge in meaningful ways. ☐

Professional Responsibility

Creating and supporting safe, productive learning environments that result in learners achieving at the highest levels is a teacher's primary responsibility. To do this well, teachers must engage in meaningful, intensive professional learning by regularly examining practice through ongoing study, self-reflection, and collaboration. They must be aware of legal and ethical requirements and engage in the highest levels of professional and ethical conduct.

STANDARD 8: Reflection and Continuous Growth—The candidate is a reflective practitioner who uses evidence to continually evaluate and adapt practice to meet the needs of each learner. ☐

STANDARD 9: Leadership and Collaboration—The candidate is a leader who engages collaboratively with learners, families, colleagues, and community members to build a shared vision and supportive professional culture focused on student growth and success. ☐

STANDARD 10: Professional and Ethical Behavior—The candidate demonstrates the highest standard of legal, moral, and ethical conduct as specified in Utah State Board Rule R277-515. ☐

v. 8/15/2014

www.manaraa.com

Student Name:_____ BYU ID: _____ Evaluator Name: _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT: Please provide a detailed summary of the candidate's teaching practices while working in the classroom. As part of your summary, please include information about his/her teaching skills, ability to teach the Utah core standards, ability to meet the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS), interpersonal interactions with others, and any other strengths or areas for improvement you feel inclined to include. This is not a letter of recommendation. It is an evaluation of the candidate's knowledge and skill as a practicum student, student teacher, or intern. **800 Words Maximum**

Evaluator Name:_____ Signature:_____ Date:_____

University Program
Coordinator Name: _____ Signature:_____ Date:_____

Candidate Name:_____ Signature:_____ Date:_____
I have read and discussed my CPAS with my evaluator.

www.manaraa.com

APPENDIX D:

Candidate Dispositional Scale (CDS)

Brigham Young University
Education Preparation Program

Candidate Dispositional Scales
(CDS)

Academic Year 2014-2015

www.manaraa.com

CANDIDATE DISPOSITIONAL SCALES

Course: _____ Semester _____ BYU ID _____ Name_____

SECTION I: Locus of Control
Decide to what extent you agree or disagree with the idea expressed in each of the statements listed below. If you are not currently employed as a teacher, choose the answer that best describes how you believe you would most likely perform as a teacher. Do not exaggerate. Be as honest as you can. Respond to every item; do not leave any blank.

1. I accept the responsibility to help all students in my class to learn.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

2. If my classroom is going to have a positive learning environment, it has to start with me.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

3. Part of my job is to help every student meet the academic standards of our school.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

4. It is my responsibility as a teacher to ensure that all students achieve their potential.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

5. It is my job to take the initiative to contact the parent(s) of any child who is struggling in my class.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

6. I regularly participate in teacher improvement workshops and programs.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

7. I have the responsibility to create a positive learning climate for my class.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

8. I have the responsibility to create lesson plans that are effective and that meet the needs of my students.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

9. Part of my job is to make myself available when my students need my help.
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

10. When oe of m sud ents hs a larrning po blem tatnl d on'tko w h w t s lve, I take responsibility to get help from other professionals (e.g., another teacher, a counselor, a social worker, a principal).
    □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

11. When I make lesson plans, I consciously try to meet the needs of every individual student.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

12. I accept the responsibility to keep up to date with new developments that will help me become a more effective teacher.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

13. When I don't know the answer to a student's question, I take the responsibility to help students find an answer.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

14. I have a responsibility to work with school administrators, parent groups, and other teachers to create a positive learning environment throughout our school.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

SECTION II: Aspirations

In your work as a teacher, how frequently do you personally engage in or perform each of the activities listed below? If you are not currently employed as a teacher, choose the answer that best describes how you believe you would most likely perform. Do not exaggerate. Be as honest as you can. Select the answer which best describes you. Respond to every item; do not leave any blank.

1. I actively seek opportunities to learn more about the subjects I will teach.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

2. I integrate new insights from research into the classes and subjects that I teach.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

3. I strive to be responsive to the needs and interests of each student.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

4. I seek input from my principal and fellow teachers to help me better understand my weaknesses and blind spots as a teacher.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

5. I try to be open to suggestions and constructive feedback that will help me become a more effective teacher.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

6. I work at learning how to better assess my students' progress so that I can become a better teacher.

☐ 4
Always
☐ 3
Usually
☐ 2
Sometimes
☐ 1
Never

7. I willingly try new teaching methods even if it means that I have to step out of my comfort zone.

☐ 4
☐ 3
☐ 2
☐ 1

Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

8. I try to encourage all students to make the most of their opportunities to learn.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

9. I write out my goals for how I can improve my teaching.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

10. I try to learn how students' needs differ so that I can adapt my teaching to meet those needs.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

11. I talk with my peers about how I can be a better teacher.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

12. I work to improve the overall learning environment in my classroom by collaborating with other professionals.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

13. I talk with other educators about my hopes for students in my class.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

14. I take the time needed to stay current on new developments in the subject matter I will teach.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

15. I read more than is required in my teacher preparation classes.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

16. I welcome feedback about my teaching and try to use it to help me improve my skills as a teacher.
    ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Always   Usually   Sometimes   Never

SECTION III: Diversity
Respond to each of these items regarding how typical it is of your CURRENT PRACTICE and how COMPETENT you feel in this area. If you are not currently teaching, choose the answer that best describes how you believe you would most likely perform. Respond to every item; do not leave any blank.

1. I know what program(s) and practices are available in my school to serve learners from diverse language, ability, racial, ethnic, gender, religious, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic groups.
    ☐ 5   ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

2. I know how to adjust my instruction so that diverse learners are able to meet the same content-area standards and learning goals I have for all students.
    ☐ 5   ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1

Very Competent   Not Competent

3. I regularly develop and teach curriculum in ways that value multiple and diverse language, ability, racial, ethnic, gender, religious and socioeconomic cultural perspectives.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

4. I am well informed about current district, state, and federal policy and legislation for diverse learners.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

5. I know how, why, and when various teaching strategies work with different groups of learners.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

6. My actions demonstrate respect across differences of culture, race, abilities, language, gender, sexual preference, and socioeconomic resources.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

7. I maintain high expectations for others, particularly individuals from backgrounds often subjected to negative social stereotyping.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

8. When working with others, I assist them to succeed by providing adequate support/resources (e.g., technology collaboration with other professionals, family members, community organizations).
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

9. I recognize the backgrounds and worldviews of others and attempt to strengthen our relationship when meaningful differences occur.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

10. I know enough about second language learning, acculturation, and developmental processes to adjust my own behavior to effectively meet the needs of the people I serve.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

11. I communicate in ways that others can easily understand, providing examples relevant to *their experience and world views.*
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

12. When attempting to help others, I utilize a variety of intervention and assessment techniques appropriate for their background and abilities.
    □ 5   □ 4   □ 3   □ 2   □ 1
    Very Competent   Not Competent

13. When making decisions that concern others, I include stakeholders in the decision process and seek equitable solutions.

☐ 5   ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1

Very Competent   **Not Competent**

14. I assess the outcomes of those I have attempted to help/instruct and work to reduce any gaps in achievement across different groups (e.g., race, socioeconomic status).

☐ 5   ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1

Very Competent   **Not Competent**

15. I evaluate my own performance to better meet the needs of individuals with different backgrounds and abilities.

☐ 5   ☐ 4   ☐ 3   ☐ 2   ☐ 1

Very Competent   **Not Competent**

APPENDIX E:

Field Experience Demographics (FED)

Brigham Young University
Education Preparation Program

Field Experience Demographics Worksheet
(FED)

Academic Year 2014-2015

v. 8/15/2014

Field Experience Demographics Worksheet

Use this worksheet to record data on the diversity of your school(s), mentor teacher(s) and classroom(s) during your field experiences each semester. If you are placed in only ONE school during <u>this semester</u>, leave the School 2 spaces blank. If you are placed in MORE than two schools, report on the two schools that (1) match the level of school where you plan to teach after graduation (e.g., elementary, Jr. High or High School), and (2) have the most diversity.

To find the school demographic information for your form, take the following steps:
1. Go to *http://www.schools.utah.gov/main*.
2. Hover over the *Departments* drop-down menu and select *Accountability*.
3. Ensure that *Accountability/School Performance* is selected on the left-hand side menu, and then click *Data Gateway*, found near the center of your page.
4. Select *Click here for the old Data Gateway*.
5. Select *UCAS Report*, found in the lower right-hand corner.
6. Select the **District** (e.g., Alpine) and **School** (the school in which you had your field experience) from the drop-down menus, then click *Go*.
7. Select *Additional Information*, found in blue text on the left-hand side of the report that loads.

You have now successfully found the school demographic information needed to complete your FED form.
Please note that the data available on this site will always be one school year behind.

SECTION 1: SCHOOL-WIDE DATA

School/District: 1. _____/_____
2. _____/_____

Enrollment Breakdown	School 1	School 2
Total Students Enrolled		
# African American Students*		
# American Indian Students*		
# Asian Students*		
# Hispanic Students*		
# Undeclared Students*		
# Pacific Islander Students*		
# White Students*		

*If UCAS report returns a result of n<10, please report as 10 students.

# English Language Learners		
# Socio-Economic Status (free/reduced lunch)		
# Students with Disabilities		

Student Summary Information	School 1	School 2
Average Daily Attendance (e.g., .95)		
School Mobility Rate (e.g., .05)		

School Information	School 1		School 2	
Title I School**	Yes	No	Yes	No

**Discuss the Title I status of your school with your Cooperating Teacher(s) and/or school personnel in the main office.

v. 8/15/2014

SECTION 2: YOUR INDIVIDUAL CLASSROOM DATA

Report the mentor teacher and student demographics below for all class(es)/section(s) you worked with in the school during your field experience. Record the number, not an approximation or a percent, of students in each category. If there are no students in a particular category in the classes you worked in, leave the space blank. This information should be obtained unobtrusively by observation and interaction with students. Be as accurate as you can while protecting the privacy of students and faculty and do not take their time asking questions or probing unnecessarily.

School 1

Mentor Teacher #1 Name _____ Ethnicity_____

Mentor Teacher #2 Name _____ Ethnicity_____

Please use the same ethnicity classifications as in the table below for your cooperating teacher's ethnicity.

School 2

Mentor Teacher #1 Name _____ Ethnicity_____

Mentor Teacher #2 Name _____ Ethnicity_____

Please use the s me ethnicity classifications as in the table below for your cooperating teacher's ethnicity

Classroom(s) Breakdown	School 1	School 2
Total Number of students in your class(es)		
#African American students in your class(es)		
#American Indian students in your class(es)		
#Asian Students in your class(es)		
#Hispanic Students in your class(es)		
# Undeclared Students in your class(es)		
#Pacific Islander Students in your class(es)		
#White Students in your class(es)		
#English Language Learners in your class(es)		
#Students with Disabilities in your class(es) *(Special Ed. students with active IEPs, Students with physical/mental/emotional handicaps with 504 status)*		
#Students in Accelerated Programs in your class(es) *(Gifted and Talented, Honors, Advanced Placement)*		

mYlink:

At the conclusion of your field experiences for the semester, log onto mYlink and go t "Task/Assessments." Select FED for the current semester and course. Complete the form before the end of the semester using the information you've rc orded on this worksheet.

v. 8/15/2014

www.manaraa.com