

# NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

## Initial Preparation of Physical Education Teachers

**Southeastern Louisiana University**

July 10, 2007

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the **American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance/National Association for Sport and Physical Education (AAHPERD/NASPE)**.

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
  Revised Report
  Response to Conditions

Program(s) Covered by this Review	Program Type	Award or Degree Level(s)
Physical Education K-12	Initial teacher license in field	Baccalaureate

### **PART A—RECOGNITION DECISION** (see Part G for specifics on decision)

#### **A.1—SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):**

- Nationally recognized  
 Nationally recognized with conditions  
 Not nationally recognized

#### **A.2—Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)**

**The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:**

- Yes
  No
  Not applicable
  Not able to determine

Comment: The percentage of teacher candidates passing the examination is above 80% meeting the required pass rate. Means and ranges are reported as required. Disaggregated data (% correct not actual sub-section mean scores and ranges) is provided for the most recent year of the examination with corresponding averages (%) for the state and nation on the sub-categories of the Praxis II examination. The disaggregated data (sub-domain proficiency through the presentation of percentages) are difficult to interpret relative to what is considered acceptable content knowledge.

**A.3—Summary of Strengths:**

The faculty appear to be well qualified and experienced in K-12 settings.

The program appears to have appropriate field and clinical experience hours related to physical education.

Program admission, retention, and exit criteria are clearly stated.

Overall, assessments appear to have potential for producing rich and varied data about candidate performance on various standards.

Care has been taken with the curriculum and it aligns well with the NCATE/NASPE standards.

The conceptual framework of the Effective Educator, the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching, and the aforementioned national alignment, appear well suited to developing candidates with strong knowledge, skills and dispositions.

**PART B—STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS**

M = Met      NM = Not Met

NASPE Standards	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
<p><b>Standard 1. Content Knowledge.</b> Physical education teachers understand physical education content and disciplinary concepts related to the development of a physically educated person.</p>	<p><b>NM</b></p>	
<p>Comment: For Praxis II, disaggregated data (% correct not actual sub-section mean scores and ranges) is provided for the most recent year of the examination with corresponding averages (%) for the state and nation on the sub-categories of the Praxis II. The disaggregated data (sub-domain proficiency through the presentation of percentages) are difficult to interpret relative to what is considered acceptable content knowledge. The data table indicates that 100% of program completers were in the “acceptable” range although the narrative indicates that three completers failed. That appears to be an inconsistency and contributes to confusion on the part of reviewers. Further, little if any evidence for the content validity of the Content Area Examination (Assessment 2) is provided. It would help to include a content analysis of the test, which specifically addresses the Standard 1 outcomes that are actually measured. Since Assessment 2 appears to assess content in laboratories of movement-oriented courses, it is unlikely to suffice as (although it can certainly contribute to) a valid measure of the comprehensive outcomes associated with Standard 1. Finally, the stated criteria in the rubrics used to measure content knowledge in Assessments 4 and 6 are not well enough defined to enable reliable judgments about the proficiency of attained content knowledge.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 2. Growth and Development.</b> Physical education teachers understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development.</p>	<p><b>NM</b></p>	
<p>Comment: The degree of specificity in the categories (levels) of the various assessment rubrics (Assessments 4 and 5) and the resulting data do not align well with the outcomes in this standard. In addition, they do not explicitly measure or reflect the levels (degree) on which this standard is achieved,</p>		

NASPE Standards	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
<p>particularly in relation to candidates being able to “understand how individuals learn and develop.” For example, the LCET (Assessment 4) identifies only a generic rubric for different levels of effective teaching. The data table provides a description of percentage of program completers in acceptable/unacceptable/target levels. There are no descriptors of what constitutes acceptable, unacceptable or target work – no rubric per se, for each component. Finally, while the motor development aspect of this standard is emphasized in the curriculum, there is insufficient evidence that outcomes related to growth are adequately met.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 3. Diverse Students.</b> Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning, and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.</p>	<p><b>NM</b></p>	
<p>Comment: Although the description for Assessment 3 and 4 present evidence of the assessment of candidates for this standard, the performance-based evidence (scoring guides) is not thorough or reliable enough to provide evidence of mastery of the standard. For example, while there are generic levels of appropriate use of the identified skills on the LCET rubric, there are no descriptive behaviors for what would constitute acceptable or target levels of addressing the specific outcomes of the standard. Thus, the degree of specificity in the categories (levels) of the various assessment rubrics (Assessments 3 and 4) and the resulting data fail to explicitly measure or reflect the degree (levels) to which this standard is achieved.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 4. Management and Motivation.</b> Physical education teachers use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p><b>M</b></p>	
<p>Comment: The sole assessment reported for satisfying this standard is Assessment 4. The description provides insufficient detail for how this standard is assessed and – though a suitable and useful data table is provided – the scoring guide for reliably rating candidates as “unacceptable,” “acceptable” or “target” for meeting this standard is missing. However, Assessment 5 contains pertinent information related to this standard. While Assessment 5 was not included on the Standards Assessment Chart as evidence for meeting this standard, the description in the narrative does include some application to this standard. Having considered this standard in light of the contributions of Assessment 5, in particular, the standard is met.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 5. Communication.</b> Physical education teachers use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to enhance learning and engagement in physical activity settings.</p>	<p><b>NM</b></p>	
<p>Comment: The sole assessment reported for this standard is Assessment 4. The description provides insufficient detail for how this standard is assessed and. Although a suitable and useful data table is provided, the scoring guide for reliably rating candidates as “unacceptable,” “acceptable” or “target” for meeting this standard is missing. The instrument's data table provides only a general description of percentage of program completers in acceptable/unacceptable/target levels, and there are no descriptors of what constitutes acceptable, unacceptable or target work in management and motivation. There is a section on instruction that incorporates communication (“Initiates instruction effectively,” “Uses effective questioning...,” “Demonstrates ability to communicate successfully with students”), but without descriptors for level of acceptability it is difficult to interpret the data. Inclusive communication is addressed indirectly in the professionalism section (“Exhibits sensitivity to diverse community and cultural norms”). The rubric fails to delineate distinct levels of candidate proficiencies.</p>		
<p><b>Standard 6. Planning and Instruction.</b> Physical education teachers plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated</p>	<p><b>M</b></p>	

NASPE Standards	Specific Program or Level: Baccalaureate	Specific Program or Level
individuals, based on state and national (NASPE K-12) standards.		
Comment: Though Assessment 3 and 4 fail to provide reliable evidence (scoring guide) for this standard, Assessment 5 provides ample evidence and justification for meeting this standard and the scoring guide sufficiently discriminates outcomes and levels of proficiency.		
<b>Standard 7. Student Assessment.</b> Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of students in physical activity.	<b>M</b>	
Comment: A poorly defined scoring guide for both Assessments 3 and 4 provides weak evidence for the meeting of the standard. Assessment 5 provides ample evidence and justification for meeting the standard and the scoring guide sufficiently discriminates outcomes and levels of proficiency.		
<b>Standard 8. Reflection.</b> Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on others (e.g., students, parents/guardians, fellow professionals), and seek opportunities to grow professionally.	<b>M</b>	
Comment: Though Assessment 3 fails to provide reliable evidence for adequately meeting this standard, Assessment 5 provides suitable evidence and justification for meeting this standard as the scoring guide sufficiently discriminates outcomes and levels of proficiency. Assessments 3 and 5 enable candidates to describe and justify both their teaching and effective teaching, reflect on the performance and student outcomes, and set goals for future instruction based on these reflections. The rubric provides descriptions of levels of performance of the candidates and the data indicates candidates meet expectations.		
<b>Standard 9. Technology.</b> Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.	<b>NM</b>	
Comment: Assessment 4 has one item ("Plans for the use of technology") that addresses this standard while Assessment 5 contains a category related to "Integration of Technology into Planning or Implementation." These assessments do not match specifically to enough outcomes within the standard (or with the standard holistically) or provide sufficient detail to enable a reliable discrimination of how candidates performed (categories; levels) on the standard.		
<b>Standard 10. Collaboration.</b> Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students' growth and well-being.	<b>NM</b>	
Comment: A thorough scoring guide is not provided for Assessment 4 and the scoring guide in Assessment 5 fails to articulate the specificity (outcomes) for the standard sufficiently to enable a reliable discrimination of how candidates performed (categories; levels) on the standard. Furthermore, the assessments do not appear to address advocacy and professional activity.		

## PART C—EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

### C.1—Candidates' knowledge of content

The required Praxis II examination and the Content Area Exam provide some evidence of content mastery by teacher candidates yet, they lack sub-category scores (means and ranges or standard deviations) that are critical to judging performance on candidates' knowledge of content. More explanation is also necessary for how sub-sections of the Content Area Exam align to the outcomes within Standard 1. Finally, the stated criteria in the rubrics used to measure content knowledge in Assessments 4 and 6 are not well enough aligned with the standard and distinct levels of proficiency are

not well enough defined for reviewers to make reliable judgments about the proficiency of attained content knowledge.

### **C.2—Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions**

The descriptions and data tables of most assessments generally align well with the standard; however, several scoring guides (rubrics) fail to provide clear and valid evidence of teacher candidates' actual performance since the degree of specificity in the categories (levels) of the various assessment rubrics fail to adequately align sufficiently with standard outcomes. In other words, rubrics do not include evidence that the assessment explicitly measures the degree (levels) to which each standard is achieved. The evidence (scoring guides) used to justify performance on most assessments is defined too broadly and ambiguously.

### **C.3—Candidate effects on P-12 student learning**

Multiple assessments (3-5) are used to provide evidence on teacher candidate's impact on P-12 student learning. Rubrics for Assessments 3 and 5 are poorly aligned with specific outcomes or measure too many effects in one level. Thus, there is a lack of credible evidence to enable candidates or supervisors with substantive guidance as to what is being performed.

## **PART D—EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

### **Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)**

Insufficient specific details are given on what data were used and how the data shaped changes in the program. Generalized statements are made about the use of data, but insufficient specific application are provided to explain how such data prompted specific changes in candidate performance or in the program. Changes seem to be based on anecdotal evidence with little use of specific data gathered from various assessments. There is a lack of quantity, quality, and specificity of information about what data and how data were used to improve candidate and program effectiveness.

## **PART E—AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION**

- The required Praxis II examination and the Content Area Exam provide some evidence of content mastery by teacher candidates yet, they lack sub-category scores (means and ranges or standard deviations) that are critical to judging performance for the standard. More explanation is also necessary for how sub-sections of the Content Area Exam align to outcomes under Standard 1.
- The stated criteria in the rubrics used to measure content knowledge in Assessments 4 and 6 are not well enough aligned or defined to the standard to enable reliable judgments about the proficiency of attained content knowledge. The assessments (descriptions) suitably demand teacher candidates to perform the NASPE/NCATE standards, but the rubrics (scoring guides) fall short of validly reflecting candidates' actual performance relative to each standard as the criteria for levels are either omitted or are too general (vague, poorly defined...). As a result, the data presented fail to reliably reflect

candidates' actual performance relative to standards. Thus, rubrics used in the various assessments must be more clearly aligned with outcomes under standards and rubrics need to be aligned with outcomes while identifying clear and distinct levels of candidate proficiencies.

- More specific evidence should be presented that data have influenced decisions to improve the program and subsequent candidate performance.

## PART F—ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1—Comments on context and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

F.2—Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

## PART G—TERMS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS FOR DECISIONS

**Program is nationally recognized with conditions.** The program is recognized through spring 2009. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified above, in its published materials. **National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.**

**Subsequent action by the institution:** To retain accreditation, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted within 18 months, or no later than **February 1, 2009**. The report must address the conditions *specified in the box below*. Failure to submit a report by the date specified above will result in loss of national recognition.

Unless required to submit earlier by the state, programs are encouraged to take the full time period specified above to address conditions to recognition. If conditions to recognition are not removed in the Response to Conditions report, program status will change to Not Recognized.

*For further information on due dates or requirements, contact program review staff at NCATE (202-466-7496).*

**National recognition with conditions.** The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (see above for specific date):

Include the sub-categories and their scores (means and ranges or standard deviations) for the most recent year for the Praxis II examination and Content Area Exam. Clarify and/or correct the information related to the "three failed completers."

Add more explanation about sub-sections of the Content Area Exam align to the outcomes within Standard 1. Include a content analysis of the exam and specifically address the Standard 1 outcomes that are actually measured.

To enable reliable judgments about the candidates' proficiency within the unmet standards (1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10), add clarity and specificity to the stated criteria across the three levels of proficiency in the scoring guides (rubrics) while more closely aligning assessment scoring guides and descriptions to standard

outcomes. This applies particularly to Assessments 2, 3, 4, and 6. In other words, rubrics used in these assessments must be more clearly aligned with outcomes under standards while identifying clear and distinct levels of candidate proficiencies.

Provide more specific evidence of how data from assessments have influenced decisions to improve the program and subsequent candidate performance.