

**Program Report for the
Preparation of Physical Education Teachers
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance/
National Association for Sport and Physical Education
(AAHPERD/NASPE)**

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

C O V E R S H E E T

Institution Indiana State University **State** IN

Date submitted February 2005

Name of Preparer Molly Hare, Myung-Ah Lee, Amelia M. Woods

Phone # 237-2947 **Email** mhare@indstate.edu

Program documented in this report:

Name of institution's program Physical Education All Grade

Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared¹ K-12

Degree or award level¹ Bachelor of Science

Is this program offered at more than one site? ? Yes X No

If yes, list the sites at which the program is offered _____

Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

Physical Education

Program report status:

- Initial review**
- Rejoinder**
- Response to national recognition with conditions**

State licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

X Yes ? No

¹ This will be a dropdown list of grade levels and possible degrees/awards that could be selected; multiple selections can be made.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

The following directions are designed to assist institutions as they complete this web-based program report. To complete the report, institutions must provide data from 6-8 key assessments that, taken as a whole, will demonstrate candidate mastery of the AANPERD/NASPE standards. These data will also be used to answer the following questions:

- Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the subjects they will teach or the jobs they will perform?
- Do candidates meet state licensure requirements?
- Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they plan their teaching?
- Can candidates apply their knowledge in classrooms and schools?
- Are candidates effective in promoting student learning?

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

- I. Contextual Information** – provides the opportunity for institutions to present general information to help reviewers understand the program
- II. Assessments and Related Data** - provides the opportunity for institutions to submit 6-8 assessments, scoring guides or criteria, and assessment data as evidence that standards are being met.
- III. Standards Assessment Chart** - provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate which of the assessments are being used to determine if candidates meet program standards.
- IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards** – provides the opportunity for institutions to discuss the assessments and assessment data in terms of standards.
- V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance** – provides the opportunity for institutions to indicate how faculty is using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and effects on student learning.

Page limits are specified for each of the narrative responses required in Sections IV and V of the report, with each page approximately equivalent to one text page of single-spaced, 12-point type. Each attachment required in Sections I and II of the report should be kept to a maximum of five text pages. Although attachments longer than five pages will be accepted electronically, NCATE staff will require institutions to revise reports submitted with lengthy attachments.

Except for the required attachments, institutional responses can be entered directly onto the web-based form or written in a standardized word processing format (e.g., Word or Word Perfect) and later cut and pasted into the web-based form. The respondent will be able to save the responses as a draft and return to the web-based form later to complete. When the report has been completed, the institution will mark it as finished and submit it for review.

Table of Contents

Section I. Context..... 4

Section II. Assessments and Related Data..... 12

Section III. Standards Assessment Chart 15

Section IV Evidence for Meeting Standards 17

**Section V Use of Assessment Results to
Improve Candidate and Program Performance 34**

SECTION I CONTEXT

1. Our program addresses Indiana Academic Standards for Physical Education for our all grade program. Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) has delineated Academic standards for our state.

2.

Physical Education							
<u>Course</u>	<u>Ages/ Level</u>	<u>Hours per sem.</u>	<u>Diversity/ Setting</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Supervision</u>	<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Activity</u>
PE 201	K-12	3	Varied	Public Schools	Cooperating School Faculty	Reflection Paper, Oral Report	Job Shadowing
PE 302	K-5	50	Varied	Public Elementary Schools	Cooperating School Faculty, University Faculty	Lesson Plans, Lesson Videotaping, Post Lesson Reflection, Student Video Tape Analysis, Systematic Observation Instruments, Unit plans, Reflection Paper	Instruction of 10-25 elementary students each week throughout the semester
PE 310	Grades 6-8 and 9-10	45	Varied	Public Middle Level and High Schools	Cooperating School Faculty, University Faculty	Lesson Plans, Lesson Videotaping, Post Lesson Reflection, Student Video Tape Analysis, Systematic Observation Instruments, Reflection Paper	Instruction of 12-34 middle and/or high school students for two instructional units
PE 497	Preschool to adult – student selects level	10	Varied	Public Schools K-12, Private School for the Blind, Hospital, Rec. Dept. Program, Special Olympics	Supervisors at each site	Reflection Paper	Observation, participation

3. Admission and retention:

Suggested Parallel Structure for Progression for 5-12 and K-12 Programs in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Phase I—Admission to the Teacher Education Program

5-12 Programs

- Application to program
- PRAXIS I at cutoff score
- Limited criminal history check complete
- GPA = 2.5
- "C" or better in core courses
- "C" or better in Educational Psychology 202

K-12 Programs

- Application to program
- PRAXIS I at cutoff score
- Limited criminal history check complete
- GPA = 2.5
- "C" or better in core courses
- "C" or better in Educational Psychology 202

Phase II—Admission to Teacher Education Program I

5-12 Programs

- "C" or better in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology 301/302
- Satisfactory recommendation from clinical faculty
- Satisfactory recommendation from course instructor(s)
- Satisfactory recommendation from content methods instructor(s)

K-12 Programs

- "C" or better in Elementary and Early Childhood Education 225
- Satisfactory recommendation from clinical faculty
- Satisfactory recommendation from course instructor(s)
- Satisfactory recommendation from content methods instructor(s)

Phase III—Admission to Teacher Education Program II

5-12 Programs

- "C" or better in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology 400/400L
- "C" or better in Special Education 226 and Educational Psychology 341 or approved equivalent (these may be taken prior to this phase)
- Satisfactory recommendation from clinical faculty, course instructor(s), and content methods instructors
- Completed application for student teaching
- PRAXIS II score no lower than one standard error of measurement below state-mandated cutoff
- GPA equal to 2.5 or better
- Any special requirements for student teaching originating in the content major satisfied
- Recommendation of content department

K-12 Programs

- "C" or better in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology 301/302, 350
- "C" or better in Special Education 226 or approved equivalent and Educational Psychology 341 or approved equivalent (these may be taken prior to this phase)
- Satisfactory recommendation from clinical faculty, course instructor(s), and content methods instructors
- Completed application for student teaching
- PRAXIS II score no lower than one standard error of measurement below state-mandated cutoff
- GPA equal to 2.5 or better
- Any special requirements for student teaching originating in the content major satisfied
- Recommendation of content department

Phase IV – Admission to Teacher Education Program III Candidacy (Prior to graduation and licensure)

5-12 Programs

- "S" in student teaching
- "B" or better in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology 402 or content major equivalent
- Application for graduation
- Application for licensure (retake PRAXIS II if not at state cutoff)

K-12 Programs

- "S" in student teaching
- "B" or better in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology 402 or content major equivalent
- Application for graduation
- Application for licensure (retake PRAXIS II if not at state cutoff)

4. Our program supports the conceptual framework “Becoming a Complete Professional.” The combination of pedagogy courses (i.e., PE 201, 290, 442, etc.), content area courses (i.e., activity courses, science discipline courses, etc.), and content pedagogy courses (e.g., PE 290, 302, 310, CIMT 301, 302) all apply to toward assisting students with their development.

5. The unique features of our program assessment include: (a) Unit Assessment System (UAS), (b) LiveText, (c) Student exit interview. UAS is a state mandated data base system to report whether students meet the standards. LiveText has been used as an electronic portfolio for student learning process (i.e., PE 290, 302, 310, etc.). The cumulated LiveText data provide in depth evidence of measuring preservice teachers’ teaching competence while they are under guided early field experience. LiveText has been used as a powerful tool for accountability in the experiential learning process. Student exit interviews are conducted after their completion of the student teaching experience.

6. Advisement:

**COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
PHYSICAL EDUCATION ALL GRADE MAJOR
F = FALL ONLY S = SPRING ONLY**

ACTIVITIES	HRS	SEM	GRD
One of the following: 107, 108 or SWIMMING COMPETENCY	1		
211 NET SPORTS (F)	2		
212 TERRITORIAL SPORTS(S)	2		
213 DANCE	2		
214 PE FOR CHILDREN (S)	2		
215 TUMBLING & GYMNASTICS	2		
216 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES (F)	2		
217 PHYSICAL FITNESS (S)	2		

ELECTIVES (2 HOURS)	HRS	SEM	GRD

UPPER DIVISION

ELECTIVES (2 HOURS)	HRS	SEM	GRD

REQUIRED COGNATE	HRS	SEM	GRD
LIFS 231	2		
LIFS 231L	1		
LIFS 241	2		
LIFS 241L	1		
OR			

REQUIRED COGNATE	HRS	SEM	GRD
LIFS 231	2		
LIFS 231L	1		
LIFS 241	2		
LIFS 241L	1		
OR			
ATTR 210	2		
PE 220	2		
ATTR 210	2		
PE 220	2		

FALL 2003

THEO RY	HRS	SEM	GRD
201 INTRODUCTION TO KINESIOLOGY	3		
266 GROWTH & MOTOR DEVELOPMENT (F)	3		
290 INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES IN PE	3		
302* TEACHING ELEMENTARY PE (F)	3		
310* TEACHING SECONDARY PE (S)	3		
366 MOTOR LEARNING (S)	3		
380/380L ANALYSIS OF HUMAN MOTION	4		
430 PROGRAM PROMOTION (F)	2		
442 ASSESSMENT IN PE (S)	3		
466 SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL ASPECTS (F)	3		
480/480L PHYSIOLOGY OF EXERCISE	4		
ATTR 202 AT & FIRST AID (F)	1		

Praxis 1 prior to entrance into Teacher Ed Program

REQUIRED PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION	HRS	SEM	GRD
CIMT GRADES OF "C" OR HIGHER (2.50 GPA)			
ELED 225* (With EPSY 202)	3		
EPSY 202	3		
CIMT 301*	3		
CIMT 302*	3		
CIMT 350*	3		
MULTI-CULTURAL (EPSY 341)	3		
PE 497 ADAPTED PE (F)	3		

*** REQUIRED ACCEPTANCE IN THE TEACHER ED PROGRAM**

STUDENT TEACHING	HRS	SEM	GRD
CIMT 401	11		
CIMT 402	1		

7. Candidates and completers

Program: Physical Education All Grade (Bachelor of Science)		
Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers ²
2003-2004	328	10
2002-2003	273	19
2001-2002	221	39

8. Faculty expertise and experience

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field & University	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member	Faculty Rank	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service	Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools
John Ozmun	PED, Indiana Univ.	Dept. Chair	Prof.	Article in <i>Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance</i> ; Textbook chapter (in press), <u>Adapted Physical Education and Sport</u> ; Textbook (2002) <u>Understanding Motor Development</u>	
Jeffrey Alexander	PhD, Arizona State Univ.	Faculty Member	Asst. Prof.	Article in <i>Clinical Nursing Research</i> ; Article in <i>Strength and Conditioning Journal</i> ; Article in <i>Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport</i>	
Molly K. Hare	PhD, Univ. of IL	Faculty Member	Asst. Prof.	Two articles in <i>Teaching Elementary Physical Education</i> ; Article in <i>Indiana AHPERD Journal</i>	7 years of Elem. P.E. Teaching
Jolynn S. Kuhlman	PhD, Univ. of TN	Faculty Member	Assoc. Prof.		8 years high school P.E. teaching

² NCATE uses the Title II definition for *program completers*. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

David J. Langley	PhD, Univ. of OR	Dir. of Center for Teaching and Learning; Faculty Member	Prof.		
Amelia M. Woods	PhD, Univ. of SC	Faculty Member	Prof.	<p>Article in <i>Teacher Educator</i>;</p> <p>Article in <i>Education</i>;</p> <p>Guest Editor, special issue of <i>The Clearing House, A journal of educational strategies, issues, ideas</i></p>	
Myung-Ah Lee	PhD, Ohio State U.	Faculty Member	Asst. Prof.	<p>Article in <i>Journal of Teaching in Physical Education</i></p> <p>Article in <i>Teaching Elementary Physical Education</i>;</p> <p>Article in Ohio <i>AHPERD Journal</i></p>	3 years public school teaching experience

SECTION II—ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED DATA³

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

1. The assessment, including the instructions to candidates about the assigned task;
2. Scoring guides or criteria used to score candidate responses on the assessment; and
3. A table with the aggregated results of the assessment providing, where possible, data for each of the most recent three years. Data should be organized according to the categories used in the scoring guide/criteria. Provide the percentage of candidates achieving at each category.

In the three columns for attachments, click in the box for each attachment to be included with the report. Each attachment should be no longer than five pages. When you click in the box on the web-based program report, you will be prompted to attach the appropriate document. The three attachments related to each assessment must be included for the program report to be complete. The report will not be reviewed until it is complete.

³ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

	Name of Assessment ⁴	Type or Form of Assessment ⁵	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁶	Attachments		
				Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
1	Praxis II	Content knowledge	Completion of program	?	?	X ⁷
2	PE student teacher exit interviews	Program assessment	Completion of student teaching	X	?	?
3	LiveText	Content pedagogy	Formative and summative in specific courses	?	?	X
4	College of Education surveys	Program assessment	Completion of student teaching	?	?	X
5	Praxis I	Standardized basic skills	Entry into program	?	?	X
6	UAS	Unit Assessment System	At completion of each semester	?	?	X
7	Program entry requirements	Screening	Entry into program	?	X	?

⁴ Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

⁵ Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

⁶ Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching or an internship, required courses [specify course title and number], or completion of the program).

⁷ NCATE requires that 80% of program completers in the most recent academic year must pass the required state licensure test in the content area in order to be eligible for program recognition. Programs are exempt from this requirement when the state does not have a required test, or if the program does not have a total of ten completers over the past three years. NCATE uses the Title II definition of “program completers,” i.e. persons who have met all the requirements of a degree program or a state-approved preparation program.

Licensure test data must reflect the percentage of candidates who have passed the state licensure test for each year over the past three academic years, including the most recent year. The most recent year of data must include the mean and range of total scores and subscores on the licensure test. Data must be presented for all program completers, even if there were fewer than 10 test takers in a given year. A Title II, state, or test agency report may be submitted as a scanned attachment, as long as those reports present data as specified above.

	Name of Assessment ⁴	Type or Form of Assessment ⁵	When the Assessment Is Administered ⁶	Attachments		
				Assessment	Scoring Guides/Criteria	Data Table
8	Report on a Student Teaching Unit	Content pedagogy	Student teaching semester	X	?	?

SECTION III—STANDARDS ASSESSMENT CHART

For each AAHPERD/NASPE standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address each standard. One assessment may apply to multiple AAHPERD/NASPE standards. In Section IV you will describe these assessments in greater detail and summarize and analyze candidate results to document that a majority of your candidates are meeting AAHPERD/NASPE standards. To save space, the details of the AAHPERD/NASPE standards are not identified here, but are available by clicking on the link to the full set of standards below. The full set of standards provides more specific information about what should be assessed.

AAHPERD/NASPE STANDARD ⁸	Content Knowledge	Pedagogical Professional KSD ⁹	Effect on Student Learning ¹⁰	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II			
1. Content Knowledge. Physical education teachers understand physical education content and disciplinary concepts related to the development of a physically educated person.	?	?	?	X#1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	X#3 ? #7	? #4 X#8
2. Growth and Development. Physical education teachers understand how individuals learn and develop and can provide opportunities that support their physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development.	?	?	?	X#1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	X#3 ? #7	? #4 ? #8
3. Diverse Students. Physical education teachers understand how individuals differ in their approaches to learning, and create appropriate instruction adapted to these differences.	?	?	?	X#1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	X#3 ? #7	X#4 X#8
4. Management and Motivation. Physical education teachers use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a safe learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	?	?	?	X#1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	? #3 ? #7	X#4 X#8
5. Communication. Physical education teachers use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to enhance learning and engagement in physical activity settings.	?	?	?	? #1 X#5	? #2 X#6	? #3 ? #7	? #4 ? #8

⁸ NCATE will provide a link to the full set of SPA standards, including indicators/elements/dimensions and supporting explanations.

⁹ KSD = knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

¹⁰ Student learning refers to students in P-12 classrooms and includes creating environments that support learning.

AAHPERD/NASPE STANDARD ⁸	Content Knowledge	Pedagogical Professional KSD ⁹	Effect on Student Learning ¹⁰	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II			
6. Planning and Instruction. Physical education teachers plan and implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies to develop physically educated individuals, based on state and national (NASPE K-12) standards.	?	?	?	X#1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	X#3 ? #7	X#4 X#8
7. Student Assessment. Physical education teachers understand and use assessment to foster physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of students in physical activity.	?	?	?	X#1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	? #3 ? #7	X#4 X#8
8. Reflection. Physical education teachers are reflective practitioners who evaluate the effects of their actions on others (e.g., students, parents/guardians, fellow professionals), and seek opportunities to grow professionally.	?	?	?	? #1 ? #5	X#2 X#6	X#3 ? #7	X#4 X#8
9. Technology. Physical education teachers use information technology to enhance learning and to enhance personal and professional productivity.	?	?	?	? #1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	X#3 ? #7	X#4 ? #8
10. Collaboration. Physical education teachers foster relationships with colleagues, parents/guardians, and community agencies to support students' growth and well-being.	?	?	?	? #1 ? #5	? #2 X#6	? #3 ? #7	X#4 ? #8

SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: Information on the 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II and their findings must be reported in this section. The assessments must be those that all candidates in the program are required to complete and should be used by the program to determine candidate proficiencies as expected in the program standards. Standards and assessments have been organized into the following three areas that are addressed in NCATE's unit standard 1:

1. Content knowledge¹¹
2. Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions¹⁴
3. Effects on student learning

For each assessment, the evidence for meeting standards should include the following information:

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program;
2. The alignment of the assessment with the specific SPA standards addressed by the assessment, as they are identified in Section III;
3. A brief summary of the data findings attached in Section II;
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards.

The response to each assessment is limited to the equivalent of two text pages.

#1 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Data from licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge.¹² AAHPERD/NASPE standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to Standard 1. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#2 (Required) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in the field of physical education.¹³ AAHPERD/NASPE standards addressed in this assessment could include but are not limited to Standard 1. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, GPAs or grades,¹⁴ and portfolio tasks.¹⁵

¹¹ In some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

¹² NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

¹³ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

¹⁴ If grades are used as the assessment or included in the assessment, provide information on the criteria for those grades and describe how they align with the specialty standards

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#3 (Required) PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom instruction.¹⁶ AAHPERD/NASPE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard 6. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop lesson or unit plans, individualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#4 (Required) PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice.¹⁷ This assessment would be applicable to all AAHPERD/NASPE standards. The assessment instrument used in the internship or other clinical experiences should be submitted.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#5 (Required) -EFFECTS ON STUDENT LEARNING:¹⁸ Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning and the creation of supportive learning environments for student learning.¹⁹ AAHPERD/NASPE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 7 and 8. Examples of assessments include those based on student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#6 (Required): Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

¹⁵ For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included are discrete items. In this case, some of the artifacts included in the portfolio may be considered individual assessments.

¹⁶ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

¹⁷ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

¹⁸ Effects on student learning include the creation of environments that support student learning.

¹⁹ NCATE will provide a link to a sample response for this requirement.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#7 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards.

Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#8 (Optional): Additional assessment that addresses AAHPERD/NASPE standards.

Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks, licensure tests not reported in #1, and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV.

(response limited to 2 pages)

#1 Content Knowledge: Praxis II

1. The Praxis II is a content test required for state licensure in Indiana. Although not a part of graduation requirements for Indiana State University, students are required to successfully pass the Praxis II in order to be licensable. Students take the Praxis II content exam during or after student teaching.

2. Assessments that are aligned with the Praxis II include content knowledge, growth and development, diversity, management and motivation, planning and instruction, and student assessment.

3. Prior to 2000, occasionally students took one of two Praxis II exams available for Physical Education. Students took either the Physical Education (test # 90) or the Physical Education (test # 91) exam. Students performed well on the Praxis II content exam. As the table above illustrates, ISU PE students outperformed students across the state. The overall ISU pass rate was 100 % in 1999-2000, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002. In 2003-2004, overall ISU pass rate was 90%.

Data

		1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004
	ISU	State	ISU	State	ISU	State	ISU	State	ISU	State
Physical Education (90)	100%	96%	100%	98%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Physical Education (91)	--	--	100%	82%	100%	87%	--	--	90%	--

4. Evidence that students are successful at passing the Praxis II content exam further indicates the standards are being met by Physical Education students. The Praxis II reflects standards which are addressed through the Physical Education Teacher Education curriculum.

#2 Content Knowledge: Report on a Student Teaching Unit

1. The physical education faculty participates in the assessment of student teaching unit reports in CIMT 402. Physical education faculty collaborates with a CIMT faculty member to review the student teaching unit reports. The established unit report assessment process that includes a well defined set of rubrics designed to identify proficient, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory work. In 2004-2005, student teaching reports were implemented through LiveText.

2. Students demonstrate their content knowledge by writing an extensive report about one unit during their student teaching experience. The unit report includes learning activities, assessment, organization, evidence of unit effectiveness, reflection, and proposed changes. Content knowledge is demonstrated through this written report.

3. Data:

Organization

Objectives	Proficient (10 pts)	Satisfactory (8 pts)	Unsatisfactory (6 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Content Knowledge	5	0	0	10	10	0
Accommodation of Learner Development	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Accommodation of Learner Diversity	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Creating a Positive Environment for Engagement in Learning	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Summary Rating	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98

Rating as a Whole

Objectives	Proficient (0 pts)	Satisfactory (0 pts)	Unsatisfactory (0 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Rating of the Report as a Whole	2	3	0	0	0	0

Activities

Objectives	Proficient(10 pts)	Satisfactory(8 pts)	Unsatisfactory(6 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Content Knowledge	4	1	0	9.6	10	0.8
Accommodation of Learner Development	4	1	0	9.6	10	0.8
Accommodation of Learner Diversity	1	4	0	8.4	8	0.8
Instructional Variety	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Creating a Positive Environment for Engagement in Learning	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Communication to Foster Active Inquiry and Collaboration	3	2	0	9.2	10	0.98
Planning Instruction to Meet Curriculum Goals	5	0	0	10	10	0

Fostering Relationships with Colleagues and Community to Promote Student Learning and Well-Being	2	0	0	10	10	0
Summary Rating	4	1	0	9.6	10	0.8

Assessments

Objectives	Proficient (10 pts)	Satisfactory (8 pts)	Unsatisfactory (6 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Accommodation of Learner Diversity	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Assessment of Learning	3	2	0	9.2	10	0.98
Summary Rating	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98

Effectiveness of unit

Objectives	Proficient (10 pts)	Satisfactory (8 pts)	Unsatisfactory (6 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Assessment to Substantiate Effectiveness	4	0	1	9.2	10	1.6
Reflection	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98
Summary Rating	2	3	0	8.8	8	0.98

4. We only have data from one semester, when LiveText was implemented as a database. Overall, our students are either proficient or satisfactory. One exception was noted in the Effectiveness of the Unit section where one student scored unsatisfactory. In this case, the student scored at least satisfactory on all other sections of the report.

#2 Content Knowledge: Program entry requirements

1. To enter the teacher education program pre-service teachers should meet the following criteria.

- Praxis I

- Application to the teacher education program
- GPA =2.5 or above
- “C” or better in core courses (i.e., physical education teacher education courses)
- “C” or better in educational psychology course (EPSY 202)

2. This screening process is the summative decision point 1 for becoming a complete professional. This process is the first decision point to maintain the quality of teacher candidates. The state of Indiana requires passing Praxis I for all teacher education candidates. The Praxis test is recommended for the first and second year students.

#2 Content Knowledge: PE student teacher exit interviews

1. To gain insight on how physical education pre-service teachers view their teacher preparation at Indiana State University, the faculty developed an exit interview guide. At the completion of the of the student teaching semester, students are interviewed by a faculty member. To encourage student teachers to be honest and open with their responses, only non-teacher education faculty conduct the interviews .

The interviews are held when student teachers return to campus during the last week of the semester. Interviews follow an interview guide. Interviews are tape recorded, and later transcribed.

As a result of interviews conducted over the past few years, we will share the findings from 20 interviews. The following information is centered on each of the interview questions.

2. Students were able to reflect on their experiences and learning throughout the curriculum. The exit interview data indicate that pre-service teachers are truly reflective practitioners. For example, not only do the students engage in reflective thought regarding teaching performance, but they engage in critical reflection relative to the teacher preparation program as well. The students also contribute as change agents for the program by reflecting on the exit interview questions.

3. In summary, when asked about the strengths of the physical education teacher education program, common responses emerged. Clinical experiences, both early on in the program and the high quality of experiences were identified as strengths. Students perceive the experiences as being of high quality due to the fact that the teaching experiences are supervised by the faculty member and the host teacher at the school. In addition, accountability of student learning is noted as a response due to structured lesson plans, students' video and audio-taping the teaching experiences, peer and self-assessment, and reflection of each teaching experience completed in the field. The students also spoke favorably about the availability of the faculty to work with them as developing teachers.

When responding with insights for improving the program, many students had no recommendation. Others suggested teaching experiences at all three levels—elementary, middle and high school. In addition, more communication between the College of Education and our department was noted. More instruction in activity classes was also suggested.

The students were able to articulate which courses had the most impact on their professional development. Common responses were the Elementary and Secondary physical education school-based field experiences courses and our Instructional Strategies course.

Students were able to articulate common themes throughout the physical education teacher education program. Designing appropriate learning experiences was the most commonly identified theme. Students also indicated that maximizing student participation was a critical theme of the physical education teacher education program as was management and professionalism.

#3 Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Effective Planning: LiveText

1. Using the electronic portfolio system of LiveText, students complete standard lesson plans for PE 290, 302, 310, College of Education courses, and student teaching. These

lesson plans include the essential components for planning effective lessons: standards addressed, organization and formation, lesson purpose, behavioral objectives, progression of skills, skill mechanics and learning cues, checking for understanding, and summary/conclusion. Lesson plans created by students are formally assessed by instructors using assessment rubrics and feedback is provided. After the lesson is taught, students complete reflection papers through LiveText. The reflection questions are standard driven and are intended to maximize performance assessment and continuous improvement. In addition, assessment rubrics were developed by our physical education teacher education faculty.

During 2004, students completed the culminating experience by writing a “Report on a Student Teaching Unit.” The “Report” was accomplished during the student teaching semester and submitted the document on LiveText. A standardized assessment rubric was utilized by two faculty members (one content area faculty member and one College of Education faculty member) to assess the student’s work.

The physical education program fully implemented the use of LiveText in 2005. Although we have limited LiveText data prior to this full implementation, assessments of these standards are reflected in our UAS assessments.

2. One of the ways for pre-service teachers to demonstrate content knowledge is to complete effective lesson plans. Pre-service teachers need to incorporate their content knowledge with designing learning environments and appropriate progressions.

3. Data

Name	3 (3 pts)	2(2 pts)	1(1 pts)	Mean	Mode	Stdev
Standards	59	8	5	2.75	3	0.57
Introduction-Equipment-Purpose	65	7	0	2.9	3	0.3
Behavioral Objectives	46	23	2	2.62	3	0.54
Skill Progression Level #1	54	17	1	2.74	3	0.47

Skill Progression Level #2	44	27	1	2.6	3	0.52
Skill Progression Level #3	40	28	4	2.5	3	0.6
Skill Progression Level #4	33	13	1	2.68	3	0.51
Summary and Checking for Understanding	54	17	1	2.74	3	0.47
Overall Presentation	64	7	1	2.88	3	0.37

4. Overall, students in PE 290 performed at above average level based on LiveText data. Students were most proficient with introduction, equipment, and purpose sections. Students were satisfactory in all categories although skill progression 3 was lower but it was still in the satisfactory level. The reason for lower score on skill progression 3, and all skill progressions (i.e., #1, #2, & #4), was due to the developmental nature of the pre-service teachers' acquiring pedagogical content knowledge.

#4 Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: College of Education surveys

1. At the completion of the two student teaching placements, Physical Education Student Teachers participate in a formal culminating workshop on the ISU campus. As part of the workshop the student teachers complete the ISU Student Teacher Survey. When completing the 30 item survey, students selected the best response based on a 4 point Likert scale, with 1 representing “poorly prepared” through 4 representing “very well prepared.”
2. Clearly the student teaching survey questions address students’ perceptions of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. For example, for skills and knowledge assessment, students evaluated their own preparedness to design units of instruction, create meaningful learning experiences, and accommodate for diverse learners. Dispositions are addressed through the question regarding assessing professional growth needs in order to develop meaningful professional growth plans. An additional disposition example question on the survey targeted

addressing productive relationships with parents/guardians to support student learning.

3. Based on the ISU Student Teacher Survey data, Physical Education Student Teachers perceive their teacher education favorably. Overall, physical education students appear to be at or above the indicators of all other Indiana State teacher education students. Question 7: designing classroom assessments that are aligned with Indiana content standards is the sole indicator whereby data suggests physical education students scored lower than non-physical education students. Non physical education students rated a 2.97 while physical education students rated 2.9. The difference is slight. This difference may be attributed to the fact that students perceive “classroom assessments” to be different from “gymnasium assessments.”

4. Our students hold positive perceptions of their ability to implement a variety of developmentally appropriate instructional strategies (Standard #3). They are especially confident in their abilities to create meaningful learning experiences based on content knowledge (rated 3.5 out of 4) and using multiple teaching strategies to encourage critical thinking (rated 3.4 out of 4). In addition, they positively perceive using teaching approaches that are sensitive to diverse learners.

Survey questions are linked to specific Indiana content standards

Indiana content standard for physical education	Indiana State University survey question
1B: content	#6
2: growth and development	#17
3: instructional strategies	#8, 14, 18, and 22
4: communication	#10
5: management and motivation	#15 and 19
6: diverse learners	#12 and 13
7: assessment	#7, 11, and 20
8: reflection	#9 and 21
9: collaborate	#23

#5 Effects on Student Learning: UAS

1. The Unit Assessment System (UAS) is required by the State of Indiana for teacher preparation programs. The UAS is a data base scoring matrix for documentation of standards met by students and was developed by our physical education pedagogy faculty. On a yearly basis, professors who teach courses in which standards are addressed update each student's personal UAS file. Each identified indicator, as a source of evidence, is coded P for proficient, S for satisfactory, or U for unsatisfactory based on the student's performance. Students who earn a proficient level have achieved a score between 87 and 100%. Satisfactory levels of achievement are scored between 86 and 70%. Unsatisfactory levels occur with scores of 69% and below.

When students do not make satisfactory or proficient performance on standard indicators, remediation involves having to repeat the assignment representing the standard and/or the course. For example, if a student does not meet expectations when developing an appropriate lesson plan, the professor recommends corrections and the student writes a new lesson plan in attempt to correct the deficiency.

2. A statistical review was conducted for a core number of classes targeting student learning. Standards for courses PE 290, 302, and 310 were analyzed. A total of one-hundred eighty-eight (n=88) evaluation forms were examined, and scores inputted according to the above procedure. Averages and graphs by course and IPSB code were then developed for use by the physical education teacher education program. The scores were averaged for every student evaluated on at least one of the standards. In this respect, IPSB score averaged over three critical courses, PE 290, 302, and 310, can be evaluated by the physical education teacher education faculty.

3. Summary Findings

- 1) In respect to viewing evaluations by IPSB standard in PE290, PE302, and PE310, the following findings become evident:
 - a. In PE290, students are evaluated on IPSB standards one, three, four, five, six, and eight. The mean scores for each standard in PE290 range between 2.59 and 2.68, with standard deviations varying between .48 and .59. In this particular course, IPSB standard six has the most students evaluated as unsatisfactory (which may explain the larger standard deviation for that standard in *Appendix A*). Overall, student scores are in the upper range of “satisfactory.”
 - b. In PE302, students are evaluated on all IPSB standards other than standard seven. The mean scores for each standard range between 2.42 for standard three, and 2.7 for standard four, with standard deviations varying between .42 and .51. In each standard, only one student was evaluated as “unsatisfactory.”
 - c. In PE310, students are evaluated on all IPSB standards other than standard eight. The mean scores for each standard range between 2.0 for standards two and six, and 2.74 on standard seven, with standard deviations varying from .00 for standard six (all scores were 2), and .688. Evaluations of standard three, four and nine indicate four or more “unsatisfactory” scores, and standard nine the highest number of “proficient” scores (which also has the highest standard deviation).
 - d. Viewing the graphs as well as the frequency tables reveal that there is little difference among the three courses in respect to average score, although there is some variance.
- 2) When average evaluation scores for the three courses are combined by IPSB standard, the following observations can be made:
 - a. The lowest average score is for IPSB standard two, and the highest for IPSB standard seven. The standard deviations vary from .23 for IPSB standard six to .49 for IPSB standard seven;

- b. The frequency tables indicate that a fair number of students received proficient ratings for standards eight and two, though this may be because only two courses are used to calculate the average (see *Appendix C*);
- c. Standards two, seven, eight, and nine contain frequencies of less than two, indicating that there are some students who received “unsatisfactory” ratings on these standards;
- d. Standards two and six have the lowest combined averages;
- e. Standard eight has the highest combined average.

4. Based on the data analysis following interpretations were made according to two major questions: (a) Is each critical course (PE 290, 302, and 310), in which standards are we proficient? In which standards are we the weaker? (b) when IPSB standard averages are compared regardless of class, in which standards are we proficient? In which standards are we the weakest? In PE 290 we had the highest evaluation score at 2.68 on standard 8 (i.e., reflection) and the lowest evaluation score at 2.53 on standard 6 (i.e., diverse learner). For PE 302 we had the highest evaluation score at 2.70 on standard 4 (i.e., communication) and the lowest evaluation score at 2.37 on standard 6 (i.e., diverse learner). For PE 310 we had the highest evaluation score at 2.74 on standard 7 (i.e., assessment) and the lowest evaluation scores at 2.0 on both standard 6 (i.e., diverse learner) and standard 2 (i.e., growth and development). For combined key three courses we had the highest evaluation score on standard 8 (i.e., reflection) and the lowest evaluation score on standard 2 (i.e., growth and development).

In summary, standards 2 (i.e., growth and development) and 6 (i.e., diverse learner) have the lowest combined averages and standard 8 (i.e., reflection) has the highest combined averages. In fact, there are little statistical differences among these evaluation scores although there is some variance. However all evaluation scores were at or above 2 (i.e., satisfactory).

#6 Required: Praxis I

1. Physical education majors are required to successfully complete Praxis I for entrance into the formal teacher education program. The Praxis I test is usually completed in year 1 or at the beginning of year 2. Students must obtain the minimum scores specified by the institution. This assessment of writing, reading, and math competency is used to gain entrance into the teacher education program.
2. Communication is the standard that is aligned with the Praxis I assessment.
3. Data suggest that reading is the weakest area for the preservice physical education teachers. The average score is 176.43 for preservice physical education teachers, while the Indiana State University cut off score for ISU is 176. On average, the writing scores for preservice physical education teachers are slightly higher than the ISU cut off at 173.28. The highest score is represented in math for the preservice physical education teachers at 178.57. Overall, preservice physical education teachers meet the minimal standard for communicating through reading, writing, and mathematical skills.

Data

2004-2005	Cut off score for ISU	PE average (n= 60)
Reading	176	176.43
Writing	172	173.28
Math	175	178.57

SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) pedagogical and professional knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) effects on student learning and on creating environments that support learning.

(response limited to 3 pages)

Summary of Findings

Based on UAS data, students score in the upper range of “satisfactory” for the core physical education teacher education courses. Strengths of this data were observed in standard 8 (reflection). With respect to the standards articulated in these courses, several areas were found to be relatively weaker than others. For example, standard 6 (diverse learner), standard 7 (assessment), and standard 2 (growth and development) were lower scores for our preservice teacher education students. In review of the exit interview findings, we found that students overwhelmingly evaluate our teacher education program as a strong one for developing effective physical education teachers. Specifically, students perceived that the clinical experiences had a profound impact on their pedagogical development. Students value the common systematic programming that exists among course design and faculty collaboration that ultimately provides coherent learning experiences. For example, students experience similar course structure related to the accountability for pedagogical development and the assessment of their teaching performance. One weakness that emerged in the data included the need for better collaboration between the physical education faculty and the College of Education faculty.

According to the ISU student teaching survey data, physical education student teachers perceived their education quite favorably. With the exception of question 7

(designing classroom assessments that are aligned with Indiana content standards), physical education students appear to be at or above the indicators of all other ISU teacher education students.

Plan for Student Remediation of Standards

When students do not achieve at least satisfactory performance on any given performance indicator, remediation is necessary. When students do not make satisfactory or proficient performance on standard indicators, remediation involves having to repeat the assignment representing the standard and/or the course. For example, if a student does not meet expectations when developing an appropriate lesson plan, the professor recommends corrections and the student writes a new lesson plan in attempt to correct the deficiency.

Plans for Change (Assessment)

We are planning to address the perceived program weakness in the area of assessment. We currently offer an assessment course (PE 442). Over the past several years this course has been taught by faculty with varied specialties. In the future, we plan to have a faculty member teach this course who has expertise in the content area. In addition we intend to have course objectives related assessment added to each of the three core teaching courses (PE 290, 302, 310).

Plans for Change (Diversity)

Our pre-service teachers increase their awareness of student diversity as they develop their pedagogical skills. As students move through PE 290, 302 and 310 they increase their awareness of diversity. We realize that this awareness is built upon with each teaching experience.

Currently students are placed in culturally diverse schools for their PE 302 and 310 teaching experiences. Diversity is discussed throughout these classes, and there are several written projects related to the diversity of the K-12 students taught. We will continue to support this contextually driven approach. In addition, we intend to recruit

diverse teacher education faculty, as well as place our pre-service teachers in clinical sites with diverse students and host teachers.

Plans for Change (Growth and Development)

Our students are required to complete a Human Growth and Development course (PE 266) that is taught by a Human Growth and Development Specialist. They also have observation and teaching experiences on the elementary, middle and high school levels. We are unsure why this is a relatively weaker area for our students. We will, however, continue to support our student's expanding awareness of human growth and development by increasing their experiences in the activity course sequences. This awareness should help them to design developmentally appropriate learning experiences.

Plans for Change (Exit interviews and Student teacher survey)

The data sources for exit interviews and student teacher survey provide us with grounded specific information relative to our teacher preparation program. We intend to continue this data collection as it exists as a measure of program evaluation.