Pennsylvania does not have a legislatively mandated program in place for assessing teacher education programs in institutions of higher education. This study was conducted to examine how Pennsylvania's public and private universities and colleges assess the quality of their teacher education programs. Deans and/or chairs of teacher education programs from all higher education institutions in the state were contacted by the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching. Participants (23 institutions), selected at random, responded to a survey instrument designed to investigate assessment procedures used in determining quality of teacher education programs. Findings indicate: scholastic aptitude test scores and high school class standing are the two largest determinants for accepting students; internally derived factors are perceived to be more important than externally derived processes; and greater emphasis has been placed on more traditional, quantitative measures than on qualitative indices. Tabular results, recommendations, and an extensive bibliography are included. Appendices consist of copies of the survey instrument, the letter introducing the project, responses to the survey instrument; and comments from respondents. (LL)
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THE PROBLEM

Introduction

During the last decade, there have been unprecedented efforts to strengthen this nation's schools. Agitation throughout the educational arena for what is now popularly known as the school reform movement was initiated by the landmark publication _A Nation At-Risk_ (1983), and shaped more recently by reports from the Holmes Group (1986), the Carnegie Foundation (1988), and the burgeoning literature.

Some critics in basic education argued for changes to occur within the schools (K-12). Smaller class size and more instructional resources to enhance the quality of teaching, rather than expanding the teacher's initial preparation, were recommended by many.

Some reformers such as the Holmes Group pleaded for political/programmatic changes at institutions of higher education. They advocated postbaccalaureate teacher preparation and the enhancement of the professional status of teachers. They discerned a "confederation as a more viable strategy for improving teacher education than single institutions moving independently of one another . . . ." (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 3) and a hierarchial career ladder that would acknowledge different professional levels. In addition, a manifestation of postbaccalaureate training was the politically mandated induction or mentoring program.
Some reformers advocated revisions and extensions to the undergraduate program focusing more upon curricula changes. These critics emphasized changing the nature of pedagogy and teaching effectiveness, and redesigning general education as well as professional core courses.

Other critics argued for a fifth year of training extending teacher training programs into graduate level work. The American Association of American Colleges for Teacher Education (AAACTE) identified seven alternative paradigms for extended teacher preparation programs (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 4).

Howey and Zimpher (1989) offered an overview of the current issues over teacher education. They succinctly amalgamated the dichotomy between basic and higher education by citing, "Recent concerns over our nation's schools and the quality of teaching within them have translated into questions of who prepares our teachers, in what manner, and how well?" (p. 1).

The public education system in the United States is a huge enterprise employing over two million teachers in eighty-three thousand schools (Johnston and Others, 1989, p. 8). Whether one's concern is basic education (schools housing grades K-12), teachers, or teacher education programs in higher education, the permutations of variables to be explored makes for an exceedingly complex problem.
Indeed, there is so much fervor and agitation in the literature over teaching and teacher education that terms such as "brouhaha", "firefight", and "shootout" were used to characterize the dissension within the reform movement.

Statement of the Problem

Pennsylvania does not have a legislatively mandated program assessment in place. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine how Pennsylvania's institutions of higher education assess the quality of their teacher education programs. More specifically, this study answered the following questions:

1. What sources are used for students' admissions into universities and colleges in Pennsylvania?
2. What processes are used within institutions of higher education to evaluate teacher education programs?
3. What measures of students' abilities are used to evaluate quality in teacher education programs?
4. What student summative assessment data are used to evaluate teacher education programs?
5. What factors are perceived to contribute to the overall quality of teacher education programs?
6. What external review agencies are used to evaluate teacher education programs?
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Methodology

Many states throughout the nation have mandated assessment programs for institutions of higher education. Pennsylvania is not one of the states where such a program has been legislatively determined (Cooper, letter Aug. 6, 1991). Due to the number of institutions in Pennsylvania, the large number of Instructional I Certificates (issued yearly) and the litany of research, the significance of assessment, as related to program quality of teacher education, has become paramount.

Therefore, it was the intent of the researchers to examine assessment issues directly related to Pennsylvania institutions of higher education. Due to the multiple dimensions associated with assessment, it was determined by an Advisory Committee to the Academy that Phase I of this project would be to determine the ways colleges and universities in Pennsylvania assess the quality of teacher education programs. The additional phases needed to further investigate this issue have not been determined. Therefore, this section addresses the methodology utilized to carry out the investigation of Phase I.
Sites and Subjects

The state of Pennsylvania is the location of a myriad of institutions of higher education. Within its boundaries are 85 private institutions, five state-related/aided institutions and 14 state institutions. During the 1990-91 year, these institutions granted 10,269 Instructional I certificates. In order to investigate the quality of these teacher education programs, a sample of university types was chosen as the units of investigation. These institutions represent approximately 80% to 85% of teachers being certified on an annual basis. All 14 universities of the SSHE, 5 of the state-related/aided institutions and 11 of the private institutions were targeted. Using the table of random numbers, 11 private colleges or universities were randomly selected from a total population of 85. The deans and/or chairs of the teacher education programs from the selected universities or colleges were the respondents of the survey instrument.

Instrumentation

The survey research method was chosen as the means to investigate the assessment procedures used to determine the quality of teacher education programs in Pennsylvania. The survey instrument reflected the processes used by colleges and universities to assess quality from both internal and external sources. These sources were selected from
pertinent college catalogs and from the current literature on assessment procedures in higher education.

In total, the survey consisted of twenty-one items and followed questionnaire and opinionnaire formats. The survey was subdivided into five distinct parts with each one containing multiple-itemed questions. Part I pertained to factors that related to teacher education program evaluation. The responses were categorized according to elementary and secondary programs. Part II addressed admissions criteria into colleges and universities and criteria for entrance into teacher education programs. Part III was concerned with student teaching prerequisites. Part IV dealt with institutional information. Part V referred to the perceptions of the respondents and their perceived opinions of their faculty on factors that contribute to the quality of teacher education programs. The survey also contained space for comments.

A large portion of time regarding survey construction was spent formatting the design. Applicable columns were computer drawn and labeled accordingly. This effort was for the purpose of visual clarity and organization.

Validation of the survey instrument was sought from experienced professionals. They were: Dr. Judy Brough, Chair of the Educational Administration Department of a private liberal arts college; Dr. Audrey Sprenger, former Director of an NCATE evaluation team; Dr. Robert Bartos,
Dean of Education and Human Services at a SSHE institution; Dr. Walt Konetschni, Chair/Professor of Sociology; Dr. Mary Cooper, former Project Director of the Pennsylvania Academy; and an Advisory Committee. Revisions were made according to suggestions. Finally, the instrument was titled "Program Quality Assessment Survey in Teacher Education in Pennsylvania." See Appendix A.

Procedures

Permission was granted from the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching on June 3, 1991 to conduct the study. Prior to approval, a proposal was submitted which detailed the goals of the project. The proposal delineated and calendarized the specifics of the investigation using the context, input, process, and product (CIPP) evaluation model. The model specifically outlined the objectives and time frames necessary for the study's completion.

From the onset, the researchers worked directly with the Executive Director and Project Director of the Academy, Dr. Susan Arisman and Dr. Mary Cooper, respectively, and members of the Pennsylvania Academy's Advisory Committee. Two meetings were held with this committee to discuss the intent of the research and to validate the assessment instrument. In addition, several other meetings were
conducted with the Project Director during the construction of the instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

Following the construction, validation, and printing of the instrument, the surveys were sorted and precoded for mailing. The coding occurred for identification so that follow-up telephone interviews might be arranged, if necessary. A cover letter from the Academy was written and sent along with the survey to the identified institutions. (See Appendix B). The coding and mailing was handled by the Academy for efficiency, cost, and anonymity. The surveys were to be returned to the Academy by mid-September, 1991.

Prior to analyses, the questions were categorized according to process and product aspects of teacher education programs. The categorization was done individually by the researchers and the Project Director, and then, ranked jointly in a following meeting. There was high agreement among the items. If calculated, the research team would have achieved high interrater reliability.
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Method of Analysis

In September 1991, The Program Quality Assessment Survey instrument was sent to fourteen SSHE institutions, five state-related/aided institutions, and eleven randomly chosen private institutions. Survey responses were received from 23 of the 30 institutions that were sent surveys for a total ~77% return rate. Of the 23, ten were from the State System of Higher Education, three from the state-related/aided institutions, and 10 from the private institutions. There were 21 institutions with elementary teacher education programs and 23 institutions with secondary teacher education programs. Data were tabulated and analyzed collectively to preserve the anonymity of the respective institutions.

Working under the direction of Dr. Tom Austin, statistician and Professor of Criminal Justice at Shippensburg University, a graduate assistant created a codebook for tallying the data on SPSS' Statistical Program. There was a total of 21 items plus a "Comments" section to be analyzed. Because of the dichotomy between elementary and secondary programs and the multi-responses for some items, responses were coded and categorized accordingly. Thus, there was a total of 110 items that were analyzed. Data were tabulated and analyzed according to the number of
responses, the percentage of respondents, and mean scores (where applicable). (See Appendix C).

**Results of Data Analysis**

Many of the results are reported using tables. However, not all of the significant data were placed in tabular format. Thus, the results reflect information extracted from the tables and information expressed separately in the narrative. In addition, such information is presented sequentially to address the questions upon which this study was based.

Table One cites admission criteria reported by colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. Such findings reflect the dichotomous structure of the sample and therefore separately address elementary and secondary programs. Of the total number of institutions (n=23) that responded, 21 had teacher education programs in elementary education and all 23 had secondary programs.

Both programs showed that the Scholastic Aptitude Test and high school class standing were the two largest determinants for accepting students into Pennsylvania colleges and universities. More specifically, 87% of the secondary teacher education programs cited these two criteria as a priority whereas in the elementary programs, 86% and 81% respectively, were reported. Another admission criterion, high school grade point average, was used by 12
### Table One

**Admissions Criteria Into Universities and Colleges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary (n=21)</th>
<th>Secondary (n=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholastic Aptitude Test</strong></td>
<td>18 86%</td>
<td>20 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Class Standing</strong></td>
<td>17 81%</td>
<td>20 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Grade Point Average</strong></td>
<td>12 57%</td>
<td>15 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Portfolios</strong></td>
<td>4 19%</td>
<td>4 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admissions Interview</strong></td>
<td>8 38%</td>
<td>8 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Two

**Internal Processes Used to Evaluate Teacher Education Programs in PA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary (n=21)</th>
<th>Secondary (n=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Committee Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>19 90%</td>
<td>21 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Policy Guidelines</strong></td>
<td>15 71%</td>
<td>17 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Evaluations of Quality</strong></td>
<td>16 76%</td>
<td>18 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Evaluations are Used</strong></td>
<td>19 90%</td>
<td>21 91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
institutions (57%) with elementary programs and 15 institutions (65%) with secondary programs. Eight institutions (35%) with secondary programs and 8 institutions (38%) with elementary programs used admissions interview as an additional criterion for entrance, while only 18% (n = 4) and 19% (n = 4) of the institutions, respectively, utilized high school portfolios.

Additional data regarding SAT scores were collected. Twelve institutions (52%) reported cutoff scores ranging between 800 and 1199. Nine institutions (39%) chose the response "not applicable" which possibly indicated the use of SATs but having no cutoff score.

Regarding admissions into teacher education programs, most colleges and universities had separate entrance requirements. Only 22% of the secondary programs and 14% of the elementary programs used a 2.0 - 2.49 grade criterion, whereas 74% and 76% respectively, utilized a grade point average of 2.5 or higher. In addition, 14 elementary programs (67%) and 16 secondary programs (70%) required "approval by the Dean of Education." Disparity of results existed with an "interview committee;" only 5 schools with elementary programs (24%) used them whereas 16 schools with secondary programs (76%) found them to be necessary.

Table Two demonstrates those assessment processes used within institutions to evaluate teacher education programs. "Faculty committees" and "student evaluations" were used in
Table Three

Measures of Student Abilities Used in Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary (n=21)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Secondary (n=23)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organize or formulate curriculum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make subject matter comprehensible</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt content and instruction to learners</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess learning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use assessment to organize instruction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with students of diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals for professional development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Four

Summative Assessment Data Used in Program Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary (n=21)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Secondary (n=23)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graduation ratios</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment ratios</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student performance on exit exams</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student exit interviews</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student portfolios</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduates of the program</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers in field with whom the student worked</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school district administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other sources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 colleges and universities (90%) with elementary programs and in 21 institutions (91%) with secondary programs. "Faculty evaluations" were used in 16 (76%) and 18 colleges (78%) with elementary and secondary programs, respectively.

Another internal source of assessment was the "significance of an internal self study." Twenty institutions with elementary programs (88%) rated the self study as "highly" or "very highly" significant factor to program quality whereas 18 institutions with secondary programs (78%) ranked self study similarly.

Table Three reveals a variety of student abilities that were used in determining program quality. Respondents were asked to indicate the presence or absence of student performance in regard to curricular features in assessing quality of teacher education programs. Such features pertained to abilities in organizing or formulating curriculum, adapting content and instruction to learners, assessing learning, and so on. The values ranged from 67% to 95% for elementary programs and 70% to 96% for secondary programs.

Table Four depicts summative assessment data used to evaluate teacher education programs. Measures such as "student performance on exit exams" (43%), "student exit interviews" (57%), and "student portfolios" (38% for elementary programs and 43% for secondary programs) were
reported. Over 81% of the institutions used employment ratios data in their program evaluations.

In non-tabular form, it was reported that nine institutions, or almost 40%, had an average employment ratio below 80% for the last three years. Four institutions, or 17%, had an employment ratio above 90% within the field of teaching. Also in non-tabular form, 16 institutions, or 69%, had an average percentage for the last three years of greater than 90% of their students pass all four sections of the NTE. In contrast, 2 respondents, or 9%, rated the NTE "very highly" or "highly" as a valid indicator for contributing to the quality of teacher education programs.

Additional assessment information was obtained by institutions from graduates, cooperating teachers, and school district administrators. In particular, 100% of the respondents reported obtaining feedback from cooperating teachers about the quality of their teacher education programs.

Table Five refers to factors which contribute to overall quality of teacher education programs (Appendix C, Question 21). A 12 item Q-Sort type of response was used to ascertain the perceptions of school deans' and/or directors of teacher education programs. The beliefs were ranked according to the most important and least important factors that contributed to the overall quality of their teacher education programs. Mean responses were calculated based
Table Five  
Perceived Importance of Factors That Contribute to Quality of Teacher Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. motivation and desire of the students
2. program curriculum
3. overall grade point average of the students
4. grade point average in the students' major
5. academic credentials of the education faculty
6. academic quality of faculty instruction
7. induction program within school districts
8. evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE
9. collaboration with school districts
10. class size
11. articulation across program components: i.e. general education, arts and sciences, professional education, field experience/ student teaching.
upon a five point scale. The four most important perceived factors were ranked: 1) academic quality of faculty instruction, 2) program curriculum, 3) motivation and desire of the students, and 4) articulation across program components. Two factors perceived as least important were "evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE" ranked 11 out of 12 and "induction programs" which ranked last.

Table Six examines those features from external sources of assessment. Most notably were the NCATE, Middle States, and PDE evaluations of program features.

It appeared that 10 institutions, or 43%, did not use the NCATE process as a means of assessing their teacher education programs. Of the 13 institutions that use the NCATE process, 6 institutions, or 46%, considered that process to contribute "very highly" or "highly" to the overall quality of teacher education programs.

Regarding the significance of NCATE and Middle States evaluation processes, respondents' values for "highly" or "very highly" were 26% (6 schools), whereas the respondents' perceived opinions of their faculty ranged from 39% for NCATE and 26% for Middle States.

In reference to the PDE evaluation, 17 institutions (74%) ranked the process "highly" or "very highly" whereas respondents' perceived opinion of their faculty were recorded slightly lower at 65% (15 institutions).
Table Six
Program Features from External Sources of Assessment

How significantly does the NCATE process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Respondent Perceived Opinion of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very highly</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How significantly does the Middle States process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Faculty Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very highly</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How significantly does the Pennsylvania Department of Education process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Faculty Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very highly</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

1. Of the institutions offering elementary and secondary programs, 17 institutions (81%) and 20 institutions (87%) for elementary and secondary programs place high priority upon Scholastic Aptitude Test scores and high school class standing for accepting students in Pennsylvania colleges and universities. Least used admission criteria were admissions interview and high school portfolios, respectively. (Table One)

2. Regarding program evaluation, the two most frequently used features were faculty committee evaluations and student evaluations (90% and 91%, respectively). (Table Two)

3. A variety of students' competencies were reported in assessing program quality among the institutions surveyed. These competencies addressed curricular features such as abilities to organize and formulate curriculum, assess learning, adopt content and instruction to learners, and so on. Respondents used six out of seven competencies over 90% of the time to assess program quality. (Table Three)

4. Student performance on exit exams, student exit interviews, student portfolios and employment ratios
were used to gather summative data on teacher education program evaluation. However, the most effective source was found to be cooperating teachers. (Table Four)

5. Four factors perceived as most important contributors to the overall quality of teacher education programs were 1) academic quality of faculty instruction, 2) program curriculum, 3) motivation and desire of the students, and 4) articulation across program component. Two factors perceived as least important to quality were evaluations from external agencies (outside the system) and induction programs. None of the twelve items was perceived to be an unimportant contributor to program quality. (Table Five)

6. NCATE, PDE, and Middle States were three external agencies used to evaluate program quality. Of the three external agencies, PDE was perceived to have the greatest effect on overall program quality. (Table Six)

7. Six of 22 institutions (27%) considered the Middle States evaluation process to contribute "very highly" or "highly" to the overall quality of teacher education programs.

8. Seventeen out of 23 institutions, or 74%, considered the PDE process to contribute "highly" or "very highly" to the overall quality of teacher education programs.
9. The respondents felt their faculty did not perceive external agencies to be as important in contributing to overall program quality as they did.

Conclusions

Measures for admissions into colleges and universities and into teacher education programs appear to be more quantitative than qualitative. The data suggest that scholastic aptitude test scores and high school class standing are the two largest determinants for accepting students in Pennsylvania colleges and universities. The selection criteria of portfolios and admissions interviews received a much lower rating even though the current literature suggests a greater emphasis on qualitative measures for selection to PA university and colleges.

As they relate to assessing the quality of teacher education programs, the data suggest that internally derived factors are perceived to be more important than externally derived processes. The one major exception was the external-oriented agency of PA Department of Education.

However, the data were inconsistent regarding the perceived importance that external agencies have upon the quality of teacher education programs. While the deans and/or directors of teacher education programs ranked the "evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE" as being, on the average, an unimportant factor with respect
to their contributions to the quality of teacher education programs, they rated the PDE evaluation process, an external agency, quite highly. It is possible that many officials at institutions did not want to pay the NCATE fee or did not have the PDE in mind when answering this question.

Although assessment of higher education is not mandated in Pennsylvania, the data suggest that assessment is certainly in the mainstream of thinking. The results reflected a variety of assessment mechanisms on program evaluation in teacher education for students, faculty, and administration. The results showed a greater frequency with the more traditional, quantitative measures than qualitative indices. The next phase needs to focus on quality

**Recommendations**

1. Further research is needed on ways to collect data on how teacher education programs are assessed.
2. In-depth interviews should be conducted on what is and what is not helpful in the program evaluation process.
3. A small research team needs to be formed to focus on and coordinate dissemination efforts based upon the results of project studies.
4. There needs to be stronger networking between program evaluation processes in teacher education programs and the Chapter 49 regulations that are currently being reviewed and reformulated. The Pennsylvania State Board
of Education's Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification has devised 14 policy questions to serve as focal points in revising these regulations.

5. Because of differential expectations, it is absolutely essential that upcoming reform efforts be more strongly correlated between higher education and basic education. In order for more meaningful reform efforts to occur, school-university partnerships should be inextricably linked so that prospective teachers are inexorably linked to the teaching-learning-assessment process. Accordingly, several paradigms of university teacher educators working in a participatory fashion with basic education teachers and schools need to be designed, field-tested, and revised.

6. An assessment model of program evaluation for teacher education programs needs to be constructed, revised, and implemented.
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Appendix A

Program Quality Assessment Survey in Teacher Education in Pennsylvania
**Part I: Program Evaluation**

Please indicate if the following factors figure into teacher education program evaluation. Select your answers to each statement by placing checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A faculty committee or other governance body evaluates courses within the teacher education programs.</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a set of policy guidelines for evaluating teacher education courses.</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty evaluations are used to evaluate the quality of the teacher education programs.</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student evaluations of courses are used to evaluate teacher education programs.</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student grade distributions are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs.</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Measures of students' abilities in the following areas are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* organize or formulate curriculum</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* make subject matter comprehensible to learner</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* adapt content and instruction to learners</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* assess learning</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* use assessment to organize instruction</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* work with students of diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* set goals for continuing professional development</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program evaluations incorporate data from the following areas:</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* graduation ratios</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* employment ratios</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* students' performances on exit exams other than the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Test</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* student exit interviews</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* student portfolios</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Feedback from the following professionals is used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:

* graduates of the program
* teachers in the field with whom the student teachers worked
* school district administrators

Please state any other sources ____________________________

Part II: Admissions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable. Note: Some items in Question 10 ask for additional information.

9. The institution has an open admissions policy.

10. The following criteria are used to admit students to the university or college:

   * Scholastic Aptitude Test combined score or American College Testing score [ minimum score accepted _____ ]
   * high school class standing [ minimum rank _____ ]
   * admissions interview
   * high school grade point average [ minimum grade _____ ]
   * portfolios of student's high school work
   * other, please identify ____________________________

11. Which of the following are used to determine entrance into teacher education programs:

   * grade point average between 2.0 - 2.49 (4.0 scale)
   * grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)
   * approval by Dean of Education or appropriate official
   * interview committee
   * other, please identify ____________________________
Part III: Student Teaching Prerequisites

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary or Secondary program columns that are applicable.

12. Student performance requirements for admission into student teaching include the following:

- an overall grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)
- at least a 2.0 or better in all required courses (4.0 scale)
- at least a 2.0 in all professional education courses (4.0 scale)
- pre-student teaching field experiences
- acceptable scores on a standardized test
- other, please identify ____________________________

Part IV: Institutional Information

Select your answer to the question and place checkmarks in the appropriate column.

13. What combined score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test is used as a cutoff score for admission to the college or university?

A) not applicable
B) above 1200
C) 1199-950
D) 949-800
E) open admissions

Please identify other tests and cutoff scores used.

14. What was the institution's total average percentage for the last three years of teacher education majors who have passed all four sections on the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests?

A) above 98%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%
15. Of those who graduate from your teacher education programs, what is the average percentage of employment within the field of teaching in the last three years?

A) above 95%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

Part V: Perceptions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the "Respondent" and "Perceived Faculty Opinions" columns. Note: This section involves your perceptions and your perceived opinions of your faculty.

16. How significantly does the NCATE process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

17. How significantly does the Middle States process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

18. How significantly does the Pennsylvania Department of Education process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly
19. How significantly does an internal self-study process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

20. How would you rate the National Teacher Exam or Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests as a valid indicator of the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

21. Review the factors below with respect to their contributions to the quality of teacher education programs. Indicate the importance of each factor by rating it according to the following five point scale: (1) very important, (2) important, (3) moderately important, (4) slightly important, (5) not important.

A) motivation and desire of the students
B) program curriculum
C) overall grade point average of the students
D) grade point average in the students' major
E) student teaching grade or performance (if on pass/fail)
F) academic credentials of the education faculty
G) academic quality of faculty instruction
H) induction program within school districts
I) evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE
J) collaboration with school districts
K) class size
L) articulation across program components: i.e., general education, arts and sciences, professional education, field experience/student teaching.
Part VI: Comments

Please use this space to identify or further explain any other facets of how the education profession assesses or determines the quality of teacher education programs.
Appendix B

Letter to Pennsylvania Colleges and Universities From Pennsylvania Academy
Dear 2-,

The Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching is initiating a project to examine issues related to the assessment of program quality in teacher education. The intention of this project is to engage those involved in teacher preparation in a dialogue about these issues which will, in turn, contribute to improved program assessment policies and practices.

Unlike a number of other states across the country Pennsylvania does not have a legislatively mandated program assessment in place. This poses a significant opportunity for those of us in the field to generate program assessments which take into account the myriad factors that contribute to a program's quality and which are supportive of ongoing program quality enhancement.

For a number of years program inputs have been used as the primary indices of program quality. Over the last two decades evidence of prospective teachers' ability to demonstrate specific discrete behaviors and/or knowledge recall have been folded into the program assessment mix. More recently, issues related to teachers' judgement, ability to apply knowledge and skills, and facility with negotiating the complexities of the classroom have emerged as salient dimensions of program assessment. Measuring these qualities and relating their presence in teacher candidates back to programs is nothing if not a complex tricky, and, as yet, unresolved business. Yet it seems compelling to persevere.

The attached survey questionnaire is being sent to a sample of deans and directors of teacher education programs throughout the Commonwealth. Results of the survey will be used to inform the broader community of teacher educators about representative features of current program assessment practice. The results also will be used to stimulate the dialogue about program assessment. Your responses are critical to building a realistic picture of current practice in this area. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. The questionnaires are coded for identification so that follow-up telephone interviews might be done.

Please complete and return the attached questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope by 5 September 1991. Feel free to call me if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Gendernalik Cooper
Project Director

Enclosure
Appendix C

Responses to Survey Instrument
Please indicate if the following factors figure into teacher education program evaluation. Select your answers to each statement by placing checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable. Percentages do not add to 100 in some cases because of no response or rounding off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>ELEMENTARY N=22</th>
<th>SECONDARY N=23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A faculty committee or other governance body evaluates courses within the teacher education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a set of policy guidelines for evaluating teacher education courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty evaluations are used to evaluate the quality of the teacher education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student evaluations of courses are used to evaluate teacher education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student grade distributions are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Measures of students' abilities in the following areas are used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* organize or formulate curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* make subject matter comprehensible to learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* adapt content and instruction to learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* assess learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* use assessment to organize instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* work with students of diverse backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* set goals for continuing professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program evaluations incorporate data from the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* graduation ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* employment ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* students' performances on exit exams other than the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* student exit interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* student portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Feedback from the following professionals is used to evaluate the quality of teacher education programs:

- graduates of the program
- teachers in the field with whom the student teachers worked
- school district administrators

Please state any other sources

Part II: Admissions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the Elementary and/or Secondary program columns that are applicable. Note: Some items in Question 10 ask for additional information.

9. The institution has an open admissions policy.

10. The following criteria are used to admit students to the university or college:

   - Scholastic Aptitude Test combined score or American College Testing score (minimum score accepted)
   - high school class standing (minimum rank)
   - admissions interview
   - high school grade point average (minimum grade)
   - portfolios of student's high school work
   - other, please identify

11. Which of the following are used to determine entrance into teacher education programs:

- grade point average between 2.0 - 2.49 (4.0 scale)
- grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)
- approval by Dean of Education or appropriate official
- interview committee
- other, please identify

---

The table shows the distribution of responses for the admissions criteria for both Elementary (N=21) and Secondary (N=23) programs.
12. Student performance requirements for admission into student teaching include the following:

- an overall grade point average of 2.5 or higher (4.0 scale)
- at least a 2.0 or better in all required courses (4.0 scale)
- at least a 2.0 in all professional education courses (4.0 scale)
- pre-student teaching field experiences
- acceptable scores on a standardized test
- other, please identify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELEMENTARY N=21</th>
<th>SECONDARY N=23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>81% 19%</td>
<td>83% 17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What combined score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test is used as a cutoff score for admission to the college or university?

A) not applicable
B) above 1200
C) 1199-950
D) 949-800
E) open admissions

Please identify other tests and cutoff scores used.

22=96% no 1=4% yes

14. What was the institution's total average percentage for the last three years of teacher education majors who have passed all four sections on the National Teacher Exam or the Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests?

A) above 98%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Of those who graduate from your teacher education programs, what is the average percentage of employment within the field of teaching in the last three years?

A) above 95%
B) above 90%
C) above 85%
D) above 80%
E) below 80%

Part V: Perceptions

Select your answers to each statement and place checkmarks under the "Respondent" and "Perceived Faculty Opinions" columns. Note: This section involves your perceptions and your perceived opinions of your faculty.

16. How significantly does the NCATE process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

17. How significantly does the Middle States process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

18. How significantly does the Pennsylvania Department of Education process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly
19. How significantly does an internal self-study process affect the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT N=23</th>
<th>PERCEIVED FACULTY OPINION N=23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A    B   C   D   E   NR</td>
<td>A    B   C   D   E   NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%  44% 44%</td>
<td>4%   13% 30% 48% 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How would you rate the National Teacher Exam or Pennsylvania Teacher Certification Tests as a valid indicator of the overall quality of your teacher education programs?

A) not applicable
B) slightly
C) moderately
D) highly
E) very highly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A    B   C   D   E   NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%  26% 39% 9% 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Review the factors below with respect to their contributions to the quality of teacher education programs. Indicate the importance of each factor by rating it according to the following five point scale: (1) very important, (2) important, (3) moderately important, (4) slightly important, (5) not important. Mean values are:

1.22 A) motivation and desire of the students
1.17 B) program curriculum
2.30 C) overall grade point average of the students
1.87 D) grade point average in the students' major
1.83 E) student teaching grade or performance (if on pass/fail)
1.61 F) academic credentials of the education faculty
1.09 G) academic quality of faculty instruction
2.86 H) induction program within school districts
2.91 I) evaluation processes from external agencies such as NCATE
1.87 J) collaboration with school districts
2.13 K) class size 8 (35%) Responded
15 (65%) No response
1.22 L) articulation across program components: i.e., general education, arts and sciences, professional education, field experience/student teaching.
Appendix D

Comments From Respondents
APPENDIX D

Comments From Respondents

Although we are not doing anything with portfolios at the moment they appear to have some value in the assessment process. The new tests being prepared by NTE are evidently going to be more performance based and that move should have a dramatic effect on program assessment as well as instructional practice. Frankly, I would like to see some kind of intern experience similar to that experienced by doctors but the sheer magnitude of teacher education programs is a problem.

At IUP we have been trying to evaluate critical qualities of candidates. In our pre-teacher assessment program we are able to pinpoint these qualities very accurately. We also have departmentally developed evaluation processes at the junior level that includes an interview, specific grade requirements and in some cases a proficiency exam.

I was highly displeased with the PA Dept. of Education review process. Surely there's a better way.

We are in the process of developing a more formal procedure for evaluating and screening candidates throughout the four years of our undergraduate training program. I cannot share the specifics of this procedure at this time. Our Special Education/Elementary Education Program has been evaluated recently by a National Inquiry Team sponsored by the Council for Exceptional Children (National Organization)

Comparison with research findings

Penn State is pleased that more of our students later earn doctorates than most places. This is fine for a research institution but it doesn't speak to the quality of the teacher preparation. We need to do more systematic assessment of employers of our students, but in the last ten years up to half our students annually accept positions outside Pennsylvania. I'd like to involve more teachers in evaluation, perhaps mentors in the induction program.

The greatest problem is resources: time and staff. Teacher Ed. Programs don't budget for continuous program
evaluation. Currently, rising enrollment is strapping all of us just to meet student demand.

The rest of the institution doesn't worry about evaluating teacher education programs because they already "know" that they are poor and not particularly worthy, though they have no real evidence of that. For example, we demonstrated that our Secondary Ed. Students' SATs and GPAs are equivalent to others in the University, but our colleagues refuse to accept that because they "know" that teacher ed. students are worse than others.

Although we are working very diligently in improving our students' scores on the NTE, I believe that the mandatory taking of the NTE is expensive and is not an indicator of how well a student will do as a teacher. I think the money the state spent on the test and the dollars spent by students is an exercise in futility. (As it pertains to making/creating good teachers)

The determining factors in teacher education quality is the product, the student who becomes a stellar teacher.

This past year we had a one hundred percent passing of the NTE.

1) Institutional, state, and national assessment programs need to be integrated to avoid redundancy.

2) Program graduates need to be assessed during their first 2-3 years in the profession.

3) SCDEs need to increase personnel and budgets to support more meaningful assessments.

4) All teacher educators should be required to complete at least one graduate course on the assessment of teaching and teacher education.

While the data you are collecting will be of some interest, I do not believe it addresses the fundamental problem in teacher education. That is, what empirical evidence is available (data collected from controlled experimentation) which demonstrates that the teaching of methods -- eg. how to teach the elementary vs secondary child; how to teach social studies vs science; how to teach the gifted vs the retarded -- is effective in ___
effective teachers. We treat the methods approach as an (the way to prepare teachers) and have for the past 50 years. Yet there is research to believe that all of these courses are based upon an erroneous assumption. That is, we can design meaningful courses for teaching people classified on a single variable. When we feel all of us differ on several variables which be taken into account for evaluation to be effective. We have addressed this issue and have some interesting results. Until we are willing to admit that our basic approach to teacher education has been faulty, it is real likely (unlikely) that significant changes will occur. Rather, what we will find (as we have in the past) is that the only significant predictor of teacher effectiveness are personal characteristics of the student and their academic performance -- not what they have learned in existing prof. educ. courses. Assessment, which is limited to products of flawed approaches to teacher education, will do little to enhance the quality of teacher education.

I will be happy to talk further with you if you are interested.

Sincerely,

William Moore
Bucknell Univ.
(717) 524-1324