

COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION

EPP ANNUAL REPORT – SECTION 7 – INQUIRY BRIEF

Prepared by:

**CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON
HIGHER EDUCATION OUTCOMES (CRHEO)**

Gregory Wolniak

Laura Davis

Kimberly Woo

Ognjen Simic

April, 2014

CONTENTS

Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R).....	3
New York State Teacher Certification Exams (NYSTCE)	7
Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Surveys (ETFQ)	10
Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS)	13
Grade Point Averages.....	16
Program Exit and Follow-Up Surveys.....	19
References.....	24

Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R)

The Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale (DRSTOS-R) is an observation protocol for rating the teaching performance of student teachers, based on the work of Charlotte Danielson as presented in her book, *Enhancing Professional Practices: A Framework for Teaching* (Danielson, 2007). The DRSTOS-R has been used to assess the pedagogical proficiency of NYU's student teachers with few modifications from fall 2004 through the present. The items of the DRSTOS-R are aligned with national frameworks for teaching, including the widely used standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

Items on the DRSTOS-R also correspond with items on other measures of pedagogical proficiency including the edTPA certification rubrics and the Danielson rubric used by the New York City Department of Education to evaluate teacher quality. DRSTOS-R data are collected for multiple purposes and help to facilitate discussion and comparison between programs.

The data in this report are intended to provide feedback that can be used to support programmatic planning in several ways. Administrative data identifying field supervisors who have submitted protocols provides accountability and speaks to internal consistency of program field supervision. In addition, this information provides a context for understanding student performance data and the extent to which the results may be generalized to the full population of students in the program. DRSTOS-R data on student performance, in conjunction with information from other sources, may be used to identify domains in need of additional program-wide attention and facilitate discussions concerning program improvement (e.g. increased emphasis in course curricula and field mentorship, etc.).

Table 1 below presents DRSTOS-R ratings for students in their final student teaching placement for the Classes of 2013 for a total of 155 BS students and 241 MA students. For both BS and MA cohorts, the program standard is for 80% or more of the students to achieve a mean of at least 3.0 for all four domains and the Total Scale. The BS students fell below the program standard for all domains, except Professional Responsibilities. However, viewed against previous years' data, BS students are increasingly exceeding or close to exceeding a proficiency score 3.0 among for 70% of students. Among MA students, the 80% standard was met for three domains, including Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities.

Disaggregated results by program options are displayed in Table 2. For BS students, the program standard was met for three out of nine groups: English, Social Studies, and Ed Theater. For MA students, the program standard was met for five out of twelve program options, including: Science, English, Social Studies, Art Education, and Dance Education. Science and Dance Education showed the highest percentages scoring means of at least 3.0. It is important to note that the number of cases differs widely by program and the percent meeting standards may vary to a large extent based on only small changes in scores for programs containing relatively few students.

Table 1**Mean Scores and Percentages Meeting Standards on the Domain Referenced Student Teacher Observation Scale-Revised (DRSTOS-R) for Steinhardt Teacher Education Students in their Final Student Teaching Placement: Fall 2012 - Summer 2013**

Scale Domain	Number of Items	N	Mean Score ¹	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
BS Students					
Planning and Preparation	6	155	3.04	0.53	63.2%
Classroom Environment	7	154	3.23	0.51	72.7%
Instruction	7	155	3.20	0.52	73.5%
Professional Responsibilities	3	155	3.43	0.57	85.2% [†]
Total Score	23	155	3.20	0.49	69.0%
MA Students					
Planning and Preparation	6	241	3.21	0.56	74.7%
Classroom Environment	7	241	3.35	0.49	82.2% [†]
Instruction	7	241	3.27	0.54	80.5% [†]
Professional Responsibilities	3	241	3.50	0.57	88.8% [†]
Total Score	23	241	3.31	0.50	77.6%

¹ Scale: 1=Not Yet Proficient; 2=Partially Proficient; 3=Entry Level Proficient; 4=Proficient.

[†] Values meeting the program standard that 80% of students at or above a Mean Score of 3.0. The standard for proficiency is 3.0.

SOURCE: 2012-13DRSTOS-R, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

Table 2**Summary of Performance on DRSTOS-R Total Scores for Student Teachers in their Last Placements by Program Certification Area: Fall 2012 – Summer 2013**

Program	N	Mean Score ¹	Standard Deviation	% Meeting Standards
BS Students				
Dual Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education	33	3.04	0.33	66.7%
Dual Childhood/Childhood Special Education	81	3.29	0.53	71.6%
Science	2	‡	‡	‡
English	8	3.39	0.50	87.5% [†]
Social Studies	6	3.28	0.60	83.3% [†]
Math	6	3.10	0.24	66.7%
Multilingual Multicultural Studies ²	2	‡	‡	‡
Ed Theater	7	3.32	0.38	85.7% [†]
Music Education	10	2.91	0.55	50.0%
MA Students				
Early Childhood/Childhood Special Education	32	3.15	0.50	71.9%
Childhood/Childhood Special Education	58	3.25	0.51	75.9%
Science	23	3.66	0.41	91.3% [†]
English	17	3.37	0.40	88.2% [†]
Social Studies	11	3.40	0.43	81.8% [†]
Math	3	‡	‡	‡
Multilingual Multicultural Studies ²	44	3.40	0.52	75.0%
Ed Theater	15	3.18	0.52	66.7%
Art Education	11	3.38	0.35	81.8% [†]
Dance Education	14	3.40	0.23	100.0% [†]
Music Education	13	2.98	0.53	53.8%

¹ Scale: 1=Not Yet Proficient; 2=Partially Proficient; 3=Entry Level Proficient; 4=Proficient.

² Multilingual Multicultural Studies includes: Bilingual Education; Foreign Language Education; Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

[†] Values meeting the program standard that 80% of students at or above a Mean Score of 3.0. The standard for proficiency is 3.0.

[‡] Reporting standards not met (fewer than five cases).

SOURCE: 2012-13DRSTOS-R, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

New York State Teacher Certification Exams (NYSTCE)

In order to receive New York State certification as a teacher, candidates must pass examinations in their certification area administered through the NYSTCE program. Elementary education teachers must pass the Liberal Arts and Science Test (LAST), the Elementary Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W), and the Elementary Education Content Specialty Test (CST). Secondary education teachers must pass the LAST, the secondary ATS-W, and the CST for the core subjects they teach.

With respect to teacher education program evaluation, the CST is used as a measure of candidates' subject matter knowledge, the ATS-W as a measure of pedagogical knowledge, and the LAST as a measure of general liberal arts content knowledge. In order to qualify for state certification, students must obtain a scaled score of at least 220 for each exam, on a scale of 100-300.

Table 3 displays the results of the performance of class of 2013 graduates on the NYSTCE exams in 2013. Test score data are matched with individual program graduates. Graduates showed strong performance on the three sets of exams by exceeding the dual program standards of 90% passing and an effect size of at least 0.80, indicating that the mean scale score exceeded passing to a large and educationally meaningful extent. The mean scores of both BS and MA Steinhardt students exceeded the passing score of 220 for Liberal Arts & Science, Teaching Skills, and Content Specialty Tests. Mean Scaled Scores and percent passing (achieving a score of 220 or more) were greatest for the Assessment of Teaching Skills – Written.

Table 3**Mean Scaled Scores, Effect Sizes, and Passing Rates for Teacher-Education Graduates on the NYSTCE Exams: Class of 2013**

	N	Mean Scaled Score (MSS)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Effect Size (ES) ¹	% Passing ²
Liberal Arts & Sciences Test (LAST)					
BS	85	270.38	16.82	3.00	98.82%
MA	181	267.47	21.45	2.21	95.58%
Total	266	268.40	20.10	2.41	96.49%
Assessment of Teaching Skills – Written (ATS-W)					
BS	85	272.29	11.07	4.72	100.00%
MA	182	267.51	16.79	2.83	97.80%
Total	267	269.03	15.35	3.20	98.50%
Content Specialty Tests (CST)					
BS	134	253.25	21.32	1.56	94.78%
MA	309	252.09	25.90	1.24	88.35%
Total	443	252.44	24.58	1.32	90.29%

¹ ES = (MSS - 220)/SD; the program standard is an ES \geq 0.80, large and meaningful.

² Passing score = 220 on a scale of 100 – 300. The program standard is 90% passing.

NOTE. If a student has multiple tests, data are based on the most recent exam.

SOURCE. 2013 New York State Teacher Certification Exams

Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Surveys (ETFQ)

Faculty and staff designed the Student Teacher End-of-Term Feedback Questionnaire (ETFQ) as an integral component of the evidence base for self-inquiry. Designed and administered as an online questionnaire, the ETFQ elicits feedback from teacher-education students concerning the extent to which they perceive that the semester's student-teaching experience has enhanced their professional knowledge and expertise. The ETFQ format includes a combination of forced-choice and open-ended items divided into three parts. The first part (items 1 and 2) asks about the school environment, the second part (items 3–14) focuses on the cooperating teacher, and the third part (items 15–25) focuses on the contributions of the student-teacher supervisor. In the context of the student teaching experience, the items ask students to evaluate how well their cooperating teachers and supervisors contribute to their growth as teachers using a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from "Very poorly" to "Very well." An open-ended prompt asks the students to describe the specific ways in which the cooperating teachers and supervisors helped their professional growth, as well as any specific experiences that were problematic. All student teachers in teacher education programs are asked to complete the ETFQ at the end of each semester of student teaching.

Table 4 below displays the results of the assessment of three scales, each corresponding to different Teacher Education Program claims for the Classes of 2013 based on ETFQ data. The total mean scores for each of the three scales met the criterion of 4.0 (nominally equivalent to a rating of "Well") for both BS and MA program finishers. For MA students, the means exceeded the program standard on all three claim scales while for BS students, the means exceeded the standard for two of the three claims (Pedagogical Knowledge and Clinical Knowledge) and were not significantly different from the standard for the Content Knowledge claim. These results are consistent with the finding that program completers continue to meet program standards on these two measures.

Table 4**Mean scores on the End of Term Feedback Questionnaire Claim Scales for teacher-education students in last student teaching placements: Class of 2013**

Scale	N	Mean ^{1,2}	Standard Deviation
Content Knowledge: Claim Scale 1 ³			
BS	97	4.06	0.89
MA	121	4.20 [†]	0.88
Total	218	4.14 [†]	0.89
Pedagogical Knowledge: Claim Scale 2 ⁴			
BS	97	4.22 [†]	0.86
MA	121	4.22 [†]	0.88
Total	218	4.22 [†]	0.87
Clinical Knowledge: Claim Scale 3 ⁵			
BS	97	4.18 [†]	0.86
MA	121	4.26 [†]	0.81
Total	218	4.22 [†]	0.83

[†] The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 4.0 ($p < 0.05$).

¹ Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale with values: 1= Very Poorly, 2=Poorly, 3=Average, 4=Well and 5= Very Well.

² The program criterion for each claim is a mean score of at least 4.0 for both BS and MA program completers.

³ Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their contribution towards developing content knowledge specific to students' field and age group.

⁴ Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their assistance in furthering organizational teaching skills in areas such as planning, structuring lessons and assessment methods.

⁵ Scale consists of mean scores on two items measuring how students rate their cooperating teachers and supervisors in terms of their contribution towards (1) enhancing teaching practices, such as instructional philosophies, and methods used in the classroom, and (2) developing classroom management skills such as establishing routines and approaches to discipline.

SOURCE. 2013 End of Term Feedback Questionnaire, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Scale (EBMAS)

The Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) is an NYU Steinhardt-developed measure of teacher candidates' developing dispositions toward teaching. EBMAS consists of 29 items developed to measure preservice teachers' beliefs about education in multicultural settings, some of which were initially drawn from the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) (Gibson and Dembo, 1984) and the Teacher Multicultural Attitudes Survey (TMAS) (Ponterotto, et al., 1998). All items were developed or selected based on clarity and alignment with the goals of NYU's teacher education program.

The EBMAS is administered with candidates at two points during their enrollment in teacher education programs – once during their first semester and then again shortly before program completion. EBMAS yields the following five scales: General teacher efficacy (GTE), defined as the overall belief that teachers' work can promote the learning of all students regardless of home background or community; Two measures of Personal Teacher Efficacy (i.e., candidates' beliefs that they as individuals can effectively educate all children regardless of background or community) - one focused on the ability to address challenges in classroom management and instruction, and the other related to personal responsibility for student success; and two scales designed to measure Multicultural Attitudes and Social Justice based on teachers' awareness of, comfort with, and sensitivity toward issues of cultural pluralism in the classroom and their belief in the moral and social responsibility of teachers to educate all children equitably. The items within every scale are statements of beliefs that candidates respond to using a six-point Likert scale of agreement (from 1=Strongly Disagree to 6=Strongly Agree) and are balanced across positive and negative statements.

Table 5 below displays the comparison of mean EBMAS scale scores against the program standard of 4.5 for BS and MA program finishers in the Classes of 2013. As shown in the table, two scales, Personal Teacher Efficacy – Student Problem Solving and Personal Teacher Efficacy – Student Success are associated with Claim 3. General Teacher Efficacy and Social Justice scales are associated with Claim 4, and Multicultural Awareness is associated with Cross Cutting Theme 2. For both BS and MA students, all observed means either met or were not statistically significantly different from the program standard of 4.50, thereby supporting the claims. The highest mean scores were for Multicultural Awareness and Social Justice and the lowest for the two Personal Teacher Efficacy scales.

Table 5**Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS) Scores by Degree: Class of 2013**

Scale ¹	BS			MA		
	N	Mean ^{2,3}	Standard Deviation	N	Mean ^{2,3}	Standard Deviation
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Problem Solving	48	4.72 [†]	0.77	156	4.46	0.72
Personal Teacher Efficacy: Student Success	48	4.35	0.70	156	4.46	0.69
General Teacher Efficacy	48	4.88 [†]	0.76	156	4.85 [†]	0.89
Multicultural Awareness	48	5.39 [†]	0.58	156	5.54 [†]	0.54
Social Justice	48	5.37 [†]	0.46	156	5.40 [†]	0.52

[†] The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 4.50 ($p < 0.05$).

¹ Scales were constructed from the multiyear EBMAS database using principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. Internal consistency (alpha) for the scales were moderate to large, confirming reliability as follows: PTE (Student Problem Solving, 5-item scale) alpha = 0.740, PTE (Student Success, 4-item scale) alpha = 0.738, General Teacher Efficacy (5-item scale) alpha = 0.673, Multicultural Awareness (8-item scale) alpha = 0.831, Social Justice (6-item scale) alpha = 0.644.

² Responses are measured on a 6-point scale of agreement, where: 1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Moderately Disagree; 3=Slightly Disagree; 4=Slightly Agree; 5=Moderately Agree; and 6=Strongly Agree.

³ The program standard is to meet or exceed a mean score of 4.50.

SOURCE. 2013 Educational Beliefs and Multicultural Attitudes Survey (EBMAS), NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

Grade Point Averages

Grade Point Averages (GPA) are among the measures used to assess teacher education students' mastery of the content and skills required to be a competent and qualified teacher. Across the university, students are graded in each course from A to F with GPAs computed on a four-point scale, weighted for course hours. Grades are awarded for achievement of course objectives. The grading criteria are described in the syllabus for each course.

Teacher education students pursuing the BS or B Mus. degrees must have a program concentration in a subject that is related to their certification area. These courses are taken in the College of Arts and Science (CAS) and Steinhardt and are designed to build the deep content knowledge, understanding and skill required for graduates to teach their subjects effectively. The Content Knowledge GPA for undergraduates is computed as a weighted average of these courses. MA students take their post-graduate course in Steinhardt and their grades in these courses are used to compute their Content Knowledge GPA.

Undergraduate students also receive a broad and deep education in the liberal arts and sciences in large part by meeting the requirements of the College Core Curriculum (CCC), a common core of courses in the CAS. The College Core Curriculum and the other courses taken at NYU help undergraduates develop a set of intellectual skills, tools and ideas that enable them to learn on their own; knowledge of cultural perspectives, practices and traditions; and facility with the tools of modern technology - cross-cutting theme skills for which evidence must be provided in the accreditation process. Accordingly, the Cross-Cutting Themes (CCT) GPA is calculated from the aggregate CCC courses and other contributing courses for both CAS and Steinhardt. Students pursuing the MA degree took their liberal arts and science courses as undergraduates. The composite undergraduate GPA is used as a proxy CCT measure.

Students in both BS and MA teacher education programs take courses that comprise a common, required Pedagogical Core. Grades from these courses were used to calculate students' Pedagogical Knowledge GPA and include Inquiries into Teaching and Learning, Teaching Students with Disabilities, courses in pedagogical content knowledge, and courses in human development. Grades in student-teaching and practicum courses and seminars are used to compute a Teaching Skills GPA as a measure of clinical practice.

Contained in Table 6 are the Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of Teacher Education Graduates in the class of 2013. Four types of GPAs are presented based on the grades achieved in courses related to different program claim areas, including: Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Skill, as well as the Cross Cutting Theme of Learning to Learn. GPAs are reported separately for BS and MA graduates.

As can be seen in the table, the program standard of 3.0 was exceeded by undergraduate and graduate-level program completers for the claim areas Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, and Clinical Skill. For GPAs within the Cross Cutting – Learning to Learn claim,

MA students exceeded the 3.0 standard while the BS students were slightly below at 2.98. However, BS students' Cross cutting grades were close enough to the standard that the mean value did not differ from 3.0 on a statistically significant basis.

Table 6

Mean Grade Point Averages (GPA) of NYU BS and MA Teacher Education Graduates by Claim area: Class of 2013

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Content Knowledge			
BS	104	3.16 [†]	0.59
MA	182	3.40 [†]	0.53
Pedagogical Knowledge			
BS	105	3.61 [†]	0.23
MA	254	3.88 [†]	0.15
Clinical Skill			
BS	97	3.86 [†]	0.25
MA	210	3.89 [†]	0.26
Cross Cutting: Learning to learn			
BS	86	2.98	0.93
MA	182	3.40 [†]	0.53

[†] The Mean value is significantly different from the program standard of 3.0 ($p < 0.05$).

NOTE. If a student has multiple tests, data are based on the most recent exam

SOURCE. 2013 Class Rosters and Grades, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

Program Exit and Follow-Up Surveys

Program Exit. CRHEO conducts surveys of Steinhardt’s teacher education students shortly before their graduation for the purpose of evaluating the quality of the teacher education program, to obtain data to inform Steinhardt’s efforts toward continuous program improvement, and to assess the readiness of program completers to begin teaching. The survey consists of both Likert-type and free-response questions organized into the following sections: (i) Candidate Background, including degree, certification, and program areas; (ii) Candidate Perceptions on how well their teacher education program prepared them for teaching; (iii) Feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their pre-service programs; and (iv) Professional Plans for the future. Data from the section measuring perceptions of preparation for teaching are used to assess the programs’ influence on the teaching skills and knowledge of the students. Program completers are asked to use a four-point scale ranging from “Very well prepared” to “Not well at all” to report their perceptions of preparation in 15 areas of essential teaching skill and knowledge. Eleven of these items were drawn from Arthur Levine’s national study of the effectiveness of schools of education (Levine, 2006). The other four items refer to skills that faculty identified as key goals of the NYU program that extended beyond the Levine study.

Program standards were set using data from the Levine study as a set of norms. For the Levine sample, the percentages responding that they were “Very well” or “Moderately well” prepared by their programs to teach ranged from 27% for *Address the needs of students with disabilities* to 81% for *Understand how students learn*. For the 11 items drawn from the Levine survey, the percentages reporting “Very well” or “Moderately well” were less than 60% for five items, ranged between 60 and 69% for three items, in the 70% range for two items, and exceeded 80% for one item. Using these data as references to set a high, uniform program standard, the Steinhardt faculty established 80% as the program standard for all 15 items.

Follow-Up. Similar to the Program Exit survey, CRHEO administers a One-Year Follow-up survey intended to assess the perceptions of graduates concerning the extent to which the program had prepared them to teach and the quality of their educational experience. This survey provides information about program completers’ early professional experiences and the degree to which their programs prepared them for teaching. Since many of the questions are identical to the Program Exit survey, the results from the two surveys can be compared to assess changes in perceptions of preparation and perceived program quality during the first year of teaching. The survey also inquires about the employment of graduates, including their teaching assignments and the locations and types of schools in which they were teaching. The employment data are used to supplement those collected through employment records.

Tables 7 and 8 below present the results from the Program Exit and One-Year Follow-Up surveys among the classes of 2013 and 2012, respectively. Percentages of respondents reporting “Very well” or “Moderately well” prepared are shown across a parallel set of items related to Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Clinical Skill, Caring Professionals, and two Cross-Cutting Themes (Integration of Technology and Teaching Diverse Learners).

As can be seen in Table 7 below, at program exit BS students met the program standard of 80% feeling “Moderately Well” or “Very Well” prepared to begin teaching with respect to Content Knowledge and Clinical Skill. They met the standard for two of the six items related to Pedagogical Knowledge, falling short on “Use student performance assessment techniques,” “Addressing the needs of students with limited English proficiency,” and “Working with parents”, as well as all three items related to Caring Professionals. Overall, the results for MA students were not as strong as those for the BS students. They met the standard for the same items as the BS students for Pedagogical Knowledge and Clinical Skill, but fell short of the standard for Content Knowledge, Caring Professional, and Cross-Cutting items. Neither BS nor MA students met the standard for either Cross-Cutting theme.

In terms of Table 8, the BS and MA graduates’ perceptions of their preparation for teaching one year after graduation were generally similar to the ones they had at program exit. MA students met program standards on three of the 15 items on the Follow-Up Survey, compared to four of 15 on the Program Exit Survey, while BS graduates met the program standards on seven of 15 items on both the Program Exit and Follow-Up Surveys. For BS graduates, there were two noteworthy differences in their responses to the two surveys. First, whereas they fell below standard at graduation in terms of “Address needs of students from diverse cultures,” their perceptions were higher on the Follow-Up survey and met the standard. Second, in relationship to the Integration of Technology theme, graduates’ perceptions were higher on the Follow-Up survey and met the standard. Second, they met standards on one of the two Clinical Skill items on the Follow-Up Survey, compared to both items at Program Exit. The results suggest the need for continued work on improving the curriculum and experiences of Steinhardt teacher education students in certain domains of teaching.

Table 7**Percentage of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who reported their Programs Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching: Class of 2013**

	Undergraduates (N=62)			Graduates (N=206)		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total
Content Knowledge						
Have a mastery of your subject area	54.8%	33.9%	88.7% †	30.6%	39.8%	70.4%
Implement state/district curriculum & standards	40.3%	41.9%	82.3% †	39.3%	34.0%	73.3%
Pedagogical Knowledge						
Understand how students learn	58.1%	22.6%	80.6% †	44.7%	42.7%	87.4% †
Use different pedagogical approaches	35.5%	46.8%	82.3% †	35.0%	46.1%	81.1% †
Use student performance assessment techniques	43.5%	35.5%	79.0%	32.0%	42.2%	74.3%
Address needs of students with disabilities	40.3%	30.6%	71.0%	28.2%	37.4%	65.5%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	19.4%	27.4%	46.8%	19.9%	29.1%	49.0%
Work with parents	19.4%	25.8%	45.2%	11.2%	23.3%	34.5%
Clinical Skill						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	62.9%	24.2%	87.1% †	44.2%	39.3%	83.5% †
Impact my students' ability to learn	54.8%	30.6%	85.5% †	42.7%	38.3%	81.1% †
Caring Professionals						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	38.7%	32.3%	71.0%	30.1%	34.0%	64.1%
Identify & use resources within the community where you teach	32.3%	37.1%	69.4%	25.2%	32.5%	57.8%
Participate as a stakeholder in the community where you teach	17.7%	30.6%	48.4%	15.5%	32.5%	48.1%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	41.9%	33.9%	75.8%	39.8%	35.9%	75.7%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology						
Integrate technology into teaching	21.0%	28.9%	49.9%	30.6%	30.6%	61.2%

† Total percentage meet or exceeds the program criterion of 80%.

NOTE. Responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

SOURCE. 2013 Program Exit Survey, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

Table 8**Percentages of Steinhardt Teacher-Education Program Completers who Reported that their Program Prepared them “Very Well” or “Moderately Well” to Begin Teaching, One Year after Program Completion: Classes of 2012**

	Undergraduates (N=42)			Graduates (N=54)		
	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total	Very Well	Moderately Well	Total
Content Knowledge						
Have a mastery of your subject area	40.5%	42.9%	83.3% [†]	48.1%	25.9%	74.1%
Implement state/district curriculum & standards	23.8%	57.1%	81.0% [†]	38.9%	29.6%	68.5%
Pedagogical Knowledge						
Understand how students learn	40.5%	50.0%	90.5% [†]	50.0%	35.2%	85.2% [†]
Use different pedagogical approaches	28.6%	57.1%	85.7% [†]	63.0%	22.2%	85.2% [†]
Use student performance assessment techniques	42.9%	33.3%	76.2%	38.9%	33.3%	72.2%
Address needs of students with disabilities	33.3%	45.2%	78.6%	29.6%	37.0%	66.7%
Address needs of students with limited English proficiency	9.5%	28.6%	38.1%	18.5%	31.5%	50.0%
Work with parents	9.5%	38.1%	47.6%	22.2%	31.5%	53.7%
Clinical Skill						
Maintain order & discipline in the classroom	21.4%	40.5%	61.9%	14.8%	44.4%	59.3%
Impact my students' ability to learn	35.7%	47.6%	83.3% [†]	48.1%	37.0%	85.2% [†]
Caring Professionals						
Work collaboratively with teachers, administrators and other school personnel	31.0%	35.7%	66.7%	48.1%	31.5%	79.6%
Identify & use resources within the community where you teach	40.5%	31.0%	71.4%	35.2%	18.5%	53.7%
Participate as a stakeholder in the community where you teach	21.4%	38.1%	59.5%	27.8%	31.5%	59.3%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Teaching Diverse Learners						
Address needs of students from diverse cultures	47.6%	38.1%	85.7% [†]	44.4%	35.2%	79.6%
Cross-Cutting Theme: Integration of Technology						
Integrate technology into teaching	19.0%	28.9%	47.9%	48.1%	24.1%	72.2%

[†] Total percentage meet or exceeds the program criterion of 80%.

NOTE. Responses recorded on a four-point scale as follows: 4=Very Well, 3=Moderately Well, 2=Somewhat Well, 1=Not Well at All. Most items were taken from Arthur Levine's survey of teacher education graduates (2006).

SOURCE. One-Year Follow-Up Survey of the Class of 2012, NYU-Steinhardt, CRHEO

Reference

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*, 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). *Teacher efficacy: A construct validation*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.

Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, D.C.: The Evaluation Schools Project.

Ponterotto, J.G., Baluch, S., Greig, T., and Rivera, L. (1998). Development and initial score validation of the teacher multicultural attitude survey. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 58, 1002-1016.