

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

X1. Describe what changes or additions have been made in response to issues cited in previous recognition report. List the sections of the report you are resubmitting and the changes that have been made. Specific instructions for preparing a revised report or a response to condition report are available on the NCATE web site at <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/process.asp?ch=4> (Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Response to National Recognition Report of 02/01/07

Responses to Comments:

A.2--Test Results—There is no box checked in this section. Therefore, we are unsure if Assessment 1 was assessed. There is a comment in Part B that reads:

Comment: Assessment 1: While Praxis II sub scores were presented for one cohort of candidates, they were reported as averages rather than actual candidates' performance and compared only with state averages and not national norms. In general candidates' performance on Praxis II appears to be a strength of the program.

We are expecting to have disaggregated data to report shortly and perhaps this will be sufficient information to meet this requirement.

B--Status of Meeting Spa Standards (Standard 1.3)—The comment below does not truly reflect the geography concentration. Only one physical geography course is offered within the major, thus ensuring alignment with this standard.

Comment: It appears that the Geography concentration may be heavily science-oriented.

D—Evaluation of the Use of Assessment Results—We have addressed the comment below by developing a new Assessment 2 which meets the reviews' suggestions:

The narrative in section 5 indicates that data has been analyzed and that there are plans for changes in the program. While they indicate that the multiple paths by which candidates may complete the program make it impossible to utilize candidates' grades as a form of analysis, perhaps looking at candidates' performance in each of the options would provide stronger evidence of their content capabilities and of the need to strengthen content knowledge in particular areas.

Changes/Additions to Initial Report:

Cover Sheet:

- #4—addition of another Report Preparer
- #5—addition of an NCATE Coordinator
- #14—Program Report Status

Section I--Context

#9—Faculty Information

A highly qualified tenure-track faculty member has been added to the Secondary Social Studies teacher preparation program. The following is the comment from the National Recognition Report:

Comment: Both supervisors have a background in the social sciences field. There is no indication of who teaches the methods course nor is there is a statement that the cooperating teachers are certified in social studies. Since college supervisors regularly rate candidates' performance more favorably than the cooperating teachers do, there is a question of inter-rater reliability.

Both faculty members listed taught Secondary Social Studies Methods. The new faculty member (as of 8/07) also teaches Secondary Social Studies Methods. All cooperating teachers for both the Methods field experience and student teaching are certified in New Hampshire in Secondary Social Studies (grades 5-12) and have at least three years experience. This is required by law in NH. The issue of inter-rater reliability may be resolved through the use of new assessments.

Section II—List of Assessments

C.1—Candidates' knowledge of content

Assessment 2:

Assessments 1 & 2: There is little information to verify candidates' knowledge of content except through Praxis II. In Assessment 2 no information was provided regarding candidates performance in individual disciplines that would provide evidence of candidates' knowledge. Instead, assessment relies on cooperating teachers' and college supervisors' ratings of candidates' knowledge as applied in student teaching. This data provides limited understanding of candidates' level of knowledge of the multiple disciplines that comprise the social studies because the evaluators are not specialists in the disciplines and therefore are not qualified to assess knowledge in all the disciplines. The report acknowledges that it is unlikely that a student teacher would teach in all the disciplines during student teaching; therefore candidates' knowledge of some disciplines would not be assessed. NCSS prefers candidates' grades in courses relevant to the social standards to be aggregated, placed in a table of candidate scores (by area of concentration perhaps), and analyzed relative to what that data reveals about program strengths and areas for improvement.

Assessment I will be addressed through the addition of disaggregated subscores instead of percentages provided on the PRAXIS II Assessment (0081).

A new Assessment 2 has been developed that meets the suggestions of the reviewers. (See Sections II, III, and IV).

C.1—Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Assessment 3:

Assessment 3: While the generic rubric used to provide data on candidates' ability to plan for teaching during student teaching reveals that they are expected to be able to plan, the rubric itself needs to be expanded to assist reviewers in understanding the criteria used to reach the conclusions arrived at by supervisors and cooperating teachers. While this data need not be reported by standard, having done so should provide the opportunity for the program to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement in both the candidates' performance and in the program.

A new Assessment 3 has been created that better addresses the ability of the teacher candidates to effectively plan for teaching. (See Sections II, III, and IV)

C.3—Candidate effects of P-12 learning

Assessment 5: Again, the same instrument is used as evidence in this area as in C.1 and C.2. on the same form as is used for the prior assessments, the rating is on a simple scale of 1 to 3. No other evidence is offered to verify candidates' ability to gauge the impact of their teaching on student learning. A simplistic rating on a single form is inadequate evidence. A more detailed rubric should be developed to address the degree to which students have learned from instruction by the candidate. A simple pre test-post test on a unit taught by the candidate (similar to the Teacher Work Sample model) including evidence of candidates' analysis of the data would provide stronger evidence. Data for this assessment need not be reported by standard.

A new Assessment 5 has been developed to assess the impact and effect of the student teacher on their own students' learning. (See Sections II, III, and IV)

Section III—Relationship of Assessment to Standards

Included in this section is the revision of how assessments are aligned with standards.

Section IV—Evidence for Meeting Standards

Included in this section are newly developed Assessment 2, Assessment 3, and Assessment 5. We have taken all the reviewers' suggestions and our own experiences with previous assessments and we believe we will be able to successfully assess our teacher candidates' achievements in these three areas. In addition, we believe that we can use these assessments to better provide continuous improvement in our Secondary Social Studies teacher preparation program. We anxiously await data from these new assessments.