

# NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

## Initial Preparation of Physical Education Teachers

Note: This form uses the NASPE standards approved by NCATE in 2008. NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). This form uses the NASPE standards approved by NCATE in 2008. All initial licensure physical education teacher education programs must use the NASPE 2008 Initial Standards beginning Fall 2010.

NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE).

### COVER PAGE

#### Name of Institution

Newberry College

#### Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2011

#### This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions

#### Program(s) Covered by this Review

Physical Education

#### Grade Level<sup>(1)</sup>

PK-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

#### Program Type

First Teaching License

#### Award or Degree Level(s)

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's (Initial licensure)

### PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

**SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program(s):**

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

**Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)**

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

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

**Comment:**

Newberry reports a 100% pass rate on Praxis II.

**Summary of Strengths:**

Well presented report; easy to read sections, alignment tables and rubrics. Color-coded data tables are easy to interpret. Evidence is provided that program is organized, follows state codes closely, and uses evidence to inform PETE.

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

**Standard 1: Scientific and Theoretical Knowledge**

Physical education teacher candidates know and apply discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts critical to the development of physically educated individuals.

**Element 1.1** Describe and apply physiological and biomechanical concepts related to skillful movement, physical activity and fitness.

|                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Met                      | Met with Conditions      | Not Met                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Element 1.2** Describe and apply motor learning and psychological/behavioral theory related to skillful movement, physical activity, and fitness.

|                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Met                      | Met with Conditions      | Not Met                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Element 1.3** Describe and apply motor development theory and principles related to skillful movement, physical activity, and fitness.

|                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Met                      | Met with Conditions      | Not Met                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Element 1.4** Identify historical, philosophical, and social perspectives of physical education issues and legislation.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Element 1.5** Analyze and correct critical elements of motor skills and performance concepts.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Decision for Standard 1:**

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Comments:**

Assessments 1, 2 and 4 are identified as addressing Elements 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.5. Assessments 1 and 2 are identified for Element 1.4.

Assessment 1 is the Praxis II test and video analysis test for Physical Education. Passing mean scores and subscores are presented. The narrative notes that candidates are well prepared and that the program monitors strengths/weaknesses. Data from Praxis II content exam can provide partial evidence toward meeting Elements 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 (the "describe" portion of these elements). A paper/pencil exam cannot provide full evidence for meeting the aforementioned elements (cannot provide evidence for "apply" portion of these elements).

Assessment 2 is Grade Point Average in Content Areas. This assessment includes grade point scores in 10 classes in the major. An alignment table is presented; however, there are many comingled standards and elements in the table. Element 1.1, 1.4 and 1.5 are the least comingled (they are together in one rubric descriptor). There is no rubric provided that describes what performance levels, related to NASPE Standard/Elements, correspond to an A, B, C, etc., thus making it difficult to determine candidate strengths and weaknesses by element. Data do not provide evidence for elements under Standard 1.

Assessment 4 is the Internship Evaluation.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 7 do not align with the intent of Element 1.2. As such, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 1.2.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance, in the scoring guide for entry 28 do not align with the intent of Element 1.3. As such, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 1.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance, in the scoring guide for entry 29 do not align with the intent of Element 1.2. As such, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 1.2.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance, in the scoring guide for entry 31 aligns with the intent of Element 1.5. While data for this entry is comingled with Element 4.3, performance expectations are similar in intent. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 1.5.

Elements 1.4 and 1.5 are met. Elements 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are met with conditions. The standard is met with conditions.

**Standard 2: Skill and Fitness Based Competence**

Physical education teacher candidates are physically educated individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to demonstrate competent movement performance and health enhancing fitness as delineated in

the NASPE K – 12 Standards.

**Element 2.1** Demonstrate personal competence in motor skill performance for a variety of physical activities and movement patterns.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 2.2** Achieve and maintain a health-enhancing level of fitness throughout the program.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 2.3** Demonstrate performance concepts related to skillful movement in a variety of physical activities.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Decision for Standard 2:**

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Comments:**

This Standard is addressed by Assessments 2 and 7. For general comments on Assessment 2, see review for Standard 1, above.

Assessment 2, Grade Point Average, provides supporting evidence for Elements 2.1 and 2.3 in two courses: Skills and Techniques of Individual Sports, and Skills and Techniques of Team Sports, as well as in other courses. However, standards/elements are comingled in the rubric descriptors in all cases. Element 2.2 is addressed in Personal and Community Health, where candidates complete a personal fitness plan based on pre-assessment data.

Assessment 7 is Skills and Fitness Based Competence. This assessment consists of a bank of fitness tests completed in Personal and Community Health class, and a tumbling assessment. There does not appear to be an assessment of specific skills in areas such as dance, fundamental movement, and game skills for target, net/wall, batting/fielding, or invasion sports, games and activities. It is obvious from the "test bank" that candidates must perform fitness tests and/or concepts, as per Elements 2.1 and 2.3. However, it is not obvious that candidates must perform at a level of competence for performance concepts. Further, despite this lack of clarity, reviewers question that the data from these 2 items provide evidence of candidates' competence for a variety of physical activities and movement patterns (as per Element 2.1) and related to skillful movement in a variety of physical activities (as per Element 2.3). The key in the prior statement is in regard to the expectation of variety. In other words, reviewers question if graduates of the program have competence across a variety of motor performance skills in authentic environments. Other concerns: 1. No identified passing level, or minimal level of acceptable performance, for the Fitnessgram (college indicated that they were working on this but the update was not included in the report); 2. The program should consider interpreting this Standard of tracking their candidates "throughout the program". A description should be devoted to suggesting what plan of action this program has for meeting the standard (testing candidates twice is mentioned, however it is not specified when - it should be at least twice in different semesters).

Elements 2.1-2.3 are met with conditions; Standard 2 is met with conditions.

### **Standard 3: Planning and Implementation**

Physical education teacher candidates plan and implement developmentally appropriate learning experiences aligned with local, state, and national standards to address the diverse needs of all students.

**Element 3.1** Design and implement short and long term plans that are linked to program and instructional goals as well as a variety of student needs.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 3.2** Develop and implement appropriate (e.g., measurable, developmentally appropriate, performance based) goals and objectives aligned with local, state, and /or national standards.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 3.3** Design and implement content that is aligned with lesson objectives.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 3.4** Plan for and manage resources to provide active, fair, and equitable learning experiences.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 3.5** Plan and adapt instruction for diverse student needs, adding specific accommodations and/or modifications for student exceptionalities.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 3.6** Plan and implement progressive and sequential instruction that addresses the diverse needs of all students.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Element 3.7** Demonstrate knowledge of current technology by planning and implementing learning experiences that require students to appropriately use technology to meet lesson objectives.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

### **Decision for Standard 3:**

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

## Comments:

Assessments 3, 4 and 5 are identified as addressing Elements 3.1 and 3.4 Assessments 3, 4, 5, and 6 are identified as addressing 3.2 and 3.3. Assessments 3, 4, 5 and 8 are identified as addressing Elements 3.5 and 3.6. Assessments 3, 4 and 8 are identified as addressing Element 3.7.

Assessment 3 is the Newberry College Lesson Plan. This appears to be a college-wide, or generic, lesson plan that does not specify physical education content. However, the assessment includes the template and rubric, both of which are detailed. The plan is used for clinical practice and in the work sample. Planned lessons appear to be taught to P-12 students. The rubric has four levels of TC performance, of which levels 3 and 4 appear to be aligned with the intent of the NASPE Element for which they are intended to provide evidence. Candidates score above 3.0 in all evaluations of the plan with one exception, which is not noted in the narrative. The lesson plan and rubric have the potential to address NASPE Elements 3.1-3.6; however the alignment table comingles these Elements. Element 3.2 is the least comingled in the rubric. Element 3.7 is referenced in the rubric but it applies to teacher use of technology rather than student use, as is the intention of this element.

Assessment 4:

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 1 align with the intent of Elements 3.2 & 3.3. As such, data provides evidence for meeting Elements 3.2 & 3.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 2 align with the intent of Element 3.6, but not Element 3.5. Since the data is intended to provide evidence for two elements, each which has a different intent, or candidate performance expectation, it is unclear what the data represent. As such, data from entry 2 do not provide evidence for meeting Element 3.5 or 3.6. A similar issue is noted for entry 3; data does not provide evidence for Elements 3.1, 3.5, or 3.6. A similar issue is noted for entry 6; data do not provide evidence for Elements 3.1, 3.2, or 3.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 5 align weakly with the intent of Element 3.4; criteria is generic rather than specific to planning & management in the unique physical education setting. As such, data provide partial evidence for meeting Element 3.4.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 11 does not align with the intent of Element 3.7. Specifically, the intent of Element 3.7 is for K-12 students to use technology, in the physical education environment, to achieve the lesson objectives. Since this is not the expectation, as per the scoring guide criteria, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 3.7.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 12 do not align with the intent of Element 3.7 or 5.3. Further, even if criteria did mention expectations aligned with the intent of both elements, the data would be commingled. In other words, it would be difficult for candidates, faculty, and reviewers to determine the extent to which a score represents planning/implementation using technology versus reflective ability following instruction. Data do not provide evidence for Element 3.7 or 5.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 32 align with the intent of Element 3.1. Data provide evidence for Element 3.1.

Reviewers note the data tables, as prepared for this report, are quite difficult to read for analysis and interpretation of data, as it aligns with scoring guide and NASPE Elements.

Assessment 5 is the Unit Work Sample. This assessment consists of Work Sample elements of contextual factors, pre and post assessment, learning goals, unit and lesson plans, and summary of student and sub-group learning. An alignment table and detailed rubric with four levels (the last two of which appear to align with the intent of the NASPE element for which they are intended to provide evidence). The rubric for the assignment addresses Element 3.2 in the Learning Goals section; Elements

3.1, 3.3 - 3.7 are commingled in other rubric descriptors (notably in the Lesson Plan section which includes several plans). Element 3.5 and 3.6 are present in a Sub Group Analysis section, but not in planning. Detailed data tables show that candidates score Acceptable or above on all components with one exception.

Assessment 8 is a Portfolio. This consists of introduction, philosophy, resume, discussion of Newberry Guiding Principles, and descriptions of Best Practice, Collaboration, Diversity, Ethics and Technology. The rubric identifies Elements 3.5 and 3.6; however they are commingled. Further, assignment and scoring guide appear to be based on candidates' submissions of appropriate artifacts and reflective statement aligned with what they learned and the element. As such, data do not reflect actual ability to plan or implement, but select appropriate artifacts and explain them.

Elements 3.1 - 3.5 are met. Elements 3.6 - 3.7 are met with conditions; the standard is met with conditions.

#### **Standard 4: Instructional Delivery and Management**

Physical education teacher candidates use effective communication and pedagogical skills and strategies to enhance student engagement and learning.

**Element 4.1** Demonstrate effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills across a variety of instructional formats.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jn  | jn                  | jn      |

**Element 4.2** Implement effective demonstrations, explanations, and instructional cues and prompts to link physical activity concepts to appropriate learning experiences.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jn  | jn                  | jn      |

**Element 4.3** Provide effective instructional feedback for skill acquisition, student learning, and motivation.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jn  | jn                  | jn      |

**Element 4.4** Recognize the changing dynamics of the environment and adjust instructional tasks based on student responses.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jn  | jn                  | jn      |

**Element 4.5** Utilize managerial rules, routines, and transitions to create and maintain a safe and effective learning environment.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jn  | jn                  | jn      |

**Element 4.6** Implement strategies to help students demonstrate responsible personal and social behaviors in a productive learning environment.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Decision for Standard 4:**

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sub>n</sub> | j <sub>n</sub>      | j <sub>n</sub> |

**Comments:**

This standard is addressed by Assessments 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8. For general comments on Assessments 3 and 5, see review for Standard 3, above. For general comments on Assessment 4, see review for Standard 1, above.

The narrative for Assessment 3, Lesson Plans, identifies NASPE Elements 4.1, 4.2, and 4.6 in the alignment table; however, this assignment and rubric focuses on the lesson planning rather than instruction/implementation.

Assessment 4: Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 8 do not align with the intent of Element 4.6. As such, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 4.6.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 9 are generic, but do align with the intent of Element 4.4. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.4.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 10 are generic and do not align with the intent of Element 4.4. As such, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 4.4.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 14 align with the intent of Element 4.1. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.1.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 15 align with the intent of Element 4.6. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.6.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 16 align with the intent of Element 4.5. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.5.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 17 do not align with the intent of Element 4.5. As such, data do not provide evidence for meeting Element 4.5.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 18 align with the intent of Element 4.5. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.5.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 19 align with the intent of Element 4.5. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.5.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 20 align with the intent of Element 4.1. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.1.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 31 align with the intent of Elements 1.5 & 4.3. Given the similarity of the expectations of each element, data provide evidence for meeting Element 1.5 & 4.3, even while commingled.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 33 align with the intent of Element 4.1. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.1.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 34 align with the intent of Element 4.2. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Element 4.2.

Entries 35 & 36 are intended to provide evidence for elements under Standard 4. However, entries for scoring guide items 35 - 38 are missing. Thus, reviewers cannot determine if criteria for these items align with the intent of the NASPE Element for which they are intended to provide evidence. See



additional comment regarding data table under Std 3.

Assessment 5, Unit Work Sample, identifies this assignment aligns with NASPE Elements 4.1 and 4.4 (as per the narrative and rubric). The rubric descriptors are aligned with those elements; however, Element 4.1 is comingled among four other elements and Element 4.4 is comingled with Element 5.3. The rubric descriptors do provide potential evidence and allow for discrimination among levels of candidate performance. Candidates score at or above acceptable ("Proficient") level in all but one sub-component.

Assessment 6 is a Curriculum Project. This is a class-based project in which candidates complete a reflective analysis, teaching and learning template, and student evaluation report. The assessment rubric has for levels of performance, with the last three ("Developing" and above) identified as aligning with the intent of the NASPE Element for which it is providing evidence. Finally, while Element 4.6 is identified in the rubric, implementation/instruction is not assessed.

Assessment 8 is a Portfolio. This consists of introduction, philosophy, resume, discussion of Newberry Guiding Principles, and descriptions of Best Practice, Collaboration, Diversity, Ethics and Technology. The rubric identifies Elements 4.1 to 4.6; however they are comingled in the Best Practice section; Elements 4.4 to 4.6 are comingled in the Collaboration section. See details regarding additional weaknesses in comment box under Standard 3 above. Data do not provide evidence toward elements under Standard 4.

Elements 4.1 - 4.6 are met, mostly through evidence provided from Assessment 4. Standard 4 is met.

### **Standard 5: Impact on Student Learning**

Physical education teacher candidates utilize assessments and reflection to foster student learning and inform instructional decisions.

**Element 5.1** Select or create appropriate assessments that will measure student achievement of goals and objectives.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jñ  | jñ                  | jñ      |

**Element 5.2** Use appropriate assessments to evaluate student learning before, during, and after instruction.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jñ  | jñ                  | jñ      |

**Element 5.3** Utilize the reflective cycle to implement change in teacher performance, student learning, and/or instructional goals and decisions.

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jñ  | jñ                  | jñ      |

### **Decision for Standard 5:**

|     |                     |         |
|-----|---------------------|---------|
| Met | Met with Conditions | Not Met |
| jñ  | jñ                  | jñ      |

**Comments:**

This Standard is addressed by Assessments 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8. For general comments on Assessments 3 and 5, see review for Standard 3, above. For general comments on Assessment 4, see review for Standard 1, above. For general comments on Assessments 6 and 8, see review for Standard 3, above.

Assessment 3, Lesson Plan, identified as providing evidence for Elements 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. Element 5.1 is commingled with Element 5.2. Element 5.3 is addressed in individual descriptors and provides evidence for the reflective cycle.

Assessment 4:

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 4 align with the intent of Elements 5.1 & 5.2. However, data for these 2 different expectations, as per Element 5.1 versus 5.2 is suspect. It would be helpful for candidates, faculty, and reviewers if criteria aligned with 5.1 were in a separate entry than that of criteria aligned with 5.2. As such, data provide partial evidence for meeting Elements 5.1 & 5.2.

See comments provided under Std. 3 that pertain to entry 12; data do not provide evidence.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 13 align with the intent of Elements 5.1, 5.2, & 5.3. Since each element addresses distinctly different candidate expectations, candidates, faculty, and reviewers cannot discern the extent to which the comingled data provides evidence of assessment selection (as per Element 5.1) versus implementation of assessments (as per Element 5.2) versus reflection (as per Element 5.3). As such, data do not provide evidence for any element under Std. 5.

Assessment 5: Scoring guide criteria are generic in nature rather than specific to the physical education environment and/or the NASPE Standards/Elements.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for Instructional Decision Making align with the intent of Element 5.3. However, data is comingled to provide evidence for Element 4.4. The intent of Element 4.4 is in regard to candidates' decision making during the instructional process, not decision making in regard to analysis/reflection of student data. As such, this comingled data does not provide evidence for meeting Element 5.3. Criteria for entries intended to provide evidence for Elements 5.1 & 5.2 align with the intent of each element, in a generic format, and provide evidence for the element.

Assessment 6, Curriculum Project, addresses candidates' selection of assessments and use of assessment before, during, and after instruction. However, implementation is not included in this Assessment.

Assessment 8, Portfolio, addresses elements found below NASPE Standard 5. However, some scoring guide entries target multiple elements, resulting in data that is comingled. Attempt to align each scoring guide entry with only one element so that data provides evidence for only that performance expectation.

Elements 5.1 and 5.2 are minimally met. Element 5.3 is met with conditions. Standard 5 is met with conditions.

## **Standard 6: Professionalism**

Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate dispositions essential to becoming effective professionals.

**Element 6.1** Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the belief that all students can become physically educated individuals.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Element 6.2** Participate in activities that enhance collaboration and lead to professional growth and development.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Element 6.3** Demonstrate behaviors that are consistent with the professional ethics of highly qualified teachers.

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Element 6.4** Communicate in ways that convey respect and sensitivity

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Decision for Standard 6:**

|                |                     |                |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Met            | Met with Conditions | Not Met        |
| j <sup>n</sup> | j <sup>n</sup>      | j <sup>n</sup> |

**Comments:**

Elements 6.1 - 6.4 are addressed by Assessments 4 and 8. For general comments on these Assessments, see review for Standard 5, above.

Assessment 4:

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 21 align with the intent of Elements 6.3 & 6.4. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.3 & 6.4.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 22 align with the intent of Elements 6.3. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 23 align with the intent of Elements 6.2. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.2.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 24 align with the intent of Elements 6.2. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.2.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 25 align with the intent of Elements 6.3. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 26 align with the intent of Elements 6.3. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.3.

Criteria, at the minimal level of acceptable performance (Proficient), in the scoring guide for entry 30 align with the intent of Elements 6.3. As such, data provide evidence for meeting Elements 6.4.

Entries 35 & 36 are intended to provide evidence for elements under Standard 6. However, entries for scoring guide items 35 - 38 are missing. Thus, reviewers cannot determine if criteria for these items align with the intent of the NASPE Element for which they are intended to provide evidence. See additional comment regarding data table under Std 3.

Assessment 8: See details provided in comment box under Standard 3 for weaknesses with Assessment

8. Data do not provide evidence for elements below Standard 6.

Element 6.1 is met with conditions. Elements 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 are met. Standard 6 is met with conditions.

## **PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE**

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

NASPE standards addressed in this entry could include (but are not limited to) Standard 1 and 2. Information from Assessments #1 and #2 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on content knowledge.)

Assessments 1 and 2 provide partial evidence of candidates' content knowledge while Assessment 7 provides some skill and fitness performance evidence. Revision of assessments in future report should furnish additional evidence fulfilling this expectation.

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

NASPE standards that could be addressed in this entry include but are not limited to Standards 2-6. Information from Assessments #3, #4 and #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.)

Assessments 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 provide partial evidence that candidates plan, deliver and reflect on instruction. Once concerns with comingling of elements are addressed, along with some scoring guide criteria issues (alignment of criteria with intent of element), this area should be effectively demonstrated.

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

NASPE standards that could be addressed in this entry include but are not limited to Standards 5. Information from Assessment #5 should provide primary evidence in this area. (Assessments #6-#8 may also focus on student learning.)

Evidence of candidate effects on P-12 student learning is not apparent. Revisions to assessments should address this.

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

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

The program report indicates that faculty evaluate assessment evidence and use it to improve the PETE program. Recent changes in courses, fitness testing (Fitnessgram), Lesson Plan format, and alignment with SC content standards attest to this process. New rubrics have been developed. Faculty meet regularly and make an effort to ensure program effectiveness. A new faculty member with PK-12 teaching experience has been hired and an assessment course added to the program.

## **PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Areas for consideration**

## **PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

### F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

Several faculty have Physical Education backgrounds and some have PK-12 experience, but most faculty do not have PhDs.

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

## Part G: DECISION

### Decision:

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

## NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

### The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY  
02 / 01 / 2013

**Subsequent action by the institution:** To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 3/15/11, 9/15/11, 3/15/12, or 9/15/12. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 3/15/12 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY  
09 / 15 / 2012

**The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.**

1. Avoid comingling of elements within any one entry of a scoring guide (across all assessments).
2. For Assessments 2, 3, 4 and 8, provide an alignment of rubric levels with NASPE Levels of Performance (e.g., what level aligns with "Acceptable," what is "Unacceptable").

3. Revise Assessment 4: Items 31-38 do not match from one section to the next.
4. Clarify reference to NASPE Standard/Elements in the Assessment 4 rubric.
5. Clearly represent Elements 3.7 and 4.6 within narratives, rubrics and data.
6. Provide and interpret data for at least one administration of any new/revised assessment instrument/rubric.
7. Based on data from the revised assessment, Section V of the report should be resubmitted.

**Please click "Next"**

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.