

ASSESSMENT DATA REPORT

FALL 2007-SPRING 2008



Table of Contents

Initial Programs –Entry: Admission to the School of Education	
GPA at Entry	2
Admission Rubric: Transcript	2-3
Admission Rubric: Writing	3
Admission Disposition Rubric Results	4
PRAXIS I Test Results	5
Initial Programs-Midpoint: Application to Student Teaching	
GPA at Midpoint	6
Midpoint Disposition	6
Midpoint Portfolio	7
Initial Programs-Exit: Student Teaching/Internship	
GPA at Student Teaching/Internship	8
INTASC Standards 1-10	8-10
Praxis I Test Results	10-11
Advanced Programs	
GPA at Entry	13
Admission Disposition Results	13
Essay Assessment at Admission	14
GRE Scores	14-15
Advanced Programs-Midpoint: Admission to Midpoint Course	
GPA at Midpoint	16
Midpoint Disposition Results	16
Midpoint Portfolio	17
Advanced Programs-Exit: Graduation	
GPA at Exit	18
Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio	18
Thesis/Special Projects/Oral Defense	18
Unit Assessment	
Exit Survey	20
Exit Survey Form	21
Exit Assessment-Master Teacher	22
Exit Assessment-Form	23
Employer Survey	24
Student Involved Assessment at the University Level Undergraduate	25-27
Student Involvement Assessment at the University Level Graduate	28-30
Alumni Survey	31-34

INITIAL PROGRAMS

**Initial Programs-Entry
Admission to the School of Education**

Table 1

Program	No. Applied	No. Admitted
ECE	31	30 (97%)
ELEM	20	17 (85%)
SEED	26	23 (88%)
SPED	5	4 (80%)
SOE	82	74 (89%)

GPA at Entry

Table 2

Program	N	n	Average	Range
ECE	30	30 (100%)	3.19	2.704-3.089
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	3.07	2.75-3.43
SEED	23	23 (100%)	3.16	2.83-3.73
SPED	4	4 (100%)	3.39	3.120-3.51
SOE	74	74 (100%)	3.2	2.70-3.73

Admission Rubric: Transcript

Table 3

Program	N	n	Content Knowledge (KS1)		
			T	A	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	13 (43%)	15 (50%)	2 (7%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	5 (29%)	11 (65%)	1 (6%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	7 (30%)	16 (70%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	26 (35%)	45 (61%)	3 (4%)

Table 4

Program	N	n	Pedagogical Knowledge (KS2)		
			T	A	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	7 (23%)	21 (70%)	2 (7%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	3 (18%)	12 (71%)	2 (12%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	6 (26%)	16 (89%)	1 (4%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	18 (24%)	51 (69%)	5 (7%)

Table 5

Program	N	n	Adaptations and Innovations (RDM1)		
			T	A	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	8 (28%)	21 (72%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	2 (12%)	15 (88%)	0 (0%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	5 (22%)	18 (78%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	18 (24%)	56 (76%)	0 (0%)

Legend: T= Target A= Acceptable U= Unacceptable

Admission Rubric: Writing

Table 6

Program	N	n	Language Processes (EC3)		
			T	A	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	8 (27%)	21 (70%)	1 (3%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	2 (12%)	15 (88%)	0 (0%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	12 (16%)	60 (81%)	2 (3%)

Table 7

Program	N	n	Affective Skills (EC6)		
			T	A	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	7 (23%)	22 (73%)	1 (3%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	3 (18%)	14 (82%)	0 (0%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	12 (16%)	61 (82%)	1 (1%)

Table 8

Program	N	n	Holistic Perspective (RDM2)		
			T	A	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	6 (20%)	23 (77%)	1 (3%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	2 (12%)	14 (82%)	1 (6%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	0 (0%)	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	9 (12%)	61 (82%)	4 (5%)

Legend: T= Target A= Acceptable U= Unacceptable

Admission Disposition Rubric

Table 9

Program	N	n	Knowledgeable Scholar			
			D	P	B	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	20 (67%)	10 (30%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	9 (56%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	16 (70%)	7 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	48 (65%)	24 (32%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)

Table 10

Program	N	n	Effective Communicator			
			D	P	B	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	14 (47%)	17 (53%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	6 (38%)	10 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	16 (70%)	7 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	39 (53%)	35 (47%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 11

Program	N	n	Reflective Decision-Maker			
			D	P	B	U
ECE	30	30 (100%)	21 (68%)	9 (29%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	17	17 (100%)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	23	23 (100%)	15 (65%)	8 (35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	74	74 (100%)	45 (61%)	28 (38%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)

Legend: D= Distinguished P=Proficient B=Basic U=Unacceptable

Praxis I Result at Admission

Table 12

Program	N	n	Reading			
			Pass	Fail	Mean	Range
ECE	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
ELEM	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SEED	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SPED	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SOE	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)

Table 13

Program	N	n	Writing			
			Pass	Fail	Mean	Range
ECE	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
ELEM	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SEED	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SPED	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SOE	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)

Table 14

Program	N	n	Math			
			Pass	Fail	Mean	Range
ECE	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
ELEM	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SEED	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SPED	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)
SOE	0	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)

**Initial Programs Midpoint
Application to Student Teaching**

GPA at Midpoint

Table 1

Program	N	n	Avg.	Range
ECE	14	14 (100%)	3.44	3.28-3.65
ECE (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	3.15	3.15
ELEM	28	28 (100%)	3.14	2.74-3.54
SEED	39	39 (100%)	3.34	2.61-4.0
SPED	3	3 (100%)	3.36	3.16-3.48
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	3.02	3.02
SOE	86	86 (100%)	3.29	2.61-4.0

Midpoint Disposition

Tables 2-4 reflect the results from Spring 2008 only

Table 2

Program	N	n	Knowledgeable Scholar			
			D	P	B	U
ECE	5	5 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	16	11 (69%)	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	19	7 (37%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	3 (75%)	1 (33%)	2 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	44	26 (60%)	17 (65%)	9 (35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3

Program	N	n	Effective Communicator			
			D	P	B	U
ECE	5	5 (100%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	16	11 (69%)	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	19	7 (37%)	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	3 (75%)	1 (33%)	2 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	44	26 (60%)	14 (54%)	12 (46%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 4

Program	N	n	Reflective Decision-Maker			
			D	P	B	U
ECE	5	5 (100%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	16	11 (69%)	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	19	7 (37%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	3 (75%)	1 (33%)	2 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	44	26 (60%)	16 (61%)	9 (35%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)

Legend: D= Distinguished P=Proficient B=Basic U=Unacceptable

Midpoint Portfolio

Tables 5-8 reflect data collected in both spring and fall semester

Table 5

Program	N	n	Content Knowledge		
			T	A	U
ECE	15	5 (16%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	28	3 (11%)	2 (67%)	0 (33%)	0 (0%)
SEED	39	10 (40%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)
SPED	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
SOE	86	22 (25%)	12 (54%)	10 (46%)	0 (0%)

Table 6

Program	N	n	Pedagogical Knowledge		
			T	A	U
ECE	15	5 (16%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	28	3 (11%)	2 (67%)	0 (33%)	0 (0%)
SEED	39	10 (40%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)
SPED	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
SOE	86	22 (25%)	12 (54%)	10 (46%)	0 (0%)

Table 7

Program	N	n	Pedagogical Content Knowledge		
			T	A	U
ECE	15	5 (16%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	28	3 (11%)	2 (67%)	0 (33%)	0 (0%)
SEED	39	10 (40%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)
SPED	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
SOE	86	22 (25%)	12 (54%)	10 (46%)	0 (0%)

Table 8

Program	N	n	Professional Knowledge		
			T	A	U
ECE	15	5 (16%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	28	3 (11%)	2 (67%)	0 (33%)	0 (0%)
SEED	39	10 (40%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0 (0%)
SPED	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
SOE	86	22 (25%)	12 (54%)	10 (46%)	0 (0%)

Initial Program Exit Student Teaching/Internship

GPA at Student Teaching/ Internship

Table 1

Program	N	n	GPA	Range
ECE	31	31 (100%)	3.48	2.89 - 3.87
ELEM	22	22 (100%)	3.26	2.97 - 3.8
ELEM (IDP)	2	2(100%)	2.93	2.80-3.02
SEED	15	15 (100%)	3.45	2.74 - 4.0
SPED	3	3 (100%)	3.46	3.01 - 3.94
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	2.90	2.90
SOE	73	73 (100%)	3.41	2.80-3.94

INTASC Standards Completed by Classroom Supervisors

INTASC Standard 1

Table 2

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	17 (85%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
SPED	3	3(100%)	3(100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	26 (76%)	8 (24%)	0 (0%)

INTASC Standard 2

Table 3

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	5 (71%)	1 (29%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	1 (17%)	5 (83%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	23 (68%)	11 (32%)	0 (0%)

INTASC Standard 3

Table 4

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	16 (80%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	22 (65)	11 (32%)	1 (3%)

INTASC Standard 4**Table**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	19 (95%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	27 (79%)	6 (18%)	1 (3%)

INTASC Standard 5**Table 6**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	16 (80%)	4 (20%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	23 (68%)	11 (32%)	0 (0%)

INTASC Standard 6**Table 7**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	17 (85%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	24 (71%)	10 (29%)	0 (0%)

INTASC Standard 7**Table 8**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	17 (85%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	26 (76%)	8 (24%)	0 (0%)

Legend: T= Target A= Acceptable U= Unacceptable

INTASC Standard 8**Table 9**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	21 (62%)	13 (38%)	0 (0%)

INTASC Standard 9**Table 10**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	17 (85%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	2 (33%)	4 (77%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	24 (71%)	9 (26%)	1 (3%)

INTASC Standard 10**Table 11**

Program	N	n	T	A	U
ECE	31	20 (65%)	17 (85%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
ELEM	22	6 (27%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SEED	15	6 (40%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED (IDP)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	72	34 (47%)	25 (74%)	8 (24%)	1 (2%)

Legend: T= Target A= Acceptable U= Unacceptable

PRAXIS I Test Results: Reading**Table 15**

Program	N	n	Reading			
			Pass	Fail	Mean	Range
ECE	31	15(48%)	7(47%)	8(53%)	176.6	160 - 168
ELEM	24	9 (38%)	5 (55%)	4 (44%)	178.2	169-183
SEED	21	7 (33%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	179.83	0-183
PE	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	181	181
SPED	4	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	176.3	0 - 182
SOE	82	36 (44%)	23 (64%)	13 (36%)	178.38	160-183

PRAXIS I Test Results: Writing

Table 16

Program	N	n	Writing			
			Pass	Fail	Mean	Range
ECE	31	14 (45%)	7 (50%)	7 (50%)	174.1	163-178
ELEM	24	8 (33%)	5 (62%)	3 (38%)	172.2	168-174
SEED	21	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	178.2	0-184
PE	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	176.3	173-180
SPED	4	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	176.5	0-179
SOE	82	34 (41%)	24 (71%)	10 (29%)	175.46	163-184

PRAXIS I Test Results: Math

Table 17

Program	N	n	Math			
			Pass	Fail	Mean	Range
ECE	31	14 (45%)	8 (57%)	6 (43%)	176.5	161-183
ELEM	24	8 (33%)	7 (88%)	1 (12%)	175.3	169-182
SEED	21	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	180.4	0-186
PE	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	179	176-182
SPED	4	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	179	0-186
SOE	82	34 (41%)	27 (79%)	7 (21%)	178.04	161-186

ADVANCED PROGRAM

Advanced Program GPA at Entry

Table 1

Program	N	N	GPA	Range
Admin & Sup	6	6 (100%)	3.17	2.98-4.0
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	3.97	3.9-4.0
SPED	15	15 (100%)	3.68	3.25-4.0
SEED	9	9 (100%)	3.75	3.36-4.0
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	3.88	3.78-4.0
SOE	40	40 (100%)	3.1	2.98-4.0

Admission Disposition Results

Table 2

Program	N	n	Knowledgeable Scholar			
			D	P	B	U
Admin	6	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
SEED	9	9 (100%)	6 (66%)	3 (34%)	(0%)	(0%)
SPED	15	15 (100%)	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	(0%)	(0%)
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
SOE	40	40 (100%)	31 (78%)	9 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3

Program	N	n	Effective Communicator			
			D	P	B	U
Admin	6	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
SEED	9	9 (100%)	6 (66%)	3 (34%)	(0%)	(0%)
SPED	15	15 (100%)	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	(0%)	(0%)
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
SOE	40	40 (100%)	31 (78%)	9 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 4

Program	N	n	Reflective Decision-Maker			
			D	P	B	U
Admin	6	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
SEED	9	9 (100%)	6 (66%)	3 (34%)	(0%)	(0%)
SPED	15	15 (100%)	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	(0%)	(0%)
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	(0%)	(0%)
SOE	40	40 (100%)	31 (78%)	9 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

**Advanced Program-Entry
Essay Assessment at Admission**

Organization

Table 5

Program	N	n	T	A	U
Admin	6	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
SEED	9	9 (100%)	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0(0%)
SPED	15	15 (100%)	10 (67%)	5 (33%)	0(0%)
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0(0%)
SOE	40	40 (100%)	26 (65%)	14 (35%)	0(0%)

Writing Skills

Table 6

Program	N	n	T	A	U
Admin	6	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3(43%)	0 (0%)
SEED	9	9 (100%)	5 (55%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
SPED	15	15 (100%)	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
SOE	40	40 (100%)	23 (57%)	17 (43%)	0 (0%)

Adherence to Writing Prompt

Table 7

Program	N	n	T	A	U
Admin	6	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3(43%)	0 (0%)
SEED	9	9 (100%)	5 (55%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
SPED	15	15 (100%)	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
SOE	40	40 (100%)	26 (65%)	14 (35%)	0 (0%)

Legend: T= Target A= Acceptable U= Unacceptable

GRE Scores at Admission

Table 8

Program	N	n	GRE: Verbal	
			Mean	Range
Admin	6	6 (100%)	300	270-650
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	345.8	290-420
SEED	9	9 (100%)	498	340-650
SPED	15	15 (100%)	358	230-390
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	200	220-350
SOE	40	40 (100%)	340	220-650

Table 9

Program	N	n	GRE: Quantitative	
			Mean	Range
Admin	6	6 (100%)	306.7	220-560
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	350	250-450
SEED	9	9 (100%)	590	480-710
SPED	15	15 (100%)	339	200-390
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	200	220-350
SOE	40	40 (100%)	357	200-710

Table 10

Program	N	n	GRE: Analytical	
			Mean	Range
Admin	6	6 (100%)	241.7	300-400
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	359	313-450
SEED	9	9 (100%)	533	400-660
SPED	15	15 (100%)	350	250-400
TESOL	3	3 (100%)	350	300-350
SOE	40	40 (100%)	366	250-660

Advanced Program- Midpoint

GPA at Midpoint

Table 1

Program	N	N	GPA	Range
Admin & Sup	29	29 (100%)	3.65	2.67-4.0
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	3.81	3.71-3.93
SPED	22	22 (100%)	3.68	3.68-4.0
SEED	4	4 (100%)	3.67	3.17- 4.0
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	3.47	3.42-3.85
SOE	65	10 (100%)	3.66	2.67-4.0

Midpoint Disposition Results

Table 2

Program	N	n	Knowledgeable Scholar			
			D	P	B	U
Admin & Sup	29	10 (34%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	22	22 (100%)	20 (91%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	35 (74%)	12 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3

Program	N	n	Effective Communicator			
			D	P	B	U
Admin & Sup	29	10 (34%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	22	22 (100%)	22 (100%)	0(0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	37 (79%)	10 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 4

Program	N	n	Reflective Decision Maker			
			D	P	B	U
Admin & Sup	29	10 (34%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SPED	22	22 (100%)	20 (91%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SEED	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	35 (74%)	12 (26%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Legend: D= Distinguished P=Proficient B=Basic U=Unacceptable

Midpoint Portfolios

Table 5

Program	N	n	Content Knowledge		
			T	A	U
Admin	29	10 (34%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
SPED	22	22 (100%)	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	0 (0%)
SsED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	3 (520%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	31 (66%)	16 (35%)	0 (0%)

Table 6

Program	N	n	Content Knowledge		
			T	A	U
Admin	29	10 (34%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
SEED	22	22 (100%)	15 (68%)	7 (32%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	26 (55%)	21 (44%)	0 (0%)

Table 7

Program	N	n	Content Knowledge		
			T	A	U
Admin	29	10 (34%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
SEED	22	22 (100%)	20 (55%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	26 (65%)	14 (35%)	0 (0%)

Table 8

Program	N	n	Content Knowledge		
			T	A	U
Admin	29	10 (34%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0 (0%)
Lang & Lit	7	7 (100%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)
SEED	22	22 (100%)	5 (55%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)
SPED	4	4 (100%)	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	4	4 (100%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
SOE	65	47 (72%)	26 (65%)	14 (35%)	0 (0%)

Legend: T= Target

A= Acceptable

U= Unacceptable

Advanced Program Exit

GPA at Exit

Table 1

Program	N	n	GPA	Range
Admin & Sup	10	10(100%)	3.92	3.92-4.0
Lang & Lit	4	4 (100%)	3.92	3.82-4.0
SEED	7	7 (100%)	3.7	3.5-4.0
SPED	7	7 (100%)	3.77	3.54.0
TESOL	2	2 (100%)	3.93	3.86-4.0
SOE	30	30 (100%)	3.88	3.5-4.0

Table 2

Program	N	n	Comprehensive Exam/Portfolio			
			D	P	B	U
Admin and Sup	10	7 (70%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lang and Lit	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Secondary Education	7	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Special Education	7	7 (100%)	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	30	25 (93%)	10 (40%)	15 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3

Program	N	n	Oral Defense/Thesis/Special Project			
			D	P	B	U
Admin and Sup	10	7 (70%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Lang and Lit	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Secondary Education	7	6 (86%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Special Education	7	7 (100%)	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TESOL	2	1 (50%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
SOE	30	25 (93%)	12 (60%)	8 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Legend: D= Distinguished P=Proficient B=Basic U=Unacceptable

UNIT DATA

Initial Programs

Exit Survey Completed by the Student Teacher

Table 1

Scale: 4= Always 3= Most of the Time 2= Sometimes 1=Never					
During Student Teaching I...	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
	Early Childhood	Elementary	Secondary	SPED	SOE
	n=12	n=9	n=10	n=1	n=32
1. Read books ...	3.83	3.89	3.7	4	3.81
2. Read articles on ...	3.25	3.67	2.6	3	3.16
3. Used my knowledge of ...	3.75	3.89	3.4	3	3.66
4. Connected the lessons I ...	3.83	3.78	3.4	3	3.66
5. Did computer integration ...	1.83	3.56	3.3	3	2.81
6. Made sure the activities I ...	3.53	4	3.8	3	3.75
7. Use my students' background experiences...	3.97	3.67	3.5	3	3.69
8. Participated actively in school ...	3.97	4	3.6	4	3.84
9. Established standards of ...	4	3.78	3.5	4	3.78
10. Interacted with ...	3.58	3.56	3.1	4	3.45
11. Asked thought-provoking ...	3.5	3.78	3.2	4	3.5
12. <i>Drew out</i> the concepts from ...	3.58	3.78	3.2	4	3.53
13. Talked to each student to ...	3.5	3.78	3	4	3.44
14. Participated in parent-teacher ...	3.8	3.89	3.8	3	3.81
15. Monitored student ...	3.667	3.78	3.4	3	3.59
16. Planned and carried ...	3.67	3.78	3.1	3	3.5
17. Made sure to find ...	3.83	3.89	3.2	3	3.63
18. Linked my assessment plan ...	3.83	3.89	3.5	3	3.72
19. Consulted with others ...	3.97	3.89	3.3	3	3.69
20. Maintained student ...	3.5	4	3.4	3	3.59
21. Made modifications/adjustments ...	3.58	4	3.5	3	3.66
22. Assessed student learning ...	3.58	4	3.4	3	3.63
23. Used student assessment ...	3.75	3.89	3.4	3	3.66
24. Used multiple assessments ...	3.67	4	3.5	3	3.69
25. Discussed my expectations ...	3.58	3.67	3.3	3	3.5
AVERAGE	3.62	3.83	3.36	3.28	3.59

**Initial Programs
Exit Survey Form**

Table 2

During Student Teaching I.....	4	3	2	1
1. Read books and reference materials about the <i>topic</i> I was assigned to teach				
2. Read articles on best practices to stay current on the subject I teach.				
3. Used my knowledge of children's growth and development and theories of learning in planning my lessons				
4. Connected the lessons I taught with other subject area.				
5. Did computer integration in my teaching.				
6. Made sure the activities I carried out matched my lesson objectives.				
7. Use my students' background experiences, needs & interests in designing learning activities for different groups of learners in the classroom.				
8. Participated actively in school and community activity and used the knowledge I gained from it to understand my profession better.				
9. Established standards of conduct with my students.				
10. Interacted with parents/guardians in regard to their child's learning				
11. Asked thought-provoking questions during discussions				
12. <i>Drew out</i> the concepts from the students				
13. Talked to each student to find out the difficulty				
14. Participated in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings and student teaching seminars				
15. Monitored student comprehension through				
16. Planned and carried out language activities (listening, speaking, reading, writing) for all students, including those with special needs and LOTE students				
17. Made sure to find out for myself what worked and did not work in my teaching.				
18. Linked my assessment plan with my instructional goals.				
19. Consulted with others (master teachers, supervisor, other teachers, colleagues) to reflect on my progress for self-improvement.				
20. Maintained student records and used to guide my teaching.				
21. Made modifications/adjustments in my lesson plans during my teaching.				
22. Assessed student learning after my teaching.				
23. Used student assessment outcomes in improving my teaching.				
24. Used multiple assessments to gain a better understanding of the student's total performance				
25. Discussed my expectations for achievement with my students.				

Initial Programs

Exit Assessment
Completed by the Master Teacher

My Student Teacher....	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
	Early Childhood n=9	Elementary n=4	Secondary n=8	Special Education n=2	SOE n=23
1. Read books and...	3.95	3.75	3.9	4	3.9
2. Discussed with me ...	3.35	3.5	3.05	3.5	3.35
3. Used knowledge of ...	3.8	4	3.6	4	3.85
4. Connected the lessons ...	3.95	4	3.7	4	3.9
5. Did computer technology	3.35	3.5	3.2	3	3.2
6. Made sure the activities	3.55	3.75	3.55	3.5	3.58
7. Used his/her knowledge	4	3.75	3.7	4	3.86
8. Participated actively...	3.8	3.75	3.6	4	3.78
9. Established standards...	4	3.75	3.9	4	3.91
10. Interacted with ...	3.95	3.75	3.5	4	3.8
11. Asked thought-provoking ...	3.6	3.75	3.55	3.5	3.6
12. <i>Drew out</i> the...	3.8	3.75	3.6	4	3.78
13. Talked to each	3.75	3.25	3.35	3.5	3.46
14. Participated in...	3.95	3.75	3.7	4	3.85
15. Monitored student ...	3.85	3.75	3.8	4	3.85
16. Planned and carried out	3.85	3.75	3.7	4	3.82
17. Made sure to find...	3.75	3.75	3.55	3.5	3.64
18. Linked my...	4	4	3.8	4	3.95
19. Consulted with ...	3.55	3.75	3.45	3.5	3.56
20. Maintained student ...	3.95	4	3.8	4	3.94
21. Made modifications...	3.85	4	3.8	4	3.91
22. Assessed student...	4	3.75	3.7	4	3.86
23. Used student ...	3.95	3.75	3.6	4	3.83
24. Used multiple ...	3.8	3.75	3.7	4	3.81
25. Discussed my ...	3.6	3.6	3.45	3.5	3.54
Average	3.81	3.754	3.61	3.82	3.75

Initial Programs

Exit Assessment Form

My Student Teacher....	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
	Early Childhood	Elementary	Secondary	Special Education	SOE
1. Read books and reference materials about the <i>topic</i> I assigned him/her to teach					
2. Discussed with me articles on <i>best practices</i> during our benchmark conferences.					
3. Used knowledge of children's growth and development and theories of learning in planning his/her lessons					
4. Connected the lessons with other subject areas and practical experiences					
5. Did computer technology integration in his/her teaching.					
6. Made sure the activities he/she carried out matched his/her lesson objectives.					
7. Used his/her knowledge of my students' background experiences, needs, and interests in designing learning activities for different groups of learners in my classroom.					
8. Participated actively in school and community activities and used the knowledge gained from it to understand his/her profession better.					
9. Established standards of conduct with my students.					
10. Interacted with parents/guardians in regard to their child's learning					
11. Asked thought-provoking questions during discussions					
12. <i>Drew out</i> the concepts from the students					
13. Talked to each student to find out the difficulty					
14. Participated in parent-teacher conferences, school meetings and student teaching seminars					
15. Monitored student comprehension through					
16. Planned and carried out language activities (listening, speaking, reading, writing) for all students, including those with special needs and LOTE students					
17. Made sure to find out for myself what worked and did not work in my teaching.					
18. Linked my assessment plan with my instructional goals.					
19. Consulted with others (master teachers, supervisor, other teachers, colleagues) to reflect on my progress for self-improvement.					
20. Maintained student records and used to guide my teaching.					
21. Made modifications/adjustments in my lesson plans during my teaching.					
22. Assessed student learning after my teaching.					
23. Used student assessment outcomes in improving my teaching.					
24. Used multiple assessments to gain a better understanding of the student's total performance					
25. Discussed my expectations for achievement with my students.					
Average					

Employer Survey

Table 3

Teacher Skill Evaluated	Elementary	Secondary	All Schools	Elementary	Secondary	All Schools
	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
	SY 2006-2007			SY 2007-2008		
Content Knowledge	n=12	N=15	n=27	n=10	N=11	n=21
1. Broad knowledge of subject matter	3.81	4.06	3.93	3.3	4	3.66
2. Knowledge of subject content for grade level taught	3.7	4.13	3.91	3.2	4	3.62
3. Classroom organization	3.58	3.93	3.75	3.2	3.91	3.57
4. Preparation of lessons	3.5	3.66	3.58	3.4	3.91	3.67
5. Presentation of content material	3.72	3.85	3.78	3.1	3.82	3.47
6. Pursues organized plan to cover required content	3.81	3.85	3.83	2.9	3.73	3.33
AVERAGE	3.57	3.9	3.74	3.18	3.89	3.55
Pedagogical Knowledge	n=12	N=14	n=26	n=10	N=11	n=21
7. Uses classroom time effectively	3.5	3.78	3.64	3.11	3.73	3.45
8. Actively engages students in learning process	3.54	3.78	3.66	3.4	3.82	3.62
9. Integrates curriculum	2.91	3.78	3.34	2.9	3.82	3.38
10. Varies instructional strategies	3.36	3.64	3.5	2.8	3.82	3.33
11. Effective classroom management and discipline	3.08	3.64	3.36	3.2	3.73	3.48
12. Uses technology in the workplace	3.16	3.71	3.43	2.2	3.09	2.67
13. Ability to identify special needs students and refer them to appropriate channel	3.58	3.57	3.57	2.6	3.64	3.14
14. Ability to accommodate needs of diverse students	2.91	3.64	3.27	3.1	3.27	3.19
15. Ability to accommodate needs of students with disabilities	2.81	3.64	3.22	2.8	3.545	3.19
AVERAGE	3.07	3.69	3.38	2.9	3.61	3.27
Professional Knowledge	n=12	N=14	n=26	n=10	N=11	n=21
16. Ability to communicate and work with parents	3.08	3.85	3.46	3.5	3.45	3.47
17. Ability to communicate and work with colleagues	3.5	3.92	3.71	3.6	3.64	3.62
18. Ability to communicate and work with administration	3.58	3.92	3.75	3.8	3.73	3.76
19. Professionalism in demeanor and attitude	3.33	4.07	3.7	3.5	4	3.81
20. Responsive to needs of students and co-workers	3.41	3.85	3.63	3.7	3.91	3.76
21. Responsive to constructive criticism	3.41	3.85	3.63	3.7	3.82	3.81
22. Joins in self evaluation and professional development	3.16	3.85	3.50	3.6	3.73	3.67
AVERAGE	3.35	3.9	3.63	3.63	3.75	3.69
Impact on Student Learning	n=12	N=14	n=26	n=10	N=11	n=21
23. Ability to make "action plans" based on student outcomes	2.83	3.28	3.05	2.9	3.18	3.05
24. Provides students with immediate feedback	3.5	3.64	3.57	3.3	3.27	3.29
25. Effectively assess student performance	3.08	3.57	3.32	3.2	3.55	3.38
26. Uses assessment results to improve instruction	3.16	3.5	3.33	3.2	3.09	3.14
27. Overall satisfaction with preparation of the first year teacher	3.33	3.85	3.59	3.4	3.09	3.67
AVERAGE	3.18	3.57	3.37	3.2	3.4	3.31

Student-Involved Assessment at the University Level: Undergraduate Feedback on the Teacher Education Admissions Process and Criteria

O. Randall Braman, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of Guam

Introduction

Undergraduates applying to the teacher education programs at the University of Guam are required to complete a rigorous admissions process and submit various forms of evidence in order to satisfy predetermined admissions criteria. These criteria include favorable evaluations from various faculty members, passing test scores, quality writing and other work samples, and a 2.5 grade point average. The admissions process involves a complex combination of related and unrelated steps, within and between the various criteria. I was asked to conduct a focus group session of newly admitted students to get feedback on their experiences in order to gain insight on the effectiveness of the admissions process and criteria from a student's perspective. I agreed to this proposition because, as a new faculty member in the School of Education, I thought that I was well-positioned to be a non-partial and fairly "bias-free" facilitator for this kind of information gathering. Furthermore, a focus group seemed to be a particularly appropriate way to begin this exploration.

Methodology

"Focus groups are sets of individuals with similar characteristics or having shared experiences (e.g., beginning teachers) who sit down with a moderator to discuss a topic" (Hatch, 2002, p. 24). This qualitative method is particularly appropriate to the given task in that it not only solicits feedback from individuals, which may be limited in and of itself, but also generates additional data through the interaction that takes place between various members of the group (Hatch, 2002, p. 132). Undergraduate students might feel intimidated if asked to provide critical feedback through isolated interviews, or may share very little on written surveys. Through the focus group process, however, they may feel encouraged to share freely and openly as they are supported through the validation of their peers.

Procedure

In order to select participants for the focus group, I first requested a list of the most recently admitted students to various undergraduate teaching programs. Upon receipt of this list, I decided to contact potential participants directly by visiting the classes in which they were currently enrolled. I surmised that by making personal invitations I was more likely to form a group that would give me balanced feedback. If I had simply conducted a mass mailing and relied on students to self-select their participation in the group, it may have resulted in an overrepresentation of more aggressive, vocal, and/or negative types. By encouraging students to participate who otherwise may not have participated, I was hoping to give voice to students who might normally not speak out. This strategy seemed to have worked in that the resulting group seemed to represent a balance of aggressive and passive, introverted and extroverted, and positive and negative types.

In selecting the specific students, I identified three foundations courses where there were the greatest number and variety of newly admitted students. I was able to make direct contact with six of the eleven students I had identified from the list. Four of these six students participated in the focus group and the remaining two provided me with written feedback through email. An additional student who I had identified on the list, but with whom I did not make direct contact,

participated in the focus group session. She had been invited by one of the students I had directly contacted, and who I had asked to pass on the invitation letter to others identified on my list. The invitation letter read as follows:

Dear Student,

As a recently admitted candidate to the teacher education program, your feedback is needed. You are invited to participate in a focus group interview where you and your colleagues will have the opportunity to reflect upon and share your opinions regarding the SOE admissions requirements and process. Your specific comments will be used to evaluate the current admissions criteria and procedure, but will also remain anonymous, and can be withdrawn by you at any time. Also, you may withdraw your participation at any time during the interview. The session will be no longer than one hour and refreshments will be provided. If possible, the session will occur on **Wednesday, November 12th, at 12:30pm in Room 106**, or at another date/time deemed convenient for most of the participants. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Dr. Randall Braman

Findings

Five students attended the focus group interview held during the time designated on the invitation letter. The session lasted around 45 minutes. As previously mentioned, four of the students were among the six that were directly contacted. The two remaining students who were personally invited but who could not attend the focus group session did provide feedback in writing through email. This feedback, since it was consistent with the feedback provided in the focus group session, has been incorporated in to these findings. Two of the students who participated in the focus group are elementary education majors; one is a special education major; one is a physical education major; and one is an English and secondary education major. The two students who provided feedback in writing are elementary education majors. I will describe the findings under the following two major headings:

Admissions Criteria. The students deemed the various forms of evidence required for admissions in to the teacher education program as completely appropriate and sufficient. They identified five forms of evidence, each of which they viewed as relevant and important in determining their qualifications for acceptance in to the teacher education programs:

1. Disposition rubrics indicating various levels of the candidate's knowledge and skills completed by two faculty members within and one faculty member outside of the School of Education;
2. The Praxis I exam;
3. An impromptu essay;
4. Course work samples; and
5. A 2.5 grade point average.

Admissions Process. The students strongly voiced the opinion that the admissions process is in need of considerable repair. The overall theme of the discussion was that the admissions process provides information that is "too little too late," and even inaccurate and misleading. The students said that they had not known when they were to apply. Most of the focus group reported becoming aware of the admissions process only through "word of mouth" outside the context of more formal channels. They heard about it from other students outside of class. One student commented that, "The admissions process wasn't mentioned at all in my classes. It seems it should have come up in ED 110." Although there was one student who said, "I found out about the admissions process from my advisor," he also admitted that his program was smaller than

others and that perhaps he received more personalized attention. Another student said she asked her advisor for information about the admissions process, and her advisor replied, "Just wait until it's posted." The students reported that when the admissions information was finally posted, it was only two or three weeks prior to the first submission deadlines. Furthermore, the initial posting contained incorrect deadlines and needed to be updated. "I was confused on what to do first and which paper to follow because there were several papers that were given out. For example, one had all the instructions and the other only had half."

Regarding the process for some of the above listed criteria, these specific comments were made:

"It was hard to find time to ask for help from the busy professors to fill out the rubrics."

"I transferred from GCC and had trouble finding instructors who knew me well enough to complete the rubrics. I finally asked one of my instructors from GCC."

"It was difficult to get outside faculty to fill out the forms. They gave me a hard time."

"It's [the disposition rubrics] a weird requirement. How do they know us so early in our program?"

"I did not know how or what to study for the Praxis."

"I never received feedback on my impromptu essay. I would like to know how I did."

"Who reviews the work samples we upload on Live Techs?"

"Someone told me we were to be interviewed. Is that part of the process?"

Discussion

The focus group conversation revealed that there is a significant amount of confusion and frustration among students concerning the admissions process. The students firmly maintained that the admissions criteria were sound, even when pressed to consider otherwise, but they were quick to express their criticisms of the admissions process. Overall, they felt the admissions process should have been communicated earlier and more often within the context of their courses, particularly ED110, Introduction to Teaching. One student suggested that this is where the admissions criteria and process should be introduced and explained. All the focus group members agreed that the admissions process and criteria should be more clearly and firmly embedded within the formal channels of the program, and not left to the devices of "word of mouth" and/or inaccurate "postings."

This entirely qualitative study suggests the need to demystify the teacher education admissions process in the minds of students and faculty alike. There are additional examples outside the scope of this study that could provide even further evidence to support this. In counseling we sometimes say, "The first step to recovery is to admit to having a problem." The problem is that the admissions process is not being communicated openly, clearly, and consistently to students. It is now time to propose and test possible solution.

**Student-Involved Assessment at the University Level:
Feedback on the School of Education Graduate Admissions Process and Criteria**

O. Randall Braman, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of Guam

Introduction

Post-graduate students applying to the various graduate programs in education at the University of Guam are required to complete a rigorous admissions process and submit various forms of evidence in order to satisfy predetermined admissions criteria. These criteria include favorable evaluations from various faculty members, a score of 900 or better on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), quality writing samples, and a 3.0 or better undergraduate grade point average. After gaining insights regarding the undergraduate admissions experience through a targeted focus group, I was asked to conduct another focus group session in order to get additional insights on the effectiveness of the admissions process and criteria from a graduate student's perspective. I once again agreed to this proposition because, as a new faculty member in the School of Education, I thought that I was well-positioned to be a non-partial and fairly "bias-free" facilitator for this kind of information gathering. Furthermore, a focus group seemed to be a particularly appropriate way to continue this exploration.

Methodology

"Focus groups are sets of individuals with similar characteristics or having shared experiences (e.g., beginning teachers) who sit down with a moderator to discuss a topic" (Hatch, 2002, p. 24). This qualitative method is particularly appropriate to the given task in that it not only solicits feedback from individuals, which may be limited in and of itself, but also generates additional data through the interaction that takes place between various members of the group (Hatch, 2002, p. 132). Graduate students may feel less inclined to provide critical feedback through isolated interviews, or may share very little on written surveys. Through the focus group process, however, they may feel encouraged to share freely and openly as they are supported through the validation of their peers.

Procedure

In order to recruit participants for this focus group, I simply identified a single class of recently admitted graduate students and asked the instructor for a block of class time in which to conduct my interview. This form of sampling, albeit "convenient," ensured that I would get ample participation. Graduate students in the education programs at the University of Guam are typically working adults who have little time to commit to additional meetings outside of their regular routines. By making myself available to the graduate students within the context of their regular routines rather than requesting of them to accommodate me, I was able to convene an appropriate and effective focus group.

Before I began the focus group interview session, I read the following statement to the potential participants:

As a recently admitted candidate to this graduate program in education, your feedback is needed. You are invited to participate in this focus group interview where you and your colleagues will have the opportunity to reflect upon and share your opinions regarding the SOE graduate admissions requirements and process. Your specific comments will be used to evaluate the current admissions criteria and procedure, but will also remain

anonymous, and can be withdrawn by you at any time. Also, you may withdraw your participation at any time during the interview. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Findings

Six students volunteered to participate in the focus group interview. The session lasted around 45 minutes. Five of the students were admitted in the semester in which the focus group interview took place (i.e. Fall 2008) and one student was admitted in the previous regular semester (i.e. Spring 2008). All of the students are in the same graduate program. I will describe the findings under the following two major headings:

Admissions Criteria. The students deemed the various forms of evidence required for admissions in to their graduate program as completely appropriate and sufficient. They identified six forms of evidence, each of which they viewed as relevant and important in determining their qualifications for acceptance:

6. 3 Disposition rubrics indicating various levels of the candidate's knowledge and skills completed by two faculty members within the School of Education and one faculty member, employer, or mentor teacher outside of the School of Education;
7. An undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or better;
8. A 900 or better score on the Graduate Records Examination (GRE);
9. A written essay discussing qualifications and reasons for interest in the program;
10. An active LiveText account; and
11. A completed graduate admissions and advisement form (i.e. Form A).

Admissions Process. Unlike the previous focus group of undergraduate students who strongly voiced their negative opinions of the teacher education admissions process, these graduate students had overwhelmingly positive comments regarding their own admissions process experience. These favorable impressions were reportedly and by consensus due to the efficiency, diligence, and responsiveness of this particular graduate program's "Program Coordinator." The following comment was voiced by one and confirmed by all of the participants: "Our program coordinator was instrumental in clarifying the process and providing the printed material necessary for us to be successful." The clear and consistent message from the Program Coordinator regarding the admissions process led to the clear and consistent message from this group of graduate students that their admissions experience had been remarkably pleasant.

Discussion

This most recent feedback from these graduate students could lend insight to addressing the shortcomings of the undergraduate admissions experience. In my previous report of the feedback from the undergraduate students in teacher education, there was one student who said that he had indeed, "...found out about the admissions process from my advisor." This student also admitted that his program was smaller than others and that perhaps he had received more personalized attention. This "personalized attention" seemed to be the key contributing factor to the positive experiences of the graduate students. Although graduate programs tend to have fewer students than most undergraduate programs in education, there might be a way to "divide and conquer" and establish smaller groups of students who could look to an efficient, diligent, and responsive advisor for clear and consistent direction, rather than depending on and being directed to numerous and varied sources of information.

These focus group participants, although satisfied with the admissions process to a greater extent than the previous focus group, did manage to come up with a few points of discussion that

should be considered in order to further improve the admissions experience for both graduate and undergraduate students:

1. Consider “centralizing” the admissions criteria and process even more. “Half of the information comes from the Graduate School, and the other half comes from the program. The messages can be conflicting, and students are often running back and forth trying to get it right.”
2. “Perhaps there is a way to make the information available earlier in the program. Our program coordinator was great in providing the information in a timely manner, but couldn’t we have received it or accessed it even earlier?”
3. “This process worked for us because we are a small program with few students. But what about programs that involve larger numbers of students?”

This specific study suggests that the School of Education at the University of Guam is indeed doing many good things when it comes to the admissions experience of its graduate students. However, there is always room for improvement. Maybe by assigning a small group of students to a single knowledgeable mentor, or centralizing the admissions process by providing “one-stop services,” or by exploring early avenues of information dissemination, the admissions process will continue to better meet the needs of students and the institution alike.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

**University of Guam
School of Education**

Follow-up Study of Graduates

As a part of the follow-up study of SOE graduates, a survey was conducted during the months of November & December 2007 in selected Guam Public Schools. Since most of the graduates of SOE are employed by the Guam Public School System (GPSS), and SOE has not systematically kept any records of its graduates, it was determined that this will be the best way to gather data from SOE graduates. Seven elementary schools, three middle schools and two high schools were randomly selected for the survey. 500 surveys were distributed through the school's offices to teachers, administrators, and guidance counselors who identified themselves as graduates of the School of Education, University of Guam. Systematic follow-up phone calls and school visits were conducted to maximize participation at all levels. 335 surveys were returned. The results were analyzed using the SPSS software package.

A. Demographic Information

Variable	Category	n	%
Employment	Teacher	297	88.70
	School Administrator	13	3.90
	Guidance Counselor	15	4.50
	Others	10	3.00
Gender	Male	112	33.40
	Female	223	66.60
Grade Level	Elementary	175	52.24
	Secondary	160	47.76
Number of years in current employment	1-5	251	75.15
	6-10	55	16.47
	11-15	9	2.69
	>15	19	5.69
Undergraduate Program completed at SOE	Early Childhood	23	6.87
	Elementary Education	84	25.07
	Secondary Education	108	32.24
	Chamorro Language Teaching	7	2.09
	Physical Education	11	3.28
	TESOL	2	0.60
	Special Education	15	4.48
	Certification only	54	16.12
Other	30	8.96	
Graduate Program completed at SOE	Counseling	18	16.98
	Language & Literacy	23	21.70
	Administration & Supervision	27	25.47
	Special Education	6	5.66

TESOL	5	4.72
Secondary Education	22	20.75
Others	5	4.72

The following questions refer to your education in your school of education. Look back at your years as a student in SOE and *base your answers on your most recent Degree in SOE.*

B. Quality of Faculty & Instruction in Program Coursework in SOE

	<i>Percent of graduates reporting:</i>					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Applicable
B.1 Instructors had command of the subject.	0.9	5.7	9.9	54.9	25.4	2.7
B.2 Classes were well-organized.	0.9	6.3	11.9	58.2	19.4	2.7
B.3 Courses contributed significantly to develop my knowledge.	1.2	9.0	10.1	50.4	50.8	3.3
B.4 Instructors' assessment procedures were relevant to course content.	0.9	6.0	11.9	56.4	21.8	2.4
B.5 Instructors encouraged student participation in the classroom.	1.2	5.4	8.7	48.4	33.1	2.7
B.6 Instructors showed respect for students with differing points of view.	1.2	3.9	11.9	51.3	28.4	2.7
B.7 Overall, the teaching of instructors was effective.	1.2	5.1	9.9	57.0	23.9	2.4

C. Advising and Assistance in SOE

	<i>Percent of graduates reporting</i>					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Applicable
C.1 The admissions process was efficient.						
C.2 Program information was accessible and clear.	2.1	11.3	11.0	56.4	15.8	2.7
C.3 Faculty advisors were accessible and knowledgeable about programs.	2.7	10.7	16.1	49.3	17.6	3.0
C.4 Administrators were accessible.	2.4	15.2	22.4	44.7	10.5	4.5
C.5 It was clear where to go for information and assistance.	3.9	15.0	15.6	49.8	12.9	2.7
C.6 Problems I had were solved effectively by staff or faculty.	2.1	16.9	18.4	46.1	13.6	3.0
C.7 Classes were scheduled at times convenient for me.	3.9	17.4	9.6	49.8	16.5	2.7
C.8 Sufficient numbers of class sections were offered.	4.8	20.7	12.9	45.3	13.5	2.7

D. Content of Curriculum for courses I took in SOE

As a result of coursework and field experience, how well were you prepared to . . .

(NOTE: Answer those items that apply to you. Select "NA" for those that do not.)

	Not Well Prepared			Well Prepared		
	Not Well Prepared	Disagree	Unsure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not applicable
D.1 Create and maintain an effective environment for student learning?	1.8	8.7	17.4	51.1	18.0	3.0
D.2 Plan instruction for heterogeneous groups of students?	2.4	7.2	22.2	48.9	15.6	3.6
D.3 Understand and organize curriculum for student learning?	1.5	9.9	18.6	47.4	18.9	3.6
D.4 Engage students in learning in a supportive manner?	1.5	9.0	15.0	50.2	20.7	3.6
D.5 Use student performance assessment techniques?	2.1	10.7	16.7	48.9	17.7	3.6
D.6 Engage families and communities in student learning?	3.3	14.7	26.4	37.5	12.6	5.4
D.7 Reflect on your own practice?	2.1	6.6	18.1	48.8	20.2	4.2

D.8 Collaborate with colleagues?	2.4	4.8	15.9	48.3	24.6	3.9
D.9 Work with culturally and linguistically diverse learners & communities?	1.8	12.0	24.6	39.9	17.4	4.2
D.10 Understand school, district, and other organizational structures?	6.9	12.0	24.0	40.5	11.4	5.1
D.11 Employ leadership and organizational theories?	3.9	9.9	22.2	43.2	15.3	5.4
D.12 Use decision-making skills?	0.9	6.9	18.6	51.1	18.0	4.5
D.13 Understand educational policies and legal implications of schooling?	14.4	24.6	38.6	13.5	14.5	4.5
D.14 Understand school budgets and funding?	9.6	22.5	22.8	27.9	9.9	7.2
D.15 Address socioeconomic diversity?	3.0	11.7	26.9	40.4	12.6	5.4
D.16 Address needs of students with disability?	4.2	15.6	26.6	35.0	14.7	3.9
D.17 Design and develop technology-based instruction?	5.7	12.6	23.4	38.3	15.6	4.5
D.18 Integrate technology into the grade level or subject taught?	6.0	12.6	23.4	39.3	13.8	4.8
D.19 Develop strong content area knowledge in my area of specialization?	1.8	7.5	17.7	46.4	22.2	4.5
D.20 Develop strong pedagogical content knowledge ?	1.8	8.1	20.4	49.7	15.3	4.8

	Low				High
D.21 My level of satisfaction with the overall quality of the professional preparation in my major program area was:	2.1%	7.3%	24.5%	41.5%	12.1%

E. Field Experience

(Complete this section only if you took part in a SUPERVISED field experience such as student teaching, internship, etc.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
E.1 My placement in field experience was done efficiently.	1.5	8.1	9.3	45.2	26.9	9.0
E.2 University supervisor(s) made course expectations clear.	0.3	6.9	14.7	46.1	23.4	8.7
E.3 University supervisor(s) provided constructive feedback.	0.3	8.1	10.8	48.2	24.0	8.7
E.4 University supervisor(s) were available to assist me.	1.2	7.8	12.9	44.0	25.1	9.0
E.5 The quality of the on-site master teacher/mentor was high.	0.6	8.7	13.2	37.7	29.9	9.9
E.6 The field experience helped prepare me for my subsequent work in education.	0.6	7.5	12.3	43.1	26.6	9.9
E.7 There was an appropriate amount of field experience in my program.	1.5	9.9	14.4	41.9	22.5	9.9
E.8 The overall quality of my field experience was high.	0.9	5.7	10.2	47.7	24.0	11.4

F. Nature of Education Work Since Graduation

F.1 I work in the following type of setting:

- public school (291 = 87.1%)
- private school (7 = 2.1%)
- DODEA School (15 = 4.5%)
- nonprofit organization (1)
- public agency (0)
- other (specify)

G. Impact of Master's Degree

There were 53 individuals who reported that they are currently pursuing a graduate degree in the School of Education.

G.1 I am currently working on my MA or M.Ed. degree. Yes (53 = 15.9%) No (281 = 84.1%)

84 educators, who reported they completed a Masters degree through the School of Education completed the following questions in the survey.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
G.2 I received quality advising during my graduate program	2.3	9.1	10.2	51.1	27.3	0.0
G.3 My Masters program provided me advance training in my field	1.1	2.3	9.3	54.7	32.6	0.0
G.4 The program gave me broad knowledge and understanding in my field	1.0	4.8	8.3	57.1	29.8	0.0
G.5 The program gave me formal and informal assessment skills	1.3	3.6	5.0	60.7	29.8	0.0
G.6. The program helped me develop good communication skills	2.3	2.4	10.0	52.9	31.8	0.0
G.7. The program helped me develop my media and technology skills	1.1	2.3	9.3	54.7	32.6	0.0
G.8 The program helped me develop good interpersonal skills	1.1	7.0	11.6	47.7	32.7	0.0

G. 9 The following best describes my intentions regarding further graduate study:

- No response – 247 (73.7%)
- No further graduate study planned - 40 (11.9%)
- Want to pursue doctorate - 41 (12.2%)
- Currently pursuing doctorate - 6 (1.8%)

Overall results of the survey indicate a positive outlook towards SOE and all items included in the survey.