

## **Early Childhood Education**

September 9, 2006

To: Barbara Combs, Associate Dean for Teacher Education

From: Glenn Olsen, Early Childhood Education Coordinator (last spring)

Re: Results of Survey of Teacher Education Graduates

The survey pertaining to Early Childhood Education was reviewed at an April, 2006 Early Childhood Education faculty meeting. The people present were Grace Onchwari, Kari Chiasson, Mary Baker, Pam Langlie, Jo-Anne Yearwood and Glenn Olsen. The faculty was given the survey results two weeks prior to the April faculty meeting and then the results were discussed at the April faculty meeting. Glenn then reviewed the comments from the survey and compiled the following report. Faculty was asked to review the final report.

There were thirty one responses to the survey and those responding were Early Childhood Education majors who graduated from 1999 to 2005. There were six students who had a minor in Special Education. Of the graduates, 25 or 80.6% were teaching and eleven or 35.5% were teaching in North Dakota. Another eight students (25.8%) were teaching in Minnesota. The majority of graduates (64%) were teaching in a large town, small town or rural setting. The majority of students had Hispanic students (84%), European (76%) students, American Indian (48%) students or African American (44%) students in their classroom. The graduates who were teaching also had children who were "mainstreamed" (74.2%) into their classroom.

The graduates agreed or strongly agreed to recommend UND & EHD (96.8%) as an institution and college to further their education. In addition, 83.8% stated that the quality of preparation for teaching was excellent or good. The overall quality of the following items is listed and percents ranked receiving 5-7 with 7 being exceptionally strong.

Teacher preparation program was 95.8%

Courses in undergraduate major 87.1%

General Education courses was 64.6%

Student teaching experience was 96.8%

Advice counsel received from advisor was 64.5%.

Support, assistance received from faculty/staff in program was 76.7%.

### Areas of strength

Teacher preparation program

Courses in undergraduate major

Student teaching experience

Written comments (strength)

Year of student teaching

Professors

Hours in field

Team

Technology

Hands-on-activities

Special education classes

Field experiences

Class size

### Areas of concern

Written comments (weaknesses)

1. No infant/toddler class
2. More opportunities in the classroom prior to student teaching
3. Not enough interviewing techniques
4. Help with finding employment after graduation
5. Hard to get into classes and get over ride since program has grown
6. More classroom practicums and hand on experiences
7. Need better advising from staff
8. Nothing about differentiated instruction
9. Longer student teaching kindergarten experience
10. More special education practices should be required

Ways to strengthen areas of concern (now or in future)

We, as a program area, have addressed some of the weaknesses by

1. Adding an infant/toddler class as part of the ECE program
2. The ECE program has over 90% of their classes with a field experience component (ranges from 6-30 hours). This change took place in the past two years.
3. We will recommend to the Teacher Placement/Field Experience office more mock interviews with principals or teachers that sit in as interviewers.
4. We do help with employment, but only if we hear about jobs or read about them in the paper. It would be nice to have a database that would record when graduates obtained a job and have a list of those still searching for a teaching position.
5. We try to work with students who can not get into classes for various reasons and we need to monitor our growth more closely.
6. See answer for question 2
7. Staff advising has improved with the addition of additional help
8. Differentiated instruction was offered as a 390/590 class in the summer of 2006 for the first time. It will be offered as an elective course in the spring of 2007. In addition, several instructors include information about differentiated instruction in their current courses.

9. Students that want to student teach kindergarten longer have the opportunity. The 8/8 elementary and kindergarten experience was discontinued three years ago by the elementary faculty.
10. We are finding that more students are receiving minors in special education than in the past and more faculty are teaching their classes from an inclusive perspective than before (310, 312, 314, 451 (Kari & Jo-Anne co-teach)).

Written comments (recommended changes)

More home school training

More on teasing & bullying

More special education classes

More classroom experiences

During TEAM, more focus for ECE majors since majority of students will teach in K-3 settings, but team was more about 4-6 grade.

Do less peer teaching and provide more actual classroom experiences

More work on assessment and classroom management techniques

Have textbook analysis in courses. We are asked to review and recommend textbooks, but no experience in the program or department

Better classroom management course-more practical and less theory

Reconsider having students in T&L 310 Intro to ECE actually “teach” as part of their field experience

In terms of the recommended changes, we have implemented some of those changes. We do provide more actual classroom experiences than in the past. Over 90% of ECE classes have a field experience component. Teasing and Bullying is in 312 Home School Relations and 314 Social/Emotional Guidance and Discipline with Children. One of the faculty is a nationally known expert on teasing, bullying, and school violence. We have added assessment part of the observation class. The class is now called T&L 311 Observation and Assessment. While we have no control over the T&L classroom management class, we have added guidance and discipline to our social/emotional class. This class helps the students develop their guidance and discipline philosophy.

We have been having discussions with Elementary Education about the ECE majors in TEAM and the double majors (ECE & Elem) in TEAM. The discussion revolves around providing equal emphasis on the primary grades, not just 4-6. Those discussions will be on-going this year and students in TEAM will be assessed regarding TEAM in November.

The last recommendation about having “teaching” as part of T&L 310 is still being reviewed. We have students do small group activities with children and plan their activities. With new faculty in the program area, this item will be discussed again this fall.

### Conclusion

The early childhood program area has recognized the strengths graduates believe we brought to their preservice teaching. We agree with our graduates about those strengths. The graduates identified several weaknesses in our program and we have corrected those weaknesses prior to the graduate survey or we are in the process of

rectifying those weaknesses. We have also made the changes suggested by our graduates or are in the process of making many of those changes.

The ECE program area appreciates the comments from our graduates because this lets us see how they are doing as teachers and also allows us to view our program with the intent of making it a stronger program. Hopefully, our graduates will have an opportunity to see the changes we made as a result of their comments.

## **Elementary Education Program Area Assessment Report Based on Results of Survey of Teacher Education Graduates**

(rev. 10/06; final rept.11/30/06)

Note: Survey data, report drafts and data based actions were discussed at elementary education program area meetings on the following dates: 08/23/06, 10/26/06, 11/09/06, and 11/30/06. See attached minutes.

### **Part I: The review process**

Faculty in the elementary education program conducted an analysis of the demographic, quantitative and qualitative segments of the results from the Survey of Elementary Education Program Graduates. The demographic data (see Part II. A) and quantitative data were summarized (see Part II. B) and the qualitative data for each relevant survey question (question numbers 12, 13, 27, 29 and 30) were summarized thematically (see Part II. C). The data summaries were brought before the elementary education faculty on October 26, 2006. Faculty were asked to consider the broad themes of the data summaries, comment on the themes and then specify data-based program changes. Change processes and timelines were described. See Part III of this report for those comments and change plans. Part IV of this report offers recommendations for changes to future survey protocols.

### **Part II: Summaries of the demographic, quantitative and qualitative survey results**

Part II A: Summary of demographic information. This report draws on survey results from 127 respondents who graduated the Elementary Education program between the years 1998 and 2005. There were 111 female respondents and 16 males, and 121 individuals who described themselves as Caucasian. Present teaching employment varied among the respondents: 93 (72.4%) were teaching and 73 (57.5%) described their employment as teaching fulltime. The majority of the 93 program graduates who are teaching full or part-time, teach outside of North Dakota (58 teachers). Of these 58 teachers, 28 of them teach in Minnesota. Based on data from all 127 respondents, 65 state they took licensure tests outside of ND. Forty nine (49) of the respondents state they have applied for graduate education.

The respondents describe their classrooms as diverse with students of African American, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian and Caucasian heritage. Ten (10) graduates noted they have worked with refugee students in their classrooms. Seventy-nine (79) of the respondents state special needs students are mainstreamed in their classrooms. Respondents are teaching on reservations (2), and in rural locations (4), inner city schools (2) and urban schools (16).

Part II. B: Summary of quantitative survey data. Of the 127 respondents who completed the quantitative segment of the survey, 117 agree and strongly agree that they would recommend UND and EHD. The large majority of the graduates describe the quality of teaching preparation as excellent and good (105 or 82.7%). Eighty-eight of the 127

respondents felt well prepared compared to other beginning teachers: 88 (69.3%) average and higher than average.

On a 7 point scale with 7 defined as Exceptionally Strong, 82.5% of respondents rated courses in their undergraduate major as 5, 6, or 7; 13.5% were neutral (rated with a 4).

On a 5 point scale with descriptors of “Almost Not At All” to “Very Much”, at least 70% of the respondents reported they experienced some, much or very much preparation to develop materials, manage a classroom, teach students decision-making and leadership, had control over teaching content, to help students meet state and local standards, and assess student learning. By contrast, on the same scale, 55.4% of the graduates reported that they had some, little or no preparation to help their students meet state and local standards. In a similar vein, they report the following:

- 51.6% report some, little or no preparation to link curriculum to school standards
- 38.6% report some, little or no preparation on assessment of student learning
- 54.5% report some, little or no preparation on working with families of students
- 78.3% report some, little or no preparation on working with community agencies

Part II C: Qualitative Survey/Questionnaire Data. The survey included four open-ended prompts or questions that yielded qualitative survey data. Each question/prompt is considered separately below. They are as follows:

#12: What do you consider to be the major strengths of your undergraduate preparation as provided by the teacher education program?

# 13: List what you consider to be the principal weaknesses of your undergraduate preparation as provided by the teacher education program.

# 27: As you compare yourself to other beginning teachers with whom you have worked, how do you rate the quality of your preparation to teach? Why?

# 29: What changes would you recommend for the teacher education program?

# 30: What aspects of the teacher education program would you not want changed?

**Question #12 What do you consider to be the major strengths of your undergraduate preparation as provided by the teacher education program?**

Analysis of responses to this question fall into four themes: Field Experience, Course work, Professors and Relationships.

Field experiences were noted as the biggest strength of the program. Statements about student teaching and other practicum experiences were numerous, and generally viewed

as the most valued aspect of the program. Commonly, respondents' comments suggested "the more, the better".

Course work, particularly the methods block (TEAM) was repeatedly noted as pivotal preparation for teaching in all subject areas. Special education courses were mentioned as valued, and it was repeatedly mentioned that "hands-on" aspects of all course work was important to preparedness for teaching.

Professors were regarded in positive ways: supportive, helpful, personable, knowledgeable, up-to-date, provided "hand-on" experiences and instructive in lesson planning and technology.

Respondents expressed that relationships with faculty were a strength of the program. Advising and supporting students and creating comfortable learning environments made a positive difference.

**Question # 13: List what you consider to be the principal weaknesses of your undergraduate preparation as provided by the teacher education program.**

When asked to name program weaknesses, respondents repeatedly noted the following:

- Weak classroom management content
- Few experiences with using and teaching from basal programs effectively
- Few experiences with parent/teacher communication
- The need to address issues regarding licensure in other states, including Minnesota
- Inadequate preparation to connect standards-based planning and assessment

Representative comments indicate that respondents recommend their preparation include more of the following:

- Field experiences—earlier and later, and in greater variety of settings
- Classroom management experiences
- Experiences connecting standards to curriculum
- Teaching strategies with special needs students
- Information on how to differentiate instruction
- Study of "real-life" classroom situations
- Strong experiences in multi-cultural education

**Question 27: As you compare yourself to other beginning teachers with whom you have worked, how do you rate the quality of your preparation to teach? Why?**

Analysis reveals respondents viewed themselves as well or better prepared than other beginning teachers. Comments from veteran teachers, for example, affirmed one respondents' claim to be well-prepared. Personal attributes such as age and life-experience, self-criticism and self-discipline and drive, amount of coursework, field experience, and knowledge about technology and experience serving as a

paraprofessional and substitute teaching are all statements offered by respondents to affirm their claims for being well prepared. Statements about participation in the Resident Teacher Program indicated strong preparedness to teach. Quality preparation was also attributed to having the opportunity to student teach outside of the area.

Respondent comments that indicated they were less prepared to teach than their peers attributed this to needing more field experience and needing more experience with basal curriculum.

Other respondents observed that some aspects of full preparation for teaching required “on the job training”.

**Question 29: What changes would you recommend for the teacher education program?**

Respondents’ call for change can be categorized into three areas: Advising, Field Experience, and Courses.

Respondents expressed that advising needs to be “better.” Generally and specifically, respondents called for more specific information about requirements to obtain out of state licensure. Minnesota was mentioned, specifically, a few times.

Again, respondents recommend field experience. They seek more and earlier field experience, less observation and more active involvement with students, experience in more grade levels, better student teacher/cooperating teacher matches and better quality of cooperating teachers, and more sustained experiences (e.g., in TEAM and in Student Teaching).

Respondents called for offering a diversity class that meets other state’s requirements (e.g., Minnesota). They recommended the need to require courses that supports teaching students with special needs (e.g., learning disorders, giftedness and other exceptionalities). The recommendations for changes in other courses include the call for much more instruction on basal programs, learning centers, units, and more framework information on reading and writing. Some respondents called to increase the content in TEAM courses and to increase the number of required courses in Social Studies and Mathematics. Respondents recommended changes include teaching more classroom management strategies, more information on politics in education, more about what to expect in the first year, about grading and maintaining a grade book and parent/teacher conferences, how to work with others in the professional setting—e.g., other teachers, parents, paraprofessionals. How to teach in a standards-based curriculum and taking coursework in ELL were also suggested and program changes.

**Question 30: What aspects of the teacher education program would you not want changed?**

One of the frequently reported strengths from the 1998 -2005 survey included the TEAM block of classes. TEAM consists of four method classes including Reading and Writing, Science, Social Studies, Math as well as a 60 hour field experience placement in an elementary classroom. The written responses from the students consistently included comments that TEAM was worthwhile and valuable for a number of reasons. Some specific examples mentioned include TEAM as being a helpful group of classes that prepare teacher candidates to teach the required subjects in an elementary classroom, the assigned TEAM instructors, the technology components of specific assignments, and the field experience requirements. Students reported the TEAM block of classes provides the opportunity to model classroom community building, hands-on experiences, inquiry-based learning, and the environment to share personal stories from both students and teachers.

Another notable strength of the Elementary Education Program is the required number of Literacy courses. The students leave the program feeling strong in their ability to teach literacy. They also stressed the importance and benefit of establishing an open line of communication and a comfortable relationship with their faculty academic advisors. Comments offered praise for the elementary education faculty, the portfolio processes which helped with personal organization and the ability to express developing beliefs about teaching and learning. Students liked when they were given a choice about what school, grade, city, state, or even country they were placed in for their field experiences and student teaching. The students reported noticing and appreciating when instructors had an excitement and knowledge of their content area and also appreciated when class sizes were small.

Respondents suggested that it would be beneficial to have teacher candidates complete digital portfolios because many job applications are completed online. Additionally, respondents recommended never reducing the amount of required field experiences, and adding information about educational law to the program.

### **Part III: Faculty discussion and planning data-based program changes**

Patterns that evolved from the survey summaries include the following **themes** that seek program changes:

1. Diversity of elementary education teacher candidates
2. Assessment instruction, including interpretation of assessment information, translation into grades and reporting assessment/evaluation information to families
3. Communication experience with families and community agencies
4. Instruction that is based in professional standards and basal curriculum
5. Experience and knowledge regarding classroom management
6. Field experience that is increased, earlier, active and sustained
7. Diverse populations of students and course that meets licensure requirements in various states
8. Instruction on students with exceptionalities
9. Advising information on licensure, especially out of area

Themes that suggest “no change” include:

- TEAM
- Options for student teaching out of area, including globally

**Theme** selection and plans for program changes were discussed at the elementary education program area faculty meeting on October 26 and also on November 9.

A. Classroom management was identified as a theme for action.

#### Experience and knowledge regarding classroom management

Based on classroom management data from this survey, elementary faculty plan to implement two ideas.

1. Create a technology-supported connection between the Education Building on campus and an elementary classroom in the Grand Forks public schools. The purpose of the connection is to study how skilled elementary teachers manage their classrooms through a live interactive video feed. A classroom on campus will be connected to a school classroom in which teacher candidates can see and interact with the teacher and students involved in a range of management decisions including classroom routines, student groupings, transitions, and engaged learning for all students. In October 2007 at an elementary education program area meeting, faculty will report back on this initiative.
2. In one or more sections of TL 432 Classroom Management, the course content orients preservice teachers to view teaching problem-solving. Effective instructional practices, including responsive teaching and differentiated instruction are research-based methods

which increase engagement of learners. The live interactive video feed will be implemented as part of the teaching as problem-solving curricular approach. Information on this action will also be reported on to elementary education faculty in October 2007.

B. Field experience was also identified as a theme for action. The following changes have been identified as changes already in place and/or are being implemented in the near future.

Field experience that is increased, earlier, active and sustained

1. All elementary education majors enroll in the TEAM block of methods courses (TL 410, 430, 440, 470 and 486). The field experience for TEAM is now more sustained. Students are in the field for approximately three consecutive weeks. In the past, for a large segment of the semester, they were in the field one day per week, or for a 5 week segment of the semester they followed a pattern of spending a week in the field and returning to UND for a week of classes. These and any additional changes to the TEAM field experience will be discussed at an elementary education program area meeting in October 2007.
2. To address the need for earlier experiences in the field and experiences with diverse populations, prior to being admitted to a teacher education program, UND students will need to acquire a 30 hour field experience with volunteer programs. Of this 30 hour experience, 15 hours must be divided evenly among the 3 categories of (1) multiculturalism, (2) adult poverty, special needs, English Language Learners; and (3) schools. The remaining 15 hours may be completed in the areas noted above or in the following: (a) community, (b) religious activities/events, and (c) summer activities/events. Students with volunteer experience, can apply 15 hours of their prior service towards this requirement. To qualify, the prior experience must be accumulated no more than 3 years prior to application for Teacher Education. A status report on this program (VITALs) will be discussed at an elementary education program area meeting in October 2007.

#### **Part IV: Ideas for new survey questions**

1. Include advising questions that focus on specifics such as academic advising and career services (e.g., information on licensure and job placement).
2. Include the following:
  - a. Did you have enough time in the field prior to TEAM & student teaching?
  - b. Ask specific questions about classroom management and first year weaknesses.
3. What did you value about your portfolio review experiences?
4. How have you used LiveText after graduating?
5. Add a prompt on technology use in teaching.
6. Drop or rephrase question #27 in which respondents are asked to compare themselves to other first year teachers. The data on the question is hard to interpret. Respondents may not be qualified to compare their preparation to that of other professionals.
7. Drop either Question #13 or #29. The data are somewhat repetitive.
8. Data from Question 30 are somewhat repetitive with data from Question 12.

Note: These suggested changes to the survey will be considered for the Fall 2007 Undergraduate Survey.

## **Survey of the Middle School Program Graduates** **by Gail Ingwalson**

### **Strengths of the program:**

40% of the respondents applied and attended graduate school

80% of the respondents felt that the overall quality of their teacher preparation was excellent or good.

100% indicated that the teacher preparation program was excellent or good

All respondents felt that they received much to very much preparation regarding developing materials and teaching approaches, control over teaching content, confident and prepared as a teacher, confident in ability to balance expectations of school & community with personal vision of teaching, and assessment of student learning.

75% of the respondents felt that they were better prepared than other beginning teachers. The respondents feel that their methods and field experience were beneficial (although there were also comments that there was not enough time in classrooms).

### **Weaknesses of the program::**

40% of the respondents were not able to find a job in the area that they reside

One individual felt that they didn't receive good advisement

One individual indicated that the support and assistance provided by faculty was below average.

50% of the respondents felt that they receive little preparation for working with community agencies.

One individual was not advised as to the requirements for becoming "highly qualified (No Child Left Behind) so was not able to be hired at a school in the community which they live in.

### **Addressing the weaknesses:**

Even though I tried to stay abreast of the requirements for "highly qualified" teacher, it was difficult as the state regulations were not in place until 2004. Unfortunately, I didn't provide adequate information (advisement) for one student who feels that they spent a lot of money and are not qualified to teach. If I could speak to this student, I would encourage them to take the PRAXIS II for 5-8 in their content area.

In regards to a lack of preparation in working with community agencies, I instated an event that provides student the opportunity to plan for and interact with parents and community businesses.

### **Suggestions for survey:**

I wish there was a way to encourage the graduate to contact their advisor to work through those issues that prohibited them from receiving the education that they deserved.

**Secondary Program Area Assessment, 1998-2004**  
**Prepared by Margaret Zidon**

**April 25, 2006**

The secondary program area faculty met on April 12 at its regularly scheduled monthly meeting. Margaret Zidon shared the following results with the faculty:

Who are the graduates:

- 32 graduates responded to the survey for years 1998-2004
- 24 of the 32 graduates who responded are teaching
- Of the 24 teachers, 10, or 42%, were teaching in North Dakota
- Of the 24 teachers, 14, or 58%, taught elsewhere (7 in the states and one in another country)
- All the responders were Caucasian
- 16 responders were female, 16 were male

What did the graduates cite as strengths of the teacher education program in secondary?

- Field experience
- Peer teaching in the teacher education courses
- Advice provided by teacher education professors
- Peers
- “Great T&L professors” (also mentioned subject area professors)
- Unique student teaching opportunities
- Overall, the T&L classes (as well as subject area classes)
- One student mentioned the portfolio assessment experience

What did the graduates cite as weaknesses of the secondary teacher ed. program?

- too much theory/not enough field-based experiences
- no required classes for special needs
- not enough experience in the areas of diverse learners, classroom management, discipline
- one mentioned the portfolio (didn't help in getting a job)

What did the graduates recommend?

- practical and realistic experiences (voiced by many)
- requiring a special needs courses (not voiced by many)
- learning needed on how to meet diverse learners' needs (A related issue is that some felt that there should be less emphasis on reading articles and more on classroom teaching experience.
- learning needed on how to meet standards in creative ways
- more learning about parents and politics.

Summary of Findings:

Our 1998-2004 graduates' responses are few; however, of the ones that were received, we can probably say that the graduates felt that the teacher education program prepared them for teaching, that they felt as well or better prepared as/than other teachers in the schools where they taught, and that their UND professors were knowledgeable as well as interested in their personal and professional growth.

### *Field-based Experience.*

Regardless of how much field-based experience our students accrue, they would like more. In the past year, we have been working to increase field experiences in several ways:

T&L 433 – diversity needs – one-day trip to a reservation school which we hope to extend to 2 or 3 days.

T&L 400 – we are supporting more field hours as a co-requisite with Methods courses. The Science composite degree and the Social Studies composite degree programs are in the process of requiring 60 rather than 30 hours of methods field experience.

Pre-admission. There will be in 2007, 30 hours of pre-admission field experience in the areas of diversity, working with children, and poverty.

Secondary program area is also considering requiring T&L 386, a 30-hour field experience working in alternative education settings (e.g., special education classroom, alternative high school, tutoring, etc.)

Our goal is to increase the field experiences hours from 60 to 150 hours within the next two years.

### *Special Needs Course*

Since 2003, we have integrated special needs education into the secondary program area. In consultation with Special Education faculty, the special needs curriculum is articulated from the entry level course of T&L 325: Exploring Teaching to the final course of T&L 460: Microteaching. The other courses in which special needs information and experience are integrated are T&L 350: Development and Education of the Adolescent and T&L 400 (or, for example, Lang 400 or Math 400): Methods & Materials. A handbook was prepared by Dr. Shirley Greves that outlines the special needs content and requirements within each of these courses. Dr. Lynne Chalmers, special education faculty, said that the secondary way – i.e., integrating special needs through the program – is much better than having student take a course. We agree. The information is reiterative and ongoing. Candidates know the law, know how to provide accommodations, have sat in on an I.E.P., have observed, in schools, for accommodations and have spoken with classroom teachers about accommodations. They would also have read about and discussed special needs. We will continue *not* to require a Special Education course of secondary program candidates; we will, however, encourage them to take a course, particularly the one associated most closely with LD, the most common situation that they will experience in secondary education.

### *Diverse Learners Needs*

Teaching and Learning faculty, historically, have endorsed acknowledging and building on students' prior knowledge. In recent years, several courses (T&L 345, 350, 400, & 460) have included readings and discussion and work related to Multiple Intelligences, Learning Styles, and Differentiated Instruction. Teaching is developmental in nature with the first year, typically, being one of "survival." Perhaps, the few candidates who did say that improvements were needed in meeting diverse learners' needs responded

from a sense of being overwhelmed at the great diversity – range of motivation, ability, understanding – among learners. Much as they are told this by university faculty and by classroom teachers, they may not fully understand it until they experience it. However, this may be an area where we could do more. We talked about connecting on-campus readings and field-based experiences (both observational and actual teaching). This will continue to be a focus for the Secondary Program in the 2006-07 year.

*Meeting Standards in Creative Ways*

Although only one student made this comment, secondary faculty thought it an important one to address as our program has made significant progress in this area. The faculty agreed to use “Understanding by Design” (Wiggins and McTighe) beginning at the 2005-06 academic year as a uniform practice for the development of curriculum, unit plans, lesson plans and assessments. Using UbD, candidates are required to meet, within their lessons and unit plans, standards for their disciplines. At the same time, they are to make use of various teaching strategies and assessments in the accomplishment of meeting the standards and lesson objectives. In many courses (325, 345, 350, 400, and 460), candidates learn and apply UbD. Candidates’ outcomes associated with employment of UbD throughout the program are increased skill with lesson and unit plan design, greater awareness of the necessity for formative assessment, and greater connections between standards and diverse teaching practices. We will continue to discuss our educational focus on Ubd as well as candidates’ implementation of it.

*Parents and Politics*

In several courses (325,345,350), candidates learn through readings, discussions, case studies and guest speakers, the importance of family-school connections. Also, during T&L 488 Senior Seminar guest speakers address the topic of parent involvement and teacher/parent communications. During T&L 487, Student Teaching, the candidate is required to attend and, at times, conduct the parent-teacher conferences. The secondary faculty feels that we could have parents and teachers speak more regularly in our classes about parent-school involvement. This will be a “planning” item on next fall’s agenda. The politics of education is an equally important topic, one that be enriched with guest speakers from a variety of resources: public school administrators, educational leadership faculty, NDEA representatives. This will be another item for discussion/planning at the beginning of fall semester.

A summary of graduates’ recommendations appears below in the table. We have also set a timeline for discussion and implementation of changes to the program:

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Action / Date</b>	<b>Implementation Date</b>
More Field-Based Experience	1.Pre-admission (30 hours) 2. 10 hours in TL 350 3. Make 386 required (30 hours) 4. Discuss with extended faculty – increasing the 486 from 30 to 60 hours	1. Spring 2007 2. Fall 2006 3. Discuss and possibly implement by Fall 2007 4. Discuss with Extended Faculty, Fall 2006. Possibly

		implement F 2007
Require a Special Needs Course	None except to continue to consult with Special Education Faculty about needed changes and refinements.	Review before the beginning of each semester.
Diverse Learners	1. Continue use of UbD, discuss and make refinements as needed	
Standards/Creative Teaching Strategies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Candidates will continue to learn subject area standards and use them in creation of units, lesson plans, curriculum</li> <li>2. Candidates will use a variety of strategies in lesson design and implementation</li> </ol>	Secondary faculty will continue discussion of both these aspects.
Parents & Politics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Involve parents in pre-service program as guest speakers.(parents)</li> <li>2. Involve school administrators, EdL faculty and NDEA resource personnel (politics)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 2006-07</li> <li>2. 2006-07</li> </ol> <p>Monitor effectiveness of using these resources in addressing topics related to parents and politics.</p>

In addition to future actions associated with graduates' feedback, secondary faculty have also recognized, due to portfolio artifacts and interviews, that our preservice teacher education candidates require further experience/course work in the following areas:

- 1) poverty
- 2) multicultural education (Secondary may, at some point and on a trial basis, have its own section of 433).

During secondary program meetings, we will discuss these items and how we can best address the candidates' needs in regards to these two aspects.