HAWAI'I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD
SATE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

<u>Dr. Barry Mitchell, Dr. Cristy Kessler, Dr. John Hawkins, Ms. Zanette Johnson 4/18/09</u>
Reviewer(s)   Date of review

Note: Dr. Kessler contributed comments but wasn't present due to a family emergency.

Program(s) included in this Review	Program Type	Degree or Award
Institution: Chaminade University of Honolulu Program: Secondary Education Grade Level: 7-12	Initial teacher license in: Social Studies 7-12 English 7-12 Mathematics 7-12 Science 7-12	Baccalaureate (only on military installations) Post baccalaureate Master's

APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION

Your Recommended Approval Decision:

Full Approval with Conditions

Conditions:

By December 31, 2011, the Special Education Program must submit
to the HTSB:

- Disaggregated data that illustrates teacher candidate performance in each
  of the three levels: Baccalaureate; Post-baccalaureate; Masters in each of the
  content areas.
- Plans for a systemized approach describing how data will be gathered.
- Data which has been summarized and interpreted for the purposes of program
  improvement.

SECTION 1 TEST RESULTS

Test Results

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

Yes

Pass Rate for the IHE Praxis II content area examination(s):

2006-7   86%
2005-6   91%
2004-5   88%

SECTION 2: REVIEWER SUMMARY

2.1 Summary of Strengths:

Praxis II is used as an entrance requirement making sure students have solid foundation in content knowledge.

Data from the Praxis II is analyzed and influences the program's structure

The program's creation and implementation of the assessment course and associated portfolio

The exit portfolio concept is excellent

The number of courses required for candidates in their content field is well documented

Service learning component and the NHEA grant are strengths

Consistent reference to the Hawaii State Teacher Standards

Good collaboration between Cooperating Teacher, Student Teacher, and University

Clear follow up system for those that don't demonstrate expected dispositions

2.2 Areas for Improvement:

The program should display the disaggregated Praxis II passing data by content area.

Outline a process for ongoing implementation and periodic review of the signature assessments.

Provide evidence of tools student teachers are provided to show evidence of student learning.

Show evidence of differentiated lesson plans being implemented in an ongoing fashion on the part of student teachers.

2.3 Concerns for follow-up by onsite unit review team:

-There is a need to look at the unit's conceptual framework to identify connections and selections of appropriate assessment tools.

-Review syllabus for ED 423, 427 etc. Check the grading criteria and the rubrics.

-Heavy reliance on grades in classes that might be inflated according to the data. There is a spread of grades reported, A-F, but the average is really only in the B range. Do the assignments and grading have discrimination ability between the grades?

-Clarification about whether "standards-based" evaluation is operating based on a 'mastery' conception or a sufficient 'progress-toward' conception.

SECTION 3 STATUS OF MEETING HTSB STANDARDS

HTSB Standards for SATE	STANDARD MET OR NOT MET AND REVIEWER COMMENTS
1. Focuses on the Learner Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET
	Reviewer Comments: At Chaminade, small class sizes, focus on service learning make it appear as though there is a focus on the learner No discrete evidence that the Student Teacher does this other than as projected in the lesson plan exemplars—also no assessment of effects on student learning or responsiveness.
2. Creates and maintains a safe and positive learning environment Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET
	Reviewer Comments: This is evaluated during courses.
3. Adapts to learner diversity Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET
	Reviewer Comments: Lesson plans during student teaching provide evidence of implementation.
4. Fosters effective communication in the	MET
	Reviewer Comments:

HTSB Standards for SATE	STANDARD MET OR NOT MET AND REVIEWER COMMENTS
learning environment Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	There is a lot between Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher and University,
5. Demonstrates knowledge of content	MET (Overall Standard 5) Teacher candidates have gained admission to the program by passing content area and are fulfilling courses.
Content Knowledge 5.1 Keeps abreast of current developments in content area. Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET Reviewer Comments: Comprehensive CVs included information on professional development support provided to the faculty. Candidates are going to school so they are abreast of what is going on.
Content Knowledge 5.2 Teacher mastery of language, complex processes, concepts and principles unique to content area. Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET Reviewer Comments: Lots of exposure as they go through the classes. Syllabus evaluation confirms this.
Content Knowledge 5.3 Utilizes the school's current technologies to facilitate learning in the content areas Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET Reviewer Comments: Assessment tools should be consistent with 5.5. Are the student teachers using the technologies available in the school? Are they using the technologies they've been exposed to in the teacher education program?

HTSB Standards for SATE	STANDARD MET OR NOT MET AND REVIEWER COMMENTS
	Should show a greater breadth of evidence for this in the student teachers' portfolios.
Content Knowledge 5.4.Connects knowledge of content areas to student's prior experiences, personal interests and real life situations Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	NOT MET
	Reviewer Comments: Not clearly stated. Only the portfolio would show this, but we don't see it there. Is it modeled in the university classes?
Content Knowledge 5.5 Possesses an understanding of technology appropriate to the content area, e.g. computer assisted instruction Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET
	Reviewer Comments: University program level: software adoptions are at the cutting edge Student teacher level: Insufficient evidence for how technology is used "in the service of learning" in student teachers' classrooms. Are they using the technologies available in the school?
6. Designs and provides meaningful learning experiences Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET Lesson plans and portfolios emphasize this Service learning is a key demonstration of this as well.
	Reviewer Comments: What are the components of the "signature assignments"?
7. Uses active student learning strategies Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET
	Reviewer Comments: Student teachers have been exposed to strategies; could be richer evidence for how they are applying them. Observation documents should be more detailed and

HTSB Standards for SATE	STANDARD MET OR NOT MET AND REVIEWER COMMENTS
	exhibit this.
8. Uses assessment strategies Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Unable to Determine Reviewer Comments: We have no knowledge of what these strategies are or how they're being applied at the program level Lesson plans and portfolios could demonstrate this, but evidence is limited. Service learning is a key demonstration of this as well.
9. Demonstrates professionalism Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MET Reviewer Comments: Good measures of dispositions; evidence in portfolios
10. Fosters parent and school community relationships Assessment: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	NOT MET Reviewer Comments: Insufficient evidence presented. Each student presented two examples, but we would like to see additional examples systematically across the program e.g. Parent call logs, meeting notes, event photographs. The program reports that more evidence is available and could be provided. Exemplar portfolios often demonstrated more evidence of "professionalism" than family and community involvement—more clarity on the criteria for this may be needed.

SECTION 4 EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

4.1-Candidates' knowledge of content:

The assessments appear to be appropriate for the cited standards. There is, however, a need to provide performance results via candidates' portfolios.

There is a lack of specific course syllabus in each content area so it is difficult to determine if the content is adequate. The university has identified this as a weak area and there is too much reliance on the course grades as the measure.

4.2-Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions:

There is a need to look at candidates' student teaching and exit portfolios. There is also a need to look at the components of the signature assignments.

There is extensive description about lesson planning and how ST's are prepared for this area. The disposition area is well covered. Lesson planning appears to be well covered and examination of the exit portfolio might support this observation.

4.3. - Candidate effects on P-12 student learning and the creation of environments that support student learning:

Assessment tools are in place, however there is a need for examples from candidate portfolios.

This is a weak area as there isn't enough evidence from the midterm report included to be prescriptive. An assessment can't be determined about the assignments and ratings used by the Teacher Candidates to tell whether this is actually measured.

Section 5 EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program:

The concept of signature assignments is an excellent idea leading to strengthening of the program.

There has been some solid evaluation of the programs and data is used to improve the

program. Detailed plans and implementation timelines need to be developed as evidence that the suggested changes will occur.

SECTION 6 HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AREAS OF SPECIAL EMPASIS

Evidence that candidates are prepared to address the Hawaii Department of Education areas of special emphasis:

The HCPSIII standards are incorporated into unit and lesson plans as required by the university.

HCPS III and the Glo's appear to be fully integrated into the program. Specific evidence from the on site visit supports this assumption.

SECTION 7 NATIVE HAWAIIAN CULTURE, HISTORY AND LANGUAGE

Evidence that candidates are prepared to incorporate Native Hawaiian culture, history and language into their instruction:

The candidates are introduced in their student teaching practicum to "Hawaii's Guidelines for Culturally Healthy and Responsive Environments". The university is to be commended for their federal grants partnership incorporating Hawaiian cultural values and the STEM initiative.

Evidence that student understanding of Native Hawaiian culture, history and language has been enhanced by candidates:

No evidence presented.