DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 791 TM 034 176

AUTHOR Salzman, Stephanie A.; Denner, Peter R.; Harris, Larry B.
TITLE Teacher Education Outcomes Measures: Special Study Survey.
SPONS AGENCY American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2002-04-00
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New York, NY, February 23-26, 2002).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Data Analysis; *Data Collection; Higher Education; Measurement Techniques; *Outcomes of Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teachers; *Schools of Education; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of the Special Study Survey completed by 370 member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in conjunction with the Professional Education Data System (PEDS) survey in fall 2001. The purpose of the survey was to identify and describe the approaches schools, colleges, and departments (SCDEs) take to measure candidate outcomes. The survey also solicited information about the measures used by SCDEs, including: (1) whether the measures are mandated by the state or unit; (2) whether the measures are tied to certification and licensure; (3) the source of the measures (e.g., commercially produced or developed by SCDE); (4) the knowledge bases for the outcome measures; (5) the frequency with which data from the outcomes measures are reported; (6) to whom the data are reported; and (7) how the data from the outcomes measures are used to inform programs. The Special Study yielded promising information regarding the extent to which schools, colleges, and departments of education are responding to more rigorous standards and to national and state mandates for accountability. Through multiple types of outcomes measures, the majority of teacher education institutions responding to the survey are collecting data relative to candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Appendixes contain the survey instrument and a list of institutions responding. (Contains 4 tables and 10 references.) (Author/SLD)

Teacher Education Outcomes Measures:

Special Study Survey

Stephanie A. Salzman

Peter R. Denner

Larry B. Harris

Paper presented to the AACTE Research and Information Committee at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York, New York, February 23-26, 2002. This research was partially funded by a contract from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Abstract

This paper reports the results of the Special Study Survey completed by 370 AACTE membership institutions in conjunction with the Professional Education Data System (PEDS) survey in fall of 2001. The purpose of the survey was to identify and describe what schools, colleges, and departments (SCDEs) use to measure candidate outcomes. The survey also solicited information regarding whether the measures used by SCDEs are mandated by the state or unit, whether the measures are tied to certification and licensure, the source of the measures (e.g., commercially produced or developed by the SCDE), the knowledge bases for the outcomes measures, the frequency with which data from the outcomes measures are reported, to whom the results are reported, and how the data from the outcomes measures are used to inform programs.

The Special Study yielded promising information regarding the extent to which schools, colleges, and departments of education are responding to more rigorous standards and to national and state mandates for accountability. Through multiple types of outcomes measures, the majority of teacher education institutions responding to the survey are collecting data relative to candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Teacher Education Outcomes Measures:

Special Study Survey

In the past 10 years teacher quality has been identified as the single most important factor accounting for the variability in student performance. A growing body of research has established the quality of the teacher as the largest variable in student learning, even when students' prior education, socioeconomic status, and other factors are included (Ferguson, 1991; Ferguson & Ladd, 1996; Greenwald, Hedges, & Laine, 1996; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). Emerging from this confirmation of the critical role of quality teachers are numerous national and state mandates for holding teacher education institutions accountable for the preparation of educators who possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support the learning and well-being of all students. At the heart of these mandates is the assertion that the preparation of teacher candidates must include understanding of content standards for students and what it takes to enable students to achieve them (Darling-Hammond, 2000). The expectation is that candidates should know their subject matter, demonstrate the ability to teach it to diverse groups of students, and be able to assess student learning effectively.

Federal and state policymakers have employed a variety of mechanisms to ensure teacher candidates have subject-matter competency and the skills to help students master content. Some mechanisms, such as raising admission standards and testing new teachers, put the responsibility for mastery on prospective teachers. Others hold the teacher preparation program responsible. Taking the latter approach, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2000) has developed performance-based evaluation standards that require teacher education institutions to provide evidence of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions and the impact of their candidates and graduates on student learning.

Prompted by new federal Title II legislation requiring all states to rank their teacher preparation institutions, states are also developing accountability criteria. These accountability

criteria, however, focus almost exclusively on the assessment of teacher content knowledge via standardized subject matter assessments. While subject matter knowledge is certainly an important aspect of teacher quality, teachers who support student learning also demonstrate the ability to use a broad repertoire of instructional skills and strategies that enable the learning of all students. Moreover, effective teachers are able to assess student learning and use assessment data to inform and improve the learning and teaching process (Education Commission of the States, 2000). The challenge faced by teacher education institutions is to provide evidence that their candidates and graduates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support the learning and well-being of all students.

Anticipating the mandates for teacher education accountability, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) identified the development of comprehensive assessment systems as a priority for its membership institutions. In setting this priority, AACTE commissioned Idaho State University to conduct a national survey of teacher education institutions to identify and describe what schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) use to measure candidate outcomes. Through the survey, we sought to identify the types of outcomes measures used by SCDEs; whether the measures are mandated by the state and tied to certification or licensure; the source of the measures (e.g., commercially produced or developed by the SCDE); the knowledge base for the outcomes measures; the frequency with which data from the outcomes measures are reported and to whom the results are reported; and how data from the outcomes measures are used to inform programs.

Methods

Participants

The Special Study Survey was accessible by approximately 750 AACTE member institutions who were asked to complete the special survey on the Internet along with their annual Professional Education Data System (PEDS) survey. Data were received from $N = 370$ of the

schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDE), for an approximate return rate of 50% of the membership institutions. Table 1 presents the frequency and percent by position of the persons responding to the survey. As can be seen from Table 1, the respondents held a variety of positions. Among the most frequent responders were deans (20.3%), associate deans (15.9%), and department chairs or division directors (21.4%). Of the 370 responding institutions, $n = 363$ (98.1%) indicated their SCDE collected data on candidate outcomes and completed the remainder of the survey. Seven of the institutions (1.9%) indicated their SCDE did not collect data on candidate outcomes, and exited the survey as instructed without responding to the remainder of the items on the questionnaire. Of the 363 institutions who collected data on candidate outcomes, the responses for $f = 343$ (94.5%) were based on their elementary teacher preparation program only, $f = 8$ (2.2%) were based on their early childhood teacher preparation program only, and $f = 5$ (1.4%) were based on their secondary teacher preparation program only. Four SCDEs (1.1%) said the responses were for all of there K-12 teacher preparation programs, even though the instructions asked them to respond for their largest program only. The information for program type was missing for $f = 3$ (0.8%) of the institutions collecting candidate outcomes data.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Instrument

The purpose of the survey was to identify and describe the kinds of assessments used by schools, colleges, and departments of education to measure outcomes for candidates in their programs for the initial preparation of teachers. Candidate outcomes were defined as the knowledge, dispositions, and skills the SCDE expects candidates to develop as a result of the teacher preparation program. The survey was a self-administered electronic factual questionnaire. Respondents were first asked to submit information about the name of the institution, its AACTE

identification number, and the title of the person completing the survey. The first item was a yes or no question about whether the school, college, or department of education (SCDE) collected data on candidate outcomes. Respondents who checked yes were instructed to complete the remainder of the questionnaire.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of five items that solicited factual information about the program type, the knowledge base used for the candidate outcomes measures, the uses of the data from the measures, the audiences for the data, and how frequently reports of the data are made. These questions consisted of multiple response checklists. The second part of the questionnaire identified measures of candidate outcomes. For each measure used by the SCDE, the respondents were asked to check all boxes that applied as to whether the measure is mandated and by whom; whether the measure is required for certification; and whether the source of the measure is commercial, state developed, or developed by the unit.

The Special Study Survey questionnaire was constructed by the authors and approved by the AACTE Research and Information Committee. The questionnaire was placed on the AACTE web site by the Research and Information Services Division of AACTE. Pilot testing of the electronic format of the survey was conducted by the Research and Services Division with 5 institutions randomly selected from the AACTE membership institutions. Appendix A contains a copy of the entire questionnaire. The Special Study Survey continues to be available on the AACTE web site (www.AACTE.org). The data for this study were collected from August 1, 2001 until December 15, 2001.

Procedures

The Special Study Survey was activated at the AACTE web site on August 1, 2001. Authorized persons at member institutions completed the self-administered electronic survey. All institutions were expected to respond by the September 15, 2001 deadline for submission of the PEDS survey. When completed forms were submitted, the responses were attached to an e-mail

message sent to Idaho State University on a daily basis by the AACTE Research and Services Division. Responses to the questionnaire were accepted until December 15, 2001 (even though the deadline had passed three months earlier).

Limitations

A limitation of the Special Study Survey was a lack of formal procedures by AACTE for follow-up with the institutions that did not respond to the PEDS survey. Due to the modest return rate (only about 50% of the member institutions) and the fact the institutions who are not collecting outcomes data on their candidates would have a bias to not respond, the findings of this survey are limited to the institutions who actually responded. A list of the institutions that responded to the Special Study Survey is attached as Appendix B.

An additional limitation to the findings of this study was caused by the electronic format of the survey. A major difficulty was caused by the initial data structure created by the AACTE Research and Information Services and the amount of information it accepted for each case. The amount of information entered for the open-ended response items often caused the responses for one or more of the last four outcome measures to be lost, because the case data were simply truncated. Eventually, this problem was recognized and fixed. However, the majority of the responses to the survey had already been submitted by that time. As a consequence, the findings for the last four outcomes measures are limited by the missing data. For the last two items, these limitations are severe.

Results

Knowledge Base for Candidate Outcomes Measures

The knowledge base for the SCDEs' candidate outcomes measures came from several sets of standards. NCATE Unit Accreditation Standards were used by $f = 309$ or 85.1% of the SCDEs. State standards were used by $f = 345$ or 95% of the institutions that collect data on candidate outcomes. National standards were employed as a knowledge base for candidate outcomes by

$f = 250$ or 68.9% of the institutions collecting outcomes data. Of those SCDEs using national standards, the commonly mentioned standards were the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), International Reading Association (IRA), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE).

Uses of Data From Candidate Outcomes Measures

According to the institutions responding to the survey, the data from the candidate outcomes measures are used for multiple purposes. Table 2 presents the frequency and percent of institutions using data from candidate outcomes by type of use. A high percentage of the institutions reported using the data for each of the purposes listed. The most frequent use was "to improve program effectiveness" (96.7%). This was followed closely by the use of candidate outcomes data "for accreditation documentation" (94.8%). For the $f = 45$ (12.4%) institutions indicating other uses, the regularly mentioned uses included "to provide candidates feedback for improvement," "public relations," "Title II reporting," and "to advise students."

Insert Table 2 About Here

Audiences for Data From Candidate Outcomes Measures

Across institutions, the data from the candidate outcomes measures are released to multiple audiences. Table 3 presents the frequency and percent of institutions reporting data from candidate outcomes measures by audience type. The most frequent audience was unit and program faculty (95.3%), followed by State Departments of Education (91.2%), and Title II Higher Education Act reporting (87.6%). Only 55.9% of the institutions collecting candidate outcomes data release the data to the public and only 43.3% release the data to the media. A small percentage (8.8%) of the

institutions cited additional audiences for their data. Other audiences to whom data are released included "stakeholder groups," "alumnae," "prospective students," and "K-12 public schools."

Insert Table 3 About Here

Frequency of Reports of Data From Candidate Outcomes Measures

The data from candidate outcomes measures are reported regularly with different measures being reported at different times and for different purposes. Across measures, $f = 140$ institutions (38.6%) said they reported data from candidate outcomes measures each semester, $f = 295$ (81.3%) said they reported data "annually," $f = 81$ (22.3%) said "every five years," $f = 147$ (40.5%) said "when data become available." Some institutions ($f = 24$; 6.6%) said the data from the outcomes measures were reported at other times. The other times listed included "upon request," "quarterly," "at check points in the unit assessment system," "every three years," "every 10 years," and "frequency depends on the type of data."

Measures of Candidate Outcomes

Table 4 presents the frequency and percent of institutions using each type of outcome measure for the schools, colleges, and departments of education (n = 363) that reported collecting candidate outcomes data for their initial elementary teacher preparation program or their largest teacher preparation program. Because this information was missing for some measures for some institutions from the data sets we received, the number of institutions out of the 363 for whom we we had useable data is also reported in Table 4. Percentages are based on the number of institutions out of the 363 for whom we had data for each measure.

Insert Table 4 About Here

Tests of basic skills. Of the $n = 363$ institutions who reported collecting data from candidate outcomes measures, $f = 349$ or 96.1% reported using tests of basic skills in mathematics, reading, and/or writing as an outcome measure. For the institutions using tests of basic skills, $f = 308$ (88.3.%) reported these tests are state mandated, $f = 215$ (61.6%) reported these tests are mandated by the unit or SCDE, and $f = 6$ institutions (1.7%) said these tests are not mandated. For the tests of basic skills, $f = 293$ (83.9%) said successful performance on these tests is required for certification or licensure; while $f = 44$ (12.6%) said these tests are not required for certification or licensure. For $f = 11$ institutions (3.4%) this information was missing. The tests were reported to be commercially produced by $f = 285$ SCDEs (81.7%) and developed by the state by $f = 59$ (16.9%) of the SCDEs. Only $f = 24$ SCDEs reported these tests were developed by the unit or SCDE. Because some institutions reported their tests were developed by more than one source, the total for these frequencies will exceeded the number of institutions using tests of basic skills as a measure of candidate outcomes.

Interviews. Interviews are used for collecting data on candidate outcomes by $f = 213$ (58.7%) of the SCDE. The number of SCDEs who said they are not using interviews was $f = 148$ (40.8%). This information was missing for $f = 2$ (0.6%) institutions. Of the 213 SCDEs using interviews, $f = 23$ (10.8%) said they are state mandated, $n = 184$ (86.4%) said they are mandated by the unit or SCDE, and $f = 25$ (11.7%) said they are not mandated. Because the interviews are often mandated by both the state and the unit, these frequencies when added exceed the total number of institutions using interviews. Significantly, $f = 84$ (39.4%) of the 213 institutions using interviews as a measure of candidate outcomes said the interviews are required for certification or licensure. The number reporting they are not required for certification or licensure was $f = 106$ (49.8%). This information was missing for $f = 23$ (10.8%) of the institutions. Overwhelmingly, the institutions ($f = 204$; 95.8%) reported the interviews were developed by the unit or SCDE. One institution

reported the interviews were commercially produced and one institution reported they were developed by the state.

Tests of subject matter knowledge. Tests of subject matter knowledge (such as Praxis II) are required by $f = 306$ (84.3%) of the $n = 363$ institutions collecting data on candidate outcomes. The number of SCDEs not using tests of subject matter knowledge was $f = 57$ (15.7%). These tests were reported as state mandated by $f = 284$ (92.8%) of the 306 institutions . They were reported as unit mandated by $f = 137$ (44.8%) and as not mandated by $f = 11$ (3.6%). Again, some SCDEs reported these tests are mandated by both the state and the unit. The tests of subject knowledge were reported as required for certification or licensure by $f = 278$ (90.8%) of the institutions collecting candidate outcomes data. Another $f = 18$ (5.9%) institutions reported the tests of subject matter knowledge are not required for certification or licensure. For $f = 10$ institutions (3.3%), this information was missing. Most SCDEs ($f = 256$; 83.7%) stated the tests of subject matter knowledge were developed commercially. Some SCDEs ($f = 46$; 15.0%) said they were developed by the state. A few SCDEs ($f = 16$; 5.2%) said they were developed by the unit.

Portfolios. Portfolios are used as a measure of candidate outcomes by $f = 319$ (87.9%) of the institutions collecting data on candidate outcomes. Of the 319 institutions using portfolios, $f = 64$ (20.1%) said they are mandated by the state, $f = 269$ (84.3%) said they are mandated by the unit, and $f = 37$ (11.6%) said they are not mandated. Portfolios were reported as required for certification or licensure by $f = 123$ (38.6%) of the SCDEs and as not required for certification or licensure by $f = 159$ (49.8%) of the SCDEs. This information was missing for $f = 37$ (11.6%) of the institutions that reported using portfolios as an outcomes measure. None of the institutions reported using commercially developed portfolios. Only a few of the institutions ($f = 22$; 6.9%) said the portfolios were developed by the state. Most of the institutions ($f = 305$; 95.6%) said the portfolios were developed by the unit.

Attitude surveys/self-efficacy scales. Attitude surveys and self-efficacy scales (such as the Teacher Perceiver) were reported as measures being used to assess candidate outcomes by $f = 108$ (29.8%) of the $n = 363$ institutions collecting outcomes data. These measures were reported as state mandated by $f = 9$ SCDEs (8.3%), as unit or SCDE mandated by $f = 75$ (69.4%), and as not mandated by $f = 28$ (25.9%) of the institutions using these measures. Again, due to the overlap of state and unit mandates, these frequencies do not sum to the total number of institutions using attitude surveys or self-efficacy measures. Only $f = 26$ institutions (24.1%) said the attitude surveys or self-efficacy scales are required for certification or licensure; whereas, $f = 65$ institutions (60.2%) said they are not required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for $f = 17$ (15.7%) of the institutions who reported using attitude surveys or self-efficacy scales as outcomes measures. In general, the attitude surveys or self-efficacy scales were reported to be developed by the Unit or SCDE ($f = 93$; 86.1%). These measures were reported to be commercially produced by only $f = 13$ of the SCDE (12.0%) and developed by the state by only $f = 4$ (3.7%) of the SCDE. Some institutions reported these measures were developed by more than one source, so the total numbers do not add to the number of institutions using these measures to collect outcomes data on their candidates.

Teacher work samples. Teacher work samples are used as a measure of candidate outcomes by $f = 241$ institutions (66.4%). Forty-five (18.7%) of the 241 SCDEs reported teacher work samples are mandated by the state. Another $f = 190$ SCDEs (78.8%) said teacher work samples are mandated by the unit or SCDE. Thirty-four (14.1%) of the 241 SCDEs using teacher work samples said they are not mandated. Again, these numbers reflect the fact that some institutions reported both state and unit mandates. The number of SCDE (out of the 241) who reported that teacher work samples are required for certification or licensure was $f = 85$ (35.3%). Oddly, more institutions said they are required for certification or licensure than said they are mandated by the state. The number of SCDE who reported they are not required for certification or

licensure was $f = 135$ (56%). This information was missing for $f = 21$ (8.7%) institutions who said they used teacher work samples as an outcomes measure. The vast majority, $f = 228$ (94.6%), of the 241 SCDEs who used teacher work samples said they were developed by the unit. Only $f = 2$ (0.8%) SCDEs reported they used commercially produced teacher work samples, and only $f = 11$ (4.6%) said they were developed by the state.

Measures of PK-12 student learning. Of the $n = 363$ institutions who reported using candidate outcomes measures, only $f = 103$ (28.4%) reported using measures of P-12 student learning as one of their assessments. For the 103 SCDEs using measures of P-12 student learning, $f = 25$ (24.3%) said it is because they are state mandated. The majority ($f = 73$; 70.9%) of the SCDEs said the measures of P-12 student learning are mandated by the unit or SCDE. Some institutions ($f = 18$; 17.5%) said they are not mandated. As stated previously, these figures reflect the fact that some institutions reported both state and unit mandates. Out of the 103 institutions using measures of P-12 student learning as measures of candidate outcomes, $f = 33$ (32%) said the measures are required for certification or licensure, and $f = 58$ (56.3%) said they are not required. This information was missing for $f = 12$ institutions (11.7%). More of the SCDEs ($f = 76$; 73.8%) reported the measures of P-12 student learning were developed by the unit or SCDE, than reported they were developed commercially ($f = 14$; 13.6%) or reported they were developed by the state ($f = 13$; 12.6%).

Case study analyses/problem-solving scenarios. Case study analyses or problem-solving scenarios were reported as measures being used to assess candidate outcomes by $f = 168$ (46.3%) of the $n = 363$ institutions collecting outcomes data. These measures were reported as state mandated by $f = 9$ SCDEs (5.4%), as unit or SCDE mandated by $f = 141$ (83.9%), and as not mandated by $f = 27$ (16.1%) of the institutions using these measures. As was true for the previous measures, these figures reflect the fact that some institutions reported both state and unit mandates. Only $f = 42$ institutions (25.0%) said the case study analyses or problem-solving scenarios are

required for certification or licensure; whereas, $f = 108$ institutions (64.3%) said they are not required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for $f = 18$ (10.7%) of the institutions who reported using case study analyses or problem-solving scenarios as outcomes measures. As might be expected, most of the case study analyses or problem-solving scenarios were reported to be developed by the unit or SCDE ($n = 157$; 93.5%). These measures w ere reported to be commercially produced by only $f = 10$ of the SCDEs (6.0%) and developed by the state by only $f = 2$ (1.2%) of the SCDEs. Some institutions reported these measures were developed by more than one source.

Teaching artifacts. Teaching artifacts, such as lesson plans or unit plans, are used as a measure of candidate outcomes by $f = 332$ (91.5%) of the institutions collecting data on candidate outcomes. Of the 332 institutions using teaching artifacts, $f = 52$ (15.7%) said they are mandated by the state, $f = 289$ (87.0%) said they are mandated by the unit, and $f = 22$ (6.6%) said they are not mandated. Some institutions reported both state and unit mandates, so these figures exceed the total number of institutions using teaching artifacts. Teaching artifacts were reported as required for certification or licensure by $f = 128$ (38.6%) of the SCDEs and as not required for certification or licensure by $f = 172$ (51.8%) of the SCDEs. This information was missing for $f = 32$ (9.6%) of the institutions that reported using teaching artifacts as a candidate outcomes measure. As might be anticipated, most of the institutions ($f = 306$; 92.2%) said the teaching artifacts were developed by the unit. Only one institution reported using commercially developed teaching artifacts, and very few of the institutions ($f = 12$; 3.6%) said the teaching artifacts were developed by the state.

Tests of professional knowledge. Of the $n = 363$ institutions who reported collecting data on candidate outcomes, $f = 200$ or 55.1% reported using tests of professional knowledge, such as the National Teacher Examinations, as a candidate outcomes measure. For those 200 institutions using tests of professional knowledge, $f = 180$ (90.0%) reported these tests are state mandated, $f = 93$ (46.5%) reported they are mandated by the unit or SCDE, and only $f = 10$ institutions (5.0%)

said these tests are not mandated. Many of the SCDEs said the tests are mandated by both the state and the unit. For these tests of professional knowledge, $f = 170$ of the SCDEs (85.0%) said successful performance is required for certification or licensure; while $f = 15$ (7.5%) said these tests are not required for certification or licensure. For $f = 15$ institutions (7.5%) this information was not reported. The tests of professional knowledge were reported to be commercially produced by $f = 157$ of the SCDEs (78.5%) and developed by the state by $f = 28$ (14.0%) of the SCDEs. Only $f = 21$ of the SCDEs (10.5%) reported these tests were developed by the unit or SCDE. Because a few institutions reported the tests were developed by more than one source, the total for these figures exceeds the number of institutions using tests of professional knowledge as a measure of candidate outcomes.

Teaching performance evaluations. Teaching performance evaluations from direct observations or from video are used as a measure of candidate outcomes by $f = 339$ (93.4%) of the 363 SCDEs collecting candidate outcomes data. Only $f = 92$ (27.1%) of the 339 SCDEs using teaching performance evaluations said they are mandated by the state. Most SCDEs ($f = 300$; 88.5%) said they are mandated by the unit or SCDE. Six institutions (1.8%) said they are not mandated. Again, these numbers reflect the fact that some institutions reported both State and Unit mandates. The number of SCDEs (out of the 339) who reported that teaching performance evaluations are required for certification or licensure was $f = 174$ (51.3%). The number of SCDEs who reported they are not required for certification or licensure was $f = 135$ (39.8%). This information was not reported for $f = 30$ (8.8%) of the institutions who reported using teaching performance evaluations as an outcomes measure. The vast majority of the SCDEs ($f = 304$; 89.7%) said their teaching performance evaluations were developed by the unit. Only $f = 5$ SCDEs (1.5%) reported they used commercially produced teaching performance evaluations, and only $f = 35$ (10.3%) said they were developed by the state.

Follow-up surveys with program completers. Follow-up surveys of program completers were reported as a measure of candidate outcomes by *f* = 307 of the 363 institutions (84.6%) collecting data on candidate outcomes. The surveys were reported as mandated by the state by *f* = 88 of the institutions (28.7%) and as mandated by the unit or SCDE by *f* = 248 (80.8%) of the institutions. They were reported as not mandated by *f* = 33 (10.7%) of the SCDEs. Most institutions (*f* = 219; 71.3%) reported these measures are not required for certification or licensure. Surprisingly, *f* = 43 institutions (14.0%) said that surveys of program completers are required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for *f* = 45 (14.7%) of the 307 institutions who reported using surveys of program completers. Most of the surveys (f = 263; 85.7%) were developed by the unit or SCDE. Some institutions, *f* = 35 (11.4%), said they were developed by the state. Only *f* = 12 (3.9%) of the institutions using surveys of program completers said they were developed commercially.

Candidate journals. Information about the use of candidate journals was missing for *f* = 55 of the 363 institutions who reported collecting data on candidate outcomes. For the 177 SCDEs using candidate journals, *f* = 147 (83.1%) said they are mandated by the unit or SCDE and *f* = 25 (14.1%) said they are not mandated. Only *f* = 8 (4.5%) reported they are mandated by the state. This information was missing for a few institutions. Interestingly, *f* = 30 of the 177 SCDEs (16.9%) using candidate journals reported they are required for certification or licensure. However, most SCDEs (*f* = 102; 57.6%) said they are not required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for *f* = 45 of the 177 institutions (25.4%) using candidate journals. None of the institutions using candidate journals reported they were developed commercially, and none of them said they were developed by the State (but this information was missing for *f* = 34 (19.2%) and *f* = 45 (35.4%) of the institutions respectively). As would be expected, most SCDEs (*f* = 116; 65.5%) said the candidate journals were developed by the unit. This information was missing for *f* = 51 or 28.8% of the institutions.

Assessment of technology competency. Useable data on how many institutions employed assessments of technology competency as a measure of candidate outcomes was obtained for only $f = 164$ of the 363 institutions (45.2%) that reported collecting candidate outcomes data. For $f =$ 199 institutions (54.8%), this information was missing in the data sets we received. Of the 164 institutions for whom we had data, $f = 110$ (67.1%) reported they used an assessment of technology competency as a measure of candidate outcomes, while $f = 54$ (32.9%) said they did not. The assessment of technology competency was reported as state mandated by $f = 41$ (37.3%) SCDEs, as unit or SCDE mandated by $f = 77$ (70.0%), and as not mandated by $f = 8$ (7.3%) of the SCDEs. For some institutions this information was missing, and as before some institutions reported both state and unit mandates. Forty-four institutions (40.0% of 110) reported an assessment of technology competency is required for certification or licensure. Twenty-eight (25.5%) institutions said it is not required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for $f = 22$ (20.0%) of the 110 institutions that reported using an assessment of technology competency as a candidate outcomes measure.

Tests of pedagogical-content knowledge. Unfortunately, information about the use of tests of pedagogical-content knowledge (such as Praxis III) was missing from the data sets we received for 257 of the 363 institutions that reported collecting data on candidate outcomes. We received useable data for only 106 institutions. From the data we received, $f = 40$ (37.7%) of the SCDEs said they use tests of pedagogical-content knowledge as a measure of candidate outcomes, and $f = 66$ (62.3%) said they do not use these tests. For those institutions that reported using the tests, $f = 31$ of the 40 (77.5%) institutions said they are state mandated, $f = 17$ (42.5%) said they are mandated by the unit or SCDE, and $f = 2$ (5.0%) said they are not mandated. This information was missing for some institutions and some institutions said they were mandated by both the unit and the state. Twenty-six of the 40 (65%) SCDEs for whom we had data indicating they use tests of pedagogical-content knowledge reported that these tests are required for certification or licensure.

Eight of the 40 SCDEs (20.0%) reported they are not required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for $f = 6$ (15%) of the 40 institutions . Twenty-four of the 40 institutions (60.0%) said the tests of pedagogical-content knowledge were commercially developed, 10 (25.0%) said they were developed by the state, and 8 (20.0%) institutions said they were developed by the unit. Some institutions reported more than one source. This information was missing for three of the 40 institutions.

Employer surveys. Data about the use of employer surveys was missing from the data sets we received for 265 (73.0%) of the 363 institutions that reported collecting data on candidate outcomes. Of the 98 institutions for whom we received data, $f = 53$ (54.1%) reported using employer surveys and $f = 45$ (45.9%) reported they do not use them. Of the 53 SCDEs for whom we had data indicating use of employer surveys, $f = 15$ (28.3%) said they are state mandated, $f = 46$ (86.8%) said they are mandated by the unit or SCDE, and $f = 4$ (7.5%) said they are not mandated. Surprisingly, $f = 9$ (17.0%) of the 53 institutions using employer surveys reported they are required for certification or licensure. Thirty-four (64.2%) institutions said they are not required for certification or licensure. This information was missing for $f = 10$ of the 53 (18.9%) institutions for whom we had data indicating the use of employer surveys. Two of the 53 (3.8%) institutions said the employer surveys were commercially developed and f = 6 (11.3%) said they were developed by the state. We only had valid data for two institutions indicating that the employer surveys were developed by the unit. This information was missing for 51 of the 53 institutions for whom we had data indicating use of employer surveys. Presumably, most of the employer surveys were developed by the unit, but we lack the data to verify this assumption.

Conclusions

The Special Study Survey yielded data relative to the types of outcomes measures used by schools, colleges, and departments of education. In addition, the survey yielded information regarding whether the measures used by SCDEs are mandated by the state or unit and whether the

measures are tied to certification and licensure. The survey also yielded data relative to major characteristics of the outcomes measures including the source of the measures (e.g., commercially produced or developed by the SCDE) and the knowledge bases for the outcomes measures. Finally, the survey yielded information regarding the use of the outcomes measures such as the frequency with which data from the outcomes measures are reported, to whom the results are reported, and how the data from the outcomes measures are used to inform programs.

What Outcomes Measures Are Used by SCDEs?

Survey responses indicate schools, colleges, and departments of education are using multiple types of measures to assess candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. These measures include tests of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, professional knowledge, and pedagogical-content knowledge; interviews; portfolios; case study analyses and problem-solving scenarios; journals; teacher work samples; teaching artifacts; teaching performance evaluations; attitude surveys and self-efficacy scales; measures of PK-12 student learning; and surveys with alumni and employers.

The most common candidate outcomes measures used by SCDEs include tests of basic skills, teaching artifacts, and teaching performance evaluations as reported by 90% of more of the institutions responding to the survey. Eighty percent or more of the SCDEs reported using tests of subject matter knowledge, portfolios, journals, and follow-up surveys with program completers. The measures used least by SCDEs are attitude surveys and self-efficacy scales, tests of pedagogical content knowledge, and measures of PK-12 student learning.

Results of the survey support the conclusion that a majority of schools, colleges, and departments of education are assessing candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions with multiple measures during the course of the teacher preparation program. As such, it appears that a large number of teacher education institutions are responding to federal, state, and accreditation requirements for providing evidence of candidate performance. Interestingly, review of the Title II

state reports (see www.title2.org) indicates that teacher preparation program accountability data is almost exclusively limited to standardized assessments of subject matter knowledge. The failure to include data from the other types of assessments used by SCDEs raises the question of whether important information regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness is being systematically excluded from decision-making about program quality.

Are the Outcomes Measures Mandated by the State and/or the Unit?

Responses to the Special Study Survey regarding whether the outcomes measures used by the institutions are mandated by the state and/or the unit indicate that the majority of outcomes measures used by SCDEs are mandated by the unit. In addition, data from the survey indicate that the source of the mandate (e.g., state or unit) differ by the type of assessment. For example, tests of basic skills, professional knowledge, and subject matter knowledge tend to be mandated by the state while other measures such as interviews, portfolios, teaching artifacts, and teaching performance evaluations are mandated by the unit.

As with the survey responses regarding the types of outcomes measures used by SCDEs, these data indicate that institutions are assessing candidate performance beyond the measures resulting from state mandates or Title II requirements. With the NCATE 2002 standards requiring units to use comprehensive assessment systems and to provide evidence of candidate performance, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the unit mandates for outcomes measures are a result of institutional efforts to meet new and more rigorous accreditation standards.

Are the Outcomes Measures Tied to Certification or Licensure?

Survey responses indicate that some of the outcomes measures used by schools, departments, and colleges of education are tied to certification or licensure. The measures most frequently tied to certification or licensure include tests of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, and pedagogical-content knowledge. About 84% of the institutions using tests of basic skills said the tests are tied to certification or licensure; 91% of the institutions using tests of subject matter

knowledge said the tests are required for certification or licensure; and 90% of the institutions using tests of professional knowledge said the tests are tied to certification or licensure. These figures are consistent with reports of the number of states currently requiring standardized tests of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, and professional knowledge for certification or licensure (Educational Testing Service, 2000).

What Are the Sources of Outcomes Measures?

Responses to the Special Study Survey regarding the sources (e.g., commercially produced or developed by the unit) of the outcomes measures indicate that the source depends on the type of measure. Tests of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, and professional knowledge tend to be commercially produced while all other outcomes measures are developed by the unit. These results support the inference that many institutions are committing significant resources and time to the development of candidate outcomes measures including interviews, teacher work samples, teaching performance evaluations, portfolios, case study analyses and problem solving scenarios, and alumni and employer surveys.

What Are the Knowledge Bases of Outcomes Measures?

Survey responses indicate that the knowledge bases for teacher education outcomes measures come from accreditation, national, and state standards. Of the institutions responding to the survey, 85% reported using the NCATE accreditation standards and 95% of the institutions said they used state standards as the basis for their outcomes measures. These figures provide evidence that schools, colleges, and departments of education are responding to the national and state mandates for accountability in teacher education by creating outcomes measures to assess candidate performance relative to state and professional standards for what teachers should know and be able to do.

To Whom Are Data from Outcomes Measures Reported?

Responses to the Special Study Survey regarding the audiences to whom SCDEs report data from outcomes measures indicate that institutions release candidate performance data to multiple audiences. The most commonly cited audience reported by responding institutions was unit and program faculty (95%), followed by State Departments of Education (92%), and Title II Higher Education reporting (88%). Only about half of the institutions collecting candidate outcomes data release the data to the public and only about 40% release the data to the media. These data support the conclusion that most schools, colleges, and departments of education are not taking advantage of the opportunity to release candidate performance data to policymakers and patrons. As noted by the Education Commission of the States (2000), in order to effectively respond to critics of teacher education, institutions must report data regarding the extent to which candidates and graduates are meeting state and national standards.

How Frequently Are the Data from Outcomes Measures Reported?

Survey responses indicate that schools, colleges, and departments of education frequently report data from outcomes measures. More than eighty percent of the institutions responding to the survey said they report candidate performance data annually, while nearly 40% said they report data from candidate outcomes measures each semester, and 40% said they report data when the data become available. These statistics indicate that institutions are reporting outcomes data more frequently than the one-year or five-year intervals required by the state or accreditation agencies.

Are SCDEs Using Data from Outcomes Measures to Inform Programs?

Responses from the Special Studies Survey indicate that schools, colleges, and departments of education use data from candidate outcomes measures for multiple purposes. The most frequently cited use of outcomes data cited by the responding institutions is to improve program effectiveness (96.7%). In addition, 95% of the responding institutions said they use candidate outcomes data for accreditation documentation. While data from the survey clearly establish that

SCDEs are using data from outcomes measures to inform programs, there is no information regarding precisely how the data is being used. A valuable follow-up study to the Special Study Survey would be to conduct e-mail surveys or interviews with a sample of the responding institutions to gather deeper information regarding the ways institutions are using data from outcomes measures to inform programs and to respond to national and state accountability mandates.

Overall, the Special Study Survey yielded promising information regarding the extent to which schools, colleges, and departments of education are responding to more rigorous accreditation standards and to national and state mandates for accountability. Through multiple types of outcomes measures, the majority of teacher education institutions responding to the survey are collecting data relative to candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. However, teacher education institutions are increasingly expected to show program effectiveness in terms of the impact of their candidates and graduates on student learning (NCATE, 2000; Pankratz & Banker, 2000). As such, SCDEs must expand their use of outcomes measures to include assessment approaches that connect teacher performance to PK-12 student learning. To participate as full partners in the improvement of teaching and learning in America's schools, teacher preparation institutions must ground their programs in rigorous standards for what teachers should know and be able to do and use assessment systems that ensure their candidates and graduates support the learning and well-being of all students.

References

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child.* New York: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

Education Commission of the States. (2000). *In pursuit of quality teaching: Five key strategies for policymakers.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Educational Testing Service. (2001). *The Praxis series: State requirements.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Teasting Service, Teaching & Learning Division.

Ferguson, R. (1991). Paying for public education: New evidence on how and why money matters. *Harvard Journal of Legislation, 28,* 465-498.

Ferguson, R., & Ladd, H. (1996). How and why money matters: An analysis of Alabama schools. In H. Ladd (ed.), *Holding schools accountable* (pp. 265-298). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Greenwald, R., Hedges, L., Laine, R. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 66,* 361-396.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2000). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education.* Washington, DC: Author.

Pankratz, R., & Banker, B. (2000). Setting standards for teachers and teacher education. In R. Pankratz & J. Petrosko (Eds.), *All children can learn,* pp. 177-195. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wright, S. P., Horn, S., & Sanders, W. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education,* 57-67.

Table 1

Frequency and Percent of Respondents by Position ($N = 370$)

Position	*f*	%
Dean	75	20.3
Associate Dean	59	15.9
Assistant Dean	18	4.9
Director of Teacher Education	39	10.5
Department Chair/Division Director	79	21.4
NCATE/Accreditation Coordinator	16	4.3
Assistant/Associate Chair or Director	4	1.1
Teacher Certification Officer	5	1.4
Director of Institutional Research/Analyst	8	2.2
Professor	8	2.2
Secretary or Assistant to the Dean	8	2.2
Other	8	2.2
Missing	43	11.6

Table 2

Frequency and Percent of Total (n = 363) for Uses of Data From Candidate Outcomes Measures.

Uses	*f*	%
To make decision regarding candidate admission, retention, program completion	342	94.2%
To recommend candidates for certification or licensure	334	92.0%
For national and state accountability information	327	90.1%
For accreditation documentation	344	94.8%
To improve program effectiveness	351	96.7%
Other purpose(s)	45	12.4%

Table 3

Frequency and Percent of Total (n = 363) of the Types of Audiences to Whom Data from Candidate Outcomes Measures Are Released.

Audiences	*f*	%
Regional accreditation agency	218	60.1%
Program accrediting agency	271	74.7%
Title II Higher Education Act Reporting	318	87.6%
State Department of Education	331	91.2%
Teacher Education Candidates	256	70.5%
Unit/program faculty	346	95.3%
Faculty in other units of the institution	222	61.2%
University administration	296	81.5%
Program/unit/institution advisory board	255	70.2%
Public	203	55.9%
Print and/or electronic media	157	43.3%
Other audience(s) to whom data are released	32	8.8%

Table 4

Frequency and percent of institutions using each type of outcomes measure based on the number of of schools, colleges, and departments of education for whom we had data indicating collection and use of candidate outcomes data.

Outcomes Measure	*n*	*f*	%
Tests of Basic Skills	363	349	96.1
Interviews	361	213	58.7
Tests of Subject Matter Knowledge	363	306	84.3
Portfolios	363	319	87.9
Attitude Surveys/Self-Efficacy Scales	363	108	29.8
Teacher Work Samples	363	241	66.4
Measures of PK-12 Student Learning	363	103	28.4
Case Study Analyses/Problem Solving Scenarios	363	168	46.3
Teaching Artifacts	363	332	91.5
Tests of Professional Knowledge	363	200	55.1
Teaching Performance Evaluations	363	339	93.4
Follow-Up Surveys with Program Completers	363	307	84.6
Candidate Journals	308	147	83.1
Assessment of Technology Competency	199	110	67.1
Tests of Pedagogical-Content Knowledge	106	40	37.7
Employer Surveys	98	53	54.1

Appendix A

Institution: _____ INSTID: _____ Your Title: _____

Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDE)
Teacher Education Outcomes Measures

The purpose of this survey is to identify and describe what assessments schools, colleges, and departments of education use to measure outcomes for candidates in their programs for the initial preparation of teachers. *Candidate outcomes are defined as the knowledge, dispositions, and skills the SCDE expects candidates to develop as a result of the teacher preparation program.*

PROGRAM TYPE – If your SCDE offers an elementary teacher preparation program, please respond for that program. If there is no elementary preparation program, please respond for the largest program you offer.

The responses are for:

____ Our elementary teacher preparation program.

____ We have no elementary teacher preparation program. The responses are for _____
Specify type of program

KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR CANDIDATE OUTCOMES MEASURES – *Please check all that apply*

The knowledge base for the SCDE's candidate outcomes measures comes from:

____ NCATE Unit Accreditation Standards

____ State adopted standards

____ Unit or program developed standards

____ National standards: _____
Specify source(s): INTASC, NBPTS, etc.

____ We do not collect candidate outcomes data.

USE OF DATA FROM CANDIDATE OUTCOMES MEASURES – *Please check all that apply*

Data from candidate outcomes measures are used:

____ To make decisions regarding candidate admission, retention, program completion

____ To recommend candidates for certification or licensure

____ For national and state accountability information

____ For accreditation documentation

____ To improve program effectiveness

____ Other purpose(s): _____
Specify purpose(s)

____ We do not collect candidate outcomes data.

AUDIENCE FOR DATA FROM CANDIDATE OUTCOMES MEASURES – *Please check all that apply*

Data from candidate outcomes measures are released to:

____ Accreditation agency

____ U.S. Department of Education for Title II Reporting

____ State Department of Education

____ Teacher Education Candidates

____ Unit/program faculty

____ Faculty in other units of the institution

____ University administration

____ Program/unit/institution advisory board

____ Public

____ Print and/or electronic media

____ Other audience(s) to whom data are released: _____
Specify audience(s)

____ We do not collect candidate outcomes data.

FREQUENCY OF REPORTS OF DATA FROM CANDIDATE OUTCOMES MEASURES – *Please check all that apply*

Data from candidate outcomes measures are reported:

____ Each semester

____ Annually

____ Every five years

____ When data become available

____ Other: _____
Other time(s)

____ We do not collect candidate outcomes data.

MEASURES OF CANDIDATE OUTCOMES

For each of the measures of candidate outcomes used by your SCDE, indicate by checking in the appropriate boxes whether the measure is mandated and by whom; whether the measure is required for certification, and the source of the measure. Please mark all boxes that apply. *If your SCDE does not use the listed measure of candidate outcomes, leave the corresponding boxes blank.*

Mandated?			Required for certification or licensure?		Measures of Candidate Outcomes	Source?		
State	Unit	Not Mandated	Yes	No		Commercially Produced	Developed by State	Developed by Unit
					Tests of Basic Skills in Mathematics, Reading, and/or Writing (e.g., Praxis I, writing assessment, etc.)			
					Interviews			
					Tests of Subject Matter Knowledge (e.g., Praxis II, etc.)			
					Portfolios			
					Attitude Surveys/Self-Efficacy Scales (e.g., Teacher Perceiver, etc.)			
					Teacher Work Samples (i.e., measure that shows impacts of candidate's teaching on PK-12 student learning)			
					Measures of PK-12 Student Learning (i.e., student achievement test scores, etc.)			
					Case Study Analyses/Problem Solving Scenarios			
					Teaching Artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, unit plans, etc.)			
					Tests of Professional Knowledge (e.g., NTE, etc.)			
					Teaching Performance Evaluations (from direct observation or video)			
					Follow-Up Surveys with Program Completers			
					Employer Surveys			
					Candidate Journals			
					Assessment of Technology Competency			
					Tests of Pedagogical-Content Knowledge (e.g,, Praxis III, etc.)			

Appendix B

SCDEs Responding to the Special Study Survey

Adams State College
Alabama A&M University
Anderson College
Andrews University
Appalachian State University
Arizona State University
Arkansas Tech University
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Asbury College
Ashland University
Athens State University
Atlanta Christian College
Auburn University
Auburn University Montgomery
Augsburg College
Augustana College
Austin Peay State University
Avila College
Baker University
Ball State University
Bellarmine University
Beloit College
Benedictine College
Berry College
Bethany College
Bethel College
Bethune-Cookman College
Binghamton University
Black Hills State University
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
Bluefield State College
Boise State University
Bowie State University
Bowling Green State University
Briar Cliff University
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Dominguez Hills
California State University, Fullerton
California State University, Hayward
California State University, Long Beach
California State University, Northridge
California University of Pennsylvania
Calvin College
Campbell University
Capital University

Cardinal Stritch University
Carson-Newman College
Catawba College
Central Connecticut State University
Central Washington University
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Clark Atlanta University
Clayton College & State University
Clemson University
Coe College
College of Charleston
College of Saint Benedict/ Saint John's University
College of Saint Elizabeth
College of the Ozarks
Colorado College
Colorado State University
Columbia College
Concord College
Concordia University
Concordia University (St Paul)
Concordia University-Wisconsin
Coppin State College
Creighton University
Culver-Stockton College
Cumberland College
Dakota State University
Dana College
DePaul University
Delta State University
Dickinson College
Dickinson State University
Doane College
East Carolina University
East Stroudsburg University
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Michigan University
Eastern Nazarene College
Eastern New Mexico University
Eastern Washington University
Elizabeth City State University
Elmhurst College
Elon College
Emporia State University
Evangel University
Fairmont State College
Fitchburg State College
Fontbonne College
Fort Lewis College
Francis Marion University
Friends University

Frostburg State University
Gardner-Webb University
Georgia College & State University
Georgia Southern University
Georgian Court College
Gonzaga University
Governors State University
Grand Canyon University
Grand Valley State University
Greensboro College
Guilford College
Gustavus Adolphus College
Hamline University
Harding University
Harris-Stowe State College
Hastings College
Henderson State University
Hendrix College
Hofstra University
Huntington College
Idaho State University
Illinois State University
Indiana State University
Indiana University East
Indiana University School of Education
Indiana University South Bend
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana University-Purdue University
Indiana Wesleyan University
Jackson State University
Jacksonville State University
John Brown University
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas State University
Keene State College
Kennesaw State University
Kentucky State University
Kutztown University
Lees-McRae College
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Lewis University
Lewis-Clark State College
Lindenwood University
Livingstone College
Lock Haven University
Longwood College
Louisiana State University and A&M College
Louisiana State University- Shreveport
Luther College

Lyon College
Manchester College
Marian College
Marian College of Fond Du Lac
Mars Hill College
Marymount University
Marywood University
Mayville State University
McNeese State University
McPherson College
Meredith College
Methodist College
Miami University
Michigan State University
Midland Lutheran College
Millersville University of Pennsylvania
Milligan College
Millsaps College
Minnesota State University Moorhead
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Mississippi College
Mississippi State University
Mississippi University for Women
Mississippi Valley State University
Missouri Baptist College
Missouri Southern State College
Montana State University
Montana State University- Billings
Montclair State University
Montreat College
Morehead State University
Morgan State University
Morningside College
Murray State University
Nebraska Wesleyan University
New York University
Niagara University
Nicholls State University
North Carolina A&T State University
North Carolina Central University
North Carolina State University
North Carolina Wesleyan College
North Dakota State University
Northeastern State University
Northern Kentucky University
Northern State University
Northwest College
Northwest Missouri State University
Northwest Nazarene University
Northwestern College

Northwestern Oklahoma State University
Northwestern State University
Oakland City University
Ohio Northern University
Ohio University
Ohio Wesleyan University
Oklahoma Baptist University
Oklahoma Christian University
Oklahoma Panhandle State University
Oklahoma State University
Old Dominion University
Otterbein College
Pennsylvania State University
Pfeiffer University
Pittsburg State University
Presbyterian College
Providence College
Purdue University
Queens College
Radford University
Rhode Island College
Rider University
Rowan University
Rutgers University
Saint Cloud State University
Saint Joseph's College
Saint Louis University
Saint Mary College
Saint Xavier University
Salem State College
Salisbury State University
Salve Regina University
Sam Houston State University
San Diego State University
Seattle University
Seton Hall University
Shawnee State University
Shepherd College
Silver Lake College
Simpson College
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
South Carolina State University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern Adventist University
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Southern Utah University
Southwest Baptist University
Southwest Missouri State University
Southwest State University

Southwestern Oklahoma State University
Spalding University
Spring Arbor College
State University of New York at Oswego
State University of New York, College at
State University of West Georgia
Stetson University
Stillman College
Suffolk University
Taylor University
Tennessee Technological University
Texas Wesleyan University
Texas Woman's University
The College of New Rochelle
Transylvania University
Tri-State University
Troy State University
Troy State University Dothan
Tuskegee University
Union College
Union University
University of Akron
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
University of Arkansas at Monticello
University of Central Arkansas
University of Central Florida
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Colorado at Denver
University of Connecticut
University of Evansville
University of Florida
University of Great Falls
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Houston-Clear Lake
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
University of Louisiana at Monroe
University of Louisville
University of Maine at Farmington
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Massachusetts Lowell
University of Memphis
University of Minnesota
University of Minnesota, Duluth
University of Missouri- Columbia

University of Missouri-Saint Louis
University of Mobile
University of Montana
University of Montevallo
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Nevada, Reno
University of New Mexico
University of North Alabama
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
University of North Dakota
University of North Florida
University of North Texas
University of Oregon
University of Phoenix
University of Portland
University of Rio Grande
University of Saint Francis
University of San Diego
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
University of Sioux Falls
University of South Carolina Aiken
University of South Carolina at Spartanburg
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
University of Southern Indiana
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Tennessee
University of Tennessee Martin
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tulsa
University of Virginia
University of West Alabama
University of West Florida
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin-Stout
University of the Ozarks
University of Maryland, College Park
Valparaiso University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
Virginia State University
Viterbo University
Wake Forrest University
Warren Wilson College
Wartburg College
Washburn University
Washington State University
Weber State University

Webster University
Wesley College
West Chester University
West Liberty State College
West Virginia University at Parkersburg
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Western Illinois University
Western Maryland College
Western Michigan University
Western Montana College-UM
Western Oregon University
Wheelock College
Whitworth College
Wichita State University
Widener University
William Woods University
Williams Baptist College
Wingate University
Winona State University
Winthrop University
Wright State University
Xavier University of Louisiana
Youngstown State University

AACTE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM034176

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teacher Education Outcomes Measures: Special Study Survey	
Author(s): Stephanie A. Salzman, Peter R. Denner, Larry B. Harris	
Corporate Source: Idaho State University	Publication Date: 02-24-02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1 XX

Level 1

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Stephanie Salzman	Printed Name/Position/Title: Stephanie Salzman/Associate Dean	
Organization/Address: Box 8059, ISU Pocatello, ID 83209	Telephone: (208) 282-3807	FAX: (208) 282-4697
	E-Mail Address: salzstep@isu.edu	Date: 3-2-02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)