Program Report for the Preparation of Technology Education Teachers
International Technology Education Association/Council on Technology Teacher Education (ITEA/CTTE)

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

COVER SHEET

1. Institution Name

Rhode Island College

2. State

Rhode Island

3. Date submitted

MM DD YYYY

09 / 13 / 2010

4. Report Preparer's Information:

Name of Preparer:

Charles H. McLaughlin, Jr.

Phone: Ext.

(401) 456-8793

E-mail:

Cmclaughlin@ric.edu

5. NCATE Coordinator's Information:

Name:

Alexander Sidorkin

Phone: Ext.

(401) 456-8110

E-mail:

Asidorkin@ric.edu

6. Name of institution's program

Technology Education Program

7. NCATE Category

Technology Education

8. Grade levels(1) for which candidates are being prepared

K-12

(1) e.g. K-6, K-12, 7-12

9. Program Type

- First Teaching License
- Advanced Teaching
- Other School Personnel
- Unspecified

10. Degree or award level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate
- Endorsement only

11. Is this program offered at more than one site?

- Yes
- No

12. If your answer is "yes" to above question, list the sites at which the program is offered

13. Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared

Technology Education

14. Program report status:

- Initial Review
- Response to One of the Following Decisions: Further Development Required or Recognition with Probation
- Response to National Recognition With Conditions

15. State Licensure requirement for national recognition:

NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable

state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

- Yes
- No

SECTION I - CONTEXT

1. Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of ITEA/CTTE standards. (Response limited to 4,000 characters)

Rhode Island College's Technology Education is a comprehensive program that prepares students for entry into the Technology Education profession. The curriculum includes the study of Communication, Construction, Manufacturing, and Transportation/Energy systems and their associated processes; in conjunction with applied academics in Mathematics, Science, and General Education requirements. The program is designed to provide teacher candidates with design and problem solving skills, appropriate and safe tool and machine skills, and cooperative/team learning approaches necessary to teach and prepare their students to become technologically literate and adaptable in a changing technological society.

Rhode Island College is accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) and serves approximately 9,000 undergraduate and graduate students. Two thirds of incoming freshmen at RIC are first generation college students. An array of support services, including financial aid, scholarships, and counseling, is specifically targeted to these students.

The Feinstein School of Education and Human Development (FSEHD) is the largest school on campus and the largest teacher preparation program in New England. There are five departments within the FSEHD: Elementary Education, Special Education, Health and Physical Education, Counseling and Educational Psychology, and the Department of Educational Studies (DES). DES is the home of Educational Foundations courses, secondary education programs, K-12 programs, including the Technology Education program.

The FSEHD is accredited by NCATE and the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE). The FSEHD's Conceptual Framework, which informs teaching practices in Technology Education, is aligned with the Rhode Island Professional Teaching Standards (RIPTS). The Conceptual Framework is based on the reflective practitioner model with the focus on Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity and Professionalism. The knowledge base requires candidates to have thoughtful understandings of content, learners, teaching, and the historical, social, and cultural contexts in which these elements interact. In addition, candidates are prepared to transform content knowledge into pedagogically powerful lessons to meet the needs of all learners, including those with special needs and from diverse backgrounds. Our candidates are well prepared to meet the requirements for initial licensure in Rhode Island and the requirements that will be demanded of them regionally in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and New York State.

2. Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships. (Response limited to 8,000 characters)

The Technology Education program at Rhode Island College prepares its teacher candidates with continuous and wide varieties of field experiences prior to student teaching. Expectations for candidates' skill development increase developmentally from early field experiences to the student teaching semester. Field experiences are aligned with educational theory courses. Our candidates take the

professional sequence course work in a prescribed progressive order. A matrix: TE Field and Clinical Experiences is attached. This matrix gives an in-depth description of the activities that occur in each of these clinical classrooms.

FNED 346: Schooling in a Democratic Society is the introductory course before the professional sequence begins. All students in the FSEHD must take this course as part of their teacher education program of study. It takes place prior to admission to the program and FSEHD, potential candidates observe best practices in an urban classroom and tutor students for 20 hours. Placements take place in very diverse urban schools arranged through the Volunteers in Providence Schools (VIPS) program. A goal of the experience is for teacher candidates to develop an understanding of working with student learners and how social, economic and cultural factors affect teaching and learning. FNED 346 instructors require written feedback from teacher candidates, in which they describe and analyze what they are seeing and experiencing in light of their course content.
After admission to the Technology Education program at Rhode Island College students are provided with an outstanding field based curriculum. The candidates in the Technology Education program at Rhode Island College complete a variety of field experiences prior to their capstone student teaching experience. The expectations for candidates increase developmentally from early field experiences to the student teaching semester. Field experiences are aligned with educational courses and students are required to take them in a progressive order. The program reflects the Conceptual Framework centered on Planning, Action, and Reflection. The field experiences combine on site and in class evaluation and includes, peer review, review by clinical instructors, and the professors of record.

Most candidates begin the Technology Education Professional Sequence in their junior year. At this time, students have demonstrated mastery of technology content by completing the majority of the courses required for the program. After admission to the program and FSEHD, they take CEP 315: "Educational Psychology" with their first course in the professional sequence (TECH 406) and begin making more detailed observations and actively participate in a Technology Education classroom/lab.

Teacher candidates begin their clinical experience in TECH 406: Methods in Technology Education, where they spend nine hours observing in a Technology Education classroom/lab. They are required to write their observations and make connections to classroom content. Later in the semester, they create micro-lessons taught before their peers, and then in front of the class they observed.

This course is followed by TECH 407: Practicum in Elementary Technology Education. Candidates are required observe and teach in the Technology Education Lab at Henry Barnard Laboratory School (HBS) on RIC's campus. Under the guidance of the HBS Technology Education instructor who acts as a cooperating teacher and clinical instructor, students prepare age appropriate lessons that will be taught to HBS students. As the semester progresses, students take on more responsibility; eventually planning and delivering a unit of instruction to a class assigned to them. The clinical instructor evaluates candidates.

TECH 408 Practicum in Secondary Technology Education provides teacher candidates with opportunities to observe, assist, then teach in the middle school or high school classroom/lab. The cooperating teacher and clinical instructor work closely with the teacher candidate. There they begin the transition to accept responsibility for teaching their own class. Candidates prepare a unit of instruction that is taught and evaluated by the cooperating teacher and the supervising teacher from the college.

In TECH 421: Student Teaching in Technology Education students spend 14 weeks teaching in a Technology Education classroom/lab. Candidates teach three classes (usually two preps) and prepare units and lessons aligned to the Standards for Technological Literacy. Simultaneously, students are enrolled in TECH 422 Student Teaching Seminar in Technology Education During this semester the teacher candidates apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they have been developing through

study in their Technology Education program and the professional sequence. It is at this point that candidates are assessed on their ability to teach students in the middle school or secondary technology programs over a sustained period of time. College faculty who are certified and experienced Technology Educators supervises all candidates.

Field Placements
The Feinstein School of Education and Human Development (FSEHD) has established formal partnerships with 26 RI school districts and 1 charter school. Partnership Agreements, which are renewable upon the end of the three-year term, delineate, among other items, criteria for selecting cooperating schools, clinical instructors, and cooperating teachers. Generally field experiences and student teaching assignments are made in partnership school districts.

Clinical instructors and cooperating teachers complete training in the RI Professional Teaching Standards, offered by the Office of Partnerships and Placements (OPP). Starting in Spring 2011, cooperating teachers will be required to complete a professional development course offered by Rhode Island College during the semester that he/she serves as a cooperating teacher (to be renewed every four years).

Upon recommendation made by the college supervisor, the Dean of the OPP is responsible for placement of teacher candidates in TECH 408 Practicum in Secondary Technology Education and TECH 421 Student Teaching in Technology Education. Prior to Student Teaching, all teacher candidates must present evidence of having completed 25 hours of community service.

Criteria for Personnel
All clinical instructors for the teacher preparation program in Technology Education and cooperating teachers for Student Teaching are certified to teach Technology Education at grades K- 12. Cooperating teachers for Student Teaching must have three years successful teaching experience with at least one year in the current assignment. College supervisors and the Office of Partnerships and Placements maintain a list of 'best' practitioners who are the first contacted to become cooperating teachers and for student placement in their classrooms. The college supervisors in this program are full-time faculty who hold appointments in DES and the FSEHD. The college supervisor is also the instructor from TECH 407 and TECH 408, our practicum courses, allowing them the opportunity to view growth in the teacher candidates over their academic careers.

3. Please attach files to describe a program of study that outlines the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. The program of study must include course titles. (This information may be provided as an attachment from the college catalog or as a student advisement sheet.)

TE Advising Sheet	TE Program
Program Description	

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. This system will not permit you to include tables or graphics in text fields. Therefore any tables or charts must be attached as files here. The title of the file should clearly indicate the content of the file. Word documents, pdf files, and other commonly used file formats are acceptable.

TE Field and Clinical Experiences	Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric

Program/RIPTS Alignment with ITEEA/CTTE Standards	

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. Candidate Information

Directions: Provide three years of data on candidates enrolled in the program and completing the program, beginning with the most recent academic year for which numbers have been tabulated. Report the data separately for the levels/tracks (e.g., baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, alternate routes, master's, doctorate) being addressed in this report. Data must also be reported separately for programs offered at multiple sites. Update academic years (column 1) as appropriate for your data span. Create additional tables as necessary.

Program:
B.S in Technology Education Program

Academic Year	# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program	# of Program Completers(2)
2009/2010	25	2
2008/2009	21	2
2007/2008	20	2

(2) NCATE uses the Title II definition for program completers. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

6. Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	Charles H. McLaughlin, Jr.
Highest Degree, Field, & University(3)	PhD Technology Education, University of Maryland College Park
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member(4)	Faculty member, Program Coordinator, and Clinical Supervisor
Faculty Rank(5)	Professor
Tenure Track	YES
Scholarship(6), Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service(7):List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years(8)	McLaughlin, C. H. (2009). Technology Education for Sustainability. 96th Mississippi Valley Technology Teacher Education Conference. Nashville, TN. October 1 - 3, 2009. McLaughlin, C. H., Jr. Partnerships and Promise for Stem Education. ITEA 71st Annual Conference, Louisville, KY. March 25 – 28, 2009. McLaughlin, C. H., Jr. Cooperating Teachers and Mentors: Insuring the Future of Technology Education. ITEA 70th Annual Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah. February 15 – 18, 2008. Field Editor for Children's Technology and Engineering (CTE) -- ITEEA CTE Publication Committee Chair -- ITEEA Research and Scholarship Committee Chair -- Council on Technology Teacher Education Chair. Department of Educational Studies 2005 - 2009 Strategic Planning Oversight Committee – College Faculty Development Committee – College
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools(9)	K-12 Lifetime Certification in Technology Education for State of Rhode Island Public Schools Spring 2008 and 2009 taught "Introduction to Robotics and Programming" at Hope High School. Grades 10 - 12 participated in classes to

	build and program LEGO robots.

Faculty Member Name	Dr. Frank Farinella
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	Ed.D. Boston University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[4]	Faculty: Technology Education Supervisor Student Teaching
Faculty Rank[5]	Associate Professor
Tenure Track	YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	

Faculty Member Name	Jennifer M. Robinson
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	Master of Arts, Technology Education, Ball State University
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[4]	Faculty Member. Teaches: TECH 200 Intro to Technological Systems; TECH 202 Design in Technology Education; TECH 326 Communication Systems
Faculty Rank[5]	Adjunct Professor
Tenure Track	YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	2009- Present – RITEA (Rhode Island Technology Education Association)Vice President 2007- Present – TSA (Technology Student Association) State Coordinator 2004-2006 NEATT (New England Association of Technology Teachers) Secretary 2003-2008 RITEA Secretary
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	2002 - Present: Warwick Public Schools Winman Junior High School Technology Teacher, concentration on Drafting, Design, & CADD (Pre-engineering), Graphic Communications, and Introduction to Technology.

Faculty Member Name	Keith R. Doucette, Sr.
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	M.Ed, Technology Education, Rhode Island College
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[4]	Faculty Member. Teaches: TECH 200 Intro to Technological Systems; TECH 204 Energy and Controll Systems; TECH 205 Production Systems; TECH 327 Construction Systems; TECH 329 Transportation Systems
Faculty Rank[5]	Adjunct Professor
Tenure Track	YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3	Doucette, K. R. (2010) Ideagarden: Reaping What We Sew. ITEA 72 Annual Conference, Charlotte, NC. March 16-18, 2010 Doucette, K. R (2007) Technology Education a New Look. RITEA Annual Conference, Worcester MA. October 19 2007 Advisory Committee - E.G. High School Rubric Committee - E.G High School Student Mentor - East Greenwich Student Teacher Mentor - East Greenwich

years[8]	2009
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	K-12 Professional Certification for the State of Rhode Island 2001 – 10 East Greenwich High school Technology Teacher Classes Taught: Engineering, CADD, Video Production, Transportation Technology, Manufacturing Technology, and Architectural Design Additional Responsibilities: Technology Ed. Curriculum Development Technology Ed, Budget Coordinator

Faculty Member Name	John D. Arango
Highest Degree, Field, & University[3]	M.SCI, Industrial Technology (Individualized Study Program) , Rhode Island College
Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member[4]	Faculty: Clinical Instructor for TECH 407 Practicum in Elementary Technology Education (Grades k - 6)
Faculty Rank[5]	Assistant Professor
Tenure Track	þ YES
Scholarship[6], Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service[7]:List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years[8]	Principal's Advisory, HBS Staff Development Committee, HBS Green Committee, HBS Curriculum Development Committee, FSEHD Technology Committee, FSEHD Rhode Island College Council, RIC Rhode Island College Committee on Committees, RIC NALS Journal Translation: Arango, John and Ondis, Barbra. "Why Laboratory Schools Must Enroll Students With Disabilities", Translated article named above into Spanish, NALS Journal, Fall 2009 Technology and Children Publication: Arango, J. "STEM: It's Elementary, Too" – Web Links Arango, J. "Green Technology: reduce, Reuse, and Recycle" – Web Links in Children and Technology: ITEA Arango, J. "Green Technology: Redesign" – Web Links in Children and Technology: ITEA
Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools[9]	Elementary Technology Education Teacher: Henry Barnard Laboratory School - Rhode Island College International Technology, Education, and Development Conference 2010 Presentation: Arango, J. "Playing and Engineering Improves Student Learning", International Technology, Education, and Development Conference, March 2010, Valencia, Spain Presentation: Arango, J. "Learning Experiences in the Primary and Secondary School", International Technology, Education, and Development Conference, March 2010, Valencia, Spain 06, 07, 08 and 09 Lego Robotics at HBS. Grades 3,4 and 5 participated in classes to build and program LEGO robots and programs.

(3) e.g., PhD in Curriculum & Instruction, University of Nebraska.

(4) e.g., faculty, clinical supervisor, department chair, administrator

(5) e.g., professor, associate professor, assistant professor, adjunct professor, instructor

(6) Scholarship is defined by NCATE as systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel.

Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy, and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

(7) Service includes faculty contributions to college or university activities, schools, communities, and professional associations in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission.

(8) e.g., officer of a state or national association, article published in a specific journal, and an evaluation of a local school program.

(9) Briefly describe the nature of recent experience in P-12 schools (e.g. clinical supervision, inservice training, teaching in a PDS) indicating the discipline and grade level of the assignment(s). List current P-12 licensure or certification(s) held, if any.

SECTION II - LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the ITEA/CTTE standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

1. Please provide following assessment information (Response limited to 250 characters each field)

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment (10)	Type or Form of Assessment (11)	When the Assessment Is Administered (12)
Assessment #1: Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment (required)	Content Portfolio	Portfolio	Prior to Student Teaching
Assessment #2: Content knowledge in technology (required)	Course Grades and GPA	Review for Gateway entry	Prior to Student Teaching On-going
Assessment #3: Candidate ability to plan(required)	Unit Plan	Exit portfolio TCWS	End of Student Teaching
Assessment #4: Student teaching (required)	Student Teaching Observations	Observation and Progress Reports	Student Teaching
Assessment #5: Candidate effect on student leaning (required)	Case Study Analysis of Student Learning	Case Study	Student teaching
Assessment #6: Additional assessment that addresses ITEA-CTTE standards (required)	Professional Dispositions	P2T and Final ST Evaluation	Prior to Student Teaching; End of TECH 408 Practicum; End of Student teaching
Assessment #7: Additional assessment that addresses ITEA-CTTE standards (optional)	Exit Interview	Interview	End of Student Teaching
Assessment #8: Additional assessment that addresses ITEA-CTTE standards (optional)			

(10) Identify assessment by title used in the program; refer to Section IV for further information on appropriate assessment to include.

(11) Identify the type of assessment (e.g., essay, case study, project, comprehensive exam, reflection, state licensure test, portfolio).

(12) Indicate the point in the program when the assessment is administered (e.g., admission to the program, admission to student teaching/internship, required courses [specify course title and numbers], or completion of the program).

SECTION III - RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

1. For each ITEA/CTTE standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ITEA/CTTE standards.

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
1. The Nature of Technology. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of the nature of technology within the context of the Designed World.	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢	¢	þ	¢
2. Technology and Society. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of technology and society within the context of the Designed World.	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢	¢	þ	¢
3. Design. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of design within the context of the Designed World.	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢	¢	þ	¢
4. Abilities for a Technological World. Technology teacher education program candidates develop abilities for a technological world within the context of the Designed World.	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢	¢	þ	¢
5. The Designed World. Technology teacher education program candidates develop an understanding of the Designed World.	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢	¢	þ	¢
6. Curriculum. Technology teacher education program candidates design, implement, and evaluate curricula based upon the national Standards for Technological Literacy.	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢
7. Instructional Strategies. Technology teacher education program candidates use a variety of effective teaching practices that enhance and extend learning of technology.	¢	¢	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢
8. Learning Enviroments. Technology teacher education program candidates design, create, and manage learning enviroments that promote technological literacy.	¢	¢	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢
9. Students. Technology teacher education program candidates understand students as learners, and how commonality and diversity affect learning.	¢	¢	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	¢
10. Professional Growth. Technology teacher education program candidates understand and value the importance of engaging in comprehensive and sustained professional growth to improve the teaching of technology.	¢	¢	¢	þ	¢	þ	þ	¢

SECTION IV - EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

DIRECTIONS: The 6-8 key assessments listed in Section II must be documented and discussed in Section IV. Taken as a whole, the assessments must demonstrate candidate mastery of the SPA standards. The key assessments should be required of all candidates. Assessments and scoring guides and data charts should be aligned with the SPA standards. This means that the concepts in the SPA standards should be apparent in the assessments and in the scoring guides to the same depth, breadth, and specificity as in the SPA standards. Data tables should also be aligned with the SPA standards. The data should be presented, in general, at the same level it is collected. For example, if a rubric collects data on 10 elements [each relating to specific SPA standard(s)], then the data chart should report the data on each of the elements rather that reporting a cumulative score..

In the description of each assessment below, the SPA has identified potential assessments that would

be appropriate. Assessments have been organized into the following three areas to be aligned with the elements in NCATE's unit standard 1:
• Content knowledge (Assessments 1 and 2)
• Pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions (Assessments 3 and 4)
• Focus on student learning (Assessment 5)

Note that in some disciplines, content knowledge may include or be inextricable from professional knowledge. If this is the case, assessments that combine content and professional knowledge may be considered "content knowledge" assessments for the purpose of this report.

For each assessment, the compiler should prepare one document that includes the following items:

(1) A two-page narrative that includes the following:
a. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
b. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
c. A brief analysis of the data findings;
d. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
and

(2) Assessment Documentation
e. The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates);
f. The scoring guide for the assessment; and
g. Charts that provide candidate data derived from the assessment.

The responses for e, f, and g (above) should be limited to the equivalent of five text pages each , however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond five pages.

Note: As much as possible, combine all of the files for one assessment into a single file. That is, create one file for Assessment #4 that includes the two-page narrative (items a – d above), the assessment itself (item e above), the scoring guide (item f above, and the data chart (item g above). Each attachment should be no larger than 2 mb. Do not include candidate work or syllabi. There is a limit of 20 attachments for the entire report so it is crucial that you combine files as much as possible.

1. State licensure tests or professional examinations of content knowledge. ITEA/CTTE standards addressed in this entry could include but are not limited to standards 1,2,3,4, and 5. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, data from another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Content Portfolio	Portfolio Rubrics

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. Assessment of content knowledge in technology education. ITEA/CTTE standards addressed

in this entry could include but are not limited to Standards 1, 2,3,4, and 5. Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, GPAs or grades, and portfolio tasks[13]. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Grades as Course Data

See **Attachments** panel below.

(13) For program review purposes, there are two ways to list a portfolio as an assessment. In some programs a portfolio is considered a single assessment and scoring criteria (usually rubrics) have been developed for the contents of the portfolio as a whole. In this instance, the portfolio would be considered a single assessment. However, in many programs a portfolio is a collection of candidate work—and the artifacts included

3. Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan classroom-based instruction. ITEA/CTTE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standard 6,7 and 8. Examples of assessments include the evaluation of candidates' abilities to develop leson or unit plans, indivdualized educational plans, needs assessments, or intervention plans. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Evidence of Planning

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in clinical practice. ITEA/CTTE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 6,7,8,9, and 10. An assessment instrument used in student teaching or an internship should be submitted. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Student Teaching

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on student learning. ITEA/CTTE standards that could be addressed in this assessment include but are not limited to Standards 7,8, and 9. Examples of assessments include those based on samples of student work samples, portfolio tasks, case studies, follow-up studies, and employer surveys. (Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Effects on Learning

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. Additional assessment that addresses ITEA/CTTE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks,licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies.(Answer Required)

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Candidates' Dispositions

See **Attachments** panel below.

7. Additional assessment that addresses ITEA/CTTE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks,licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

Exit Interview

See **Attachments** panel below.

8. Additional assessment that addresses ITEA/CTTE standards. Examples of assessments include evaluations of field experiences, case studies, portfolio tasks,licensure tests not reported in #1 and follow-up studies.

Provide assessment information as outlined in the directions for Section IV

SECTION V - USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE PROGRAM

1. Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

(Response limited to 12,000 characters)

1. Content Knowledge:
The use of the content portfolio as a measure of candidate knowledge will be refined in the near future. The results from the portfolio are satisfactory and students seem to cooperate with developing the work samples. However, after reviewing the materials it seems that revision is going to be required to get a better picture of content mastery. Since candidates prepare the content portfolio with their best work, work they are proud of, we may not see the entire picture of what they learned in a particular course. Because they choose their own artifacts, it is clear from the data that candidates demonstrate content knowledge. However, it is less apparent that all candidates can demonstrate strength across all the

ITEEA/CTTE standards because of the artifacts they choose. We have come a long way from when students presented three ring notebooks loaded to capacity with all their assignments. One of the revisions the program is looking at is the use of a capstone project in every content class. This project would enable reviewers to judge whether standards had been achieved and content mastered by using a culminating activity. The work would still be reviewed by a group of teacher colleagues and the scores would then be recorded electronically. The collection of capstone scores along with course grades would then be used to quantify content knowledge. Candidates who pass the course, but have trouble with the capstone project will need to be dealt with, so that they can go to practicum or student teaching as well prepared as the other candidates.

The use of Praxis 2 as a measure of candidates' content knowledge looms large in our future. Since most, if not all, of our students are employed in the State of Rhode Island, they have fulfilled the requirements for initial certification with their grades, PLT, and evaluation of their student teaching work. There a multiple assessments that our candidates endure during the program, which all measure quality, the Praxis 2 exam will provide assurance of rigor in the future. We hope to begin using this with after the recruitment of a new cohort of undergraduates.

The program prides itself in delivering contemporary and meaningful course work that prepares candidates for the rigors of the TE classroom. Two classes need to be reviewed and revised. Computer Aided Design and Drafting and Design in Technology Education are two courses that students seem to be stumbling in. While design is an important part of our program, they come from heavily production-oriented programs. They do not come to us with much in the way of design techniques and drawing skills. Design is an essential skill; we certainly would like to see better results in those classes.

The new Engineering focus in our field may be somewhat problematic. However, with engineering concepts infused into the program we will seek out new and old relationships to strengthen that area. Rhode Island College does not have an engineering partner at this time. We have enjoyed good collaboration with the Community College of Rhode Island in the past, especially with members of its Mechanical Engineering Technology Associate's degree program. And, we are working to develop links with the University of Rhode Island's School of Engineering. Presently, we do not have an engineer teaching in the program. This might benefit us in the future.

As I became aware that we are slowly losing ground to technology, a proposal to NSF was submitted for 199K for lab improvements. The grant, if funded, will provide students with a new set of technical skills and new and better problem solving opportunities. It will also allow us to provide much need in-service experience for teachers and their students at schools with out this kind of equipment.

2. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions:
Despite the fact that two different evaluation systems were used during the review period, the data across the multitude of assessments reveal the program prepares excellent candidates for the field. The small groups represented in the review period have benefited from the undivided attention of cooperating teachers, supervising faculty, and other interested teachers who opened their classrooms to our candidates. The relationships we developed with our colleagues have been a huge factor in the success that our candidates enjoy. That said, I worry that the close relationship may have an effect on the way candidate work is scored during field experiences. As we become more familiar with the Teacher Candidate Work Sample and the Observation and Progress Report, I certainly would expect that there would be much more discrimination early in the evaluation of candidates. As this is the first time the program used these instruments, we will make overtures to our cooperating teachers to work with us to better discrimination between acceptable skill development and that, which is deemed excellent.

Like the earlier Observation Report, the Observation and Progress Report (OPR), which is currently

being used has been a nice tool to ensure that our candidates, supervising faculty, and cooperating teachers are communicating on a regular basis about the progress of the candidate. The OPR requires collaboration and feedback, which ensures the candidate is informed of strengths and weaknesses. We, as have the other programs in DES, will begin to use a new mini OPR in both of our practicum during the next year. This will ensure that our partners are familiar and confident using this instrument before candidates enter student teaching.

Our candidates begin developing lesson goals and objectives very early in the program. They are well versed in assessment of student learning by the time they reach practicum. It is a considerable strength that candidates bring into their student teaching sites; our partners in the public schools have complimented us on that. The dispositions candidates display is a result of the significant amount of time they spend out in the field observing and assisting in TE classrooms. This is one of our major strengths and we will remain true to this model because of the progress that candidates make at each level of interaction with students in TE classrooms.

We remain vigilant in our efforts to make sure that only the best candidates are allowed to progress in the professional sequence. We have been steadfast in our insistence that students meet all requirements before moving on to a more advanced practicum. Students who do not have the GPA, grades, or other requirements do not get into practicum. The Technology Education Program intends to maintain this standard. We may not have a lot of students, but they are very well prepared when they leave us!

3. Student Learning:
The data collected reveals that our students are well prepared to design, implement, modify, and assess instruction. Unlike other programs in the Department of Educational Studies, Technology Education has two required practica: TECH 407 Practicum in Elementary Technology Education (K-6) and TECH 408 Practicum in Technology Education (7– 12 Grades). Both field practica are 15 weeks long with 7 weeks of field experience. This unique situation puts our candidates in the position to prepare and teach lessons to their own classes much earlier than other programs in DES. Students have many opportunities to analyze their lessons and the impact that they have on their students for a longer period of time than other teaching candidates. During the seventh week of the TECH 407 class, students are already teaching, creating assessments for student work, and collaborating with the HBS labs teacher to discuss the teaching and learning process. This rich experience makes the transition to the public school much easier because they literally have a toolbox of assessments at their disposal. Armed with this experience they can go confidently to the secondary education practicum knowing that they have the skills to design creative lessons and develop appropriate evaluations to measure learning. The combined experience is an enormous benefit to our candidates as they take over classes during student teaching.

Conclusion
This study has revealed that the Technology Education Program meets the demands of the ITEEA/CTTE Standards and prepares candidates that are highly skilled and prepared to succeed in the classroom. So that we can continue to maintain these standards, we are open to change and will be guided by documented evidence, data and narrative, to continue preparing excellent Technology Education teacher candidates.

SECTION VI - FOR REVISED REPORTS OR RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS REPORTS ONLY

1. For Revised Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the standards that were not met in the original submission. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Revised Report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/resourcesNewPgm.asp?ch=90

For Response to Conditions Reports: Describe what changes or additions have been made to address the conditions cited in the original recognition report. Provide new responses to questions and/or new documents to verify the changes described in this section. Specific instructions for preparing a Response to Conditions Report are available on the NCATE web site at http://www.ncate.org/institutions/resourcesNewPgm.asp?ch=90

(Response limited to 24,000 characters.)

Please click "Next"

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